Preventing sexual violence in sport:

The determinants of positive coach-bystander behavior

Helena Verhelle, Tine Vertommen & Gjalt-Jorn Ygram Peters.

This document is the full text of “Preventing sexual violence in sport: The determinants of positive coach-bystander behavior”, a manuscript that has been submitted for review to JCP.

Please cite this document as (note that the most current version of this manuscript is hosted at PsyArXiv at <https://psyarxiv.com/gphj8/> – please check that URL before citing this article):

Verhelle, H., Vertommen, T., & Peters G. Y (2021). Preventing sexual violence in sport. The determinants of positive coach-bystander behavior. *PsyArXiv*. doi:[10/g884](https://doi.org/10/g884)

Preventing sexual violence in sport:

The determinants of positive coach-bystander behavior.

Abstract

Background: Coaches are instrumental in creating safe sport environments, especially in preventing sexual violence, but little is known about helpful bystander behaviors, hampering effective prevention programs.

Methods: To identify determining characteristics of positive bystander behavior, 1442 Belgian youth-sport coaches completed a dedicated online questionnaire on bystander-related attitudes, descriptive and injunctive norms, autonomy beliefs, and self-efficacy using two hypothetical sport-associated sexual-violence scenarios. Potential for change was analyzed using confidence interval-based estimation of relevance (CIBER).

Results: 127 coaches (9.6%) had witnessed sexual violence over the past year. Most had intervened (single incident: 3.7%; multiple incidents: 2.4%). Experiential attitude expectation, instrumental attitude evaluation, perceived referent behavior and approval, and subskill presence were positively associated with coaches' intentions to intervene.

Discussion: Of the determinants of positive coach-bystander behavior, attitude and perceived norms proved key constituents for programs addressing sexual violence in youth sport. To promote (pro-)active coach-bystander behaviors, the results are discussed from a theoretical and practice-oriented perspective.

Keywords: bystander behavior, sexual violence, sexual harassment, sport, safeguarding, prevention, intervention

Identification of determinants of positive coach bystanding behavior to prevent sexual violence in sport

Introduction

Although sexual violence is no longer an unspoken theme in the world of youth sport and sport is expected to be a healthy and safe environment, prevalence estimates paint a different picture. Mountjoy et al. (2016, p. 3) define sexual violence as “any conduct of a sexual nature, whether non-contact, contact or penetrative, where consent is coerced/manipulated or is not or cannot be given”. In this study, we likewise use the term as an umbrella concept encompassing verbal and non-verbal contact forms of sexual harassment and abuse.

Depending on the study designs and measures used, prevalence rates for sexual harassment range from 19% to 92% and for sexual abuse from 2% to 49% (Bjørnseth & Szabo, 2018; Mountjoy et al., 2016). In a Dutch-Belgian survey, 14% of the respondents reported having experienced at least one form of sexual violence within the context of organized sports before the age of 18 (Vertommen et al., 2016). In most cases, it did not concern single events but repeated incidents that took place over longer periods of time (Vertommen et al., 2019).

The often severe physical, psychological, social, and societal consequences of such incidents render sexual violence in sport a serious public health issue (Koontz et al., 2021). Yet, despite its high prevalence and impact, signs or incidents of sexual violence are often overlooked or not acted upon. Not intervening or offering help allows the violence to continue, facilitating the perpetrator and thus aggravating and prolonging the victim's suffering (Cense & Brackenridge, 2001; Spaaij & Schailée, 2019). The role of bystanders (i.e., individuals that are not directly involved as a victim or perpetrator that have the potential to intervene and amend the situation; Banyard, 2008) has received considerable attention ever since the notorious case of Kitty Genovese in the US in the 1960s, where newspapers reported of a young woman who had been stabbed to death while, presumably,

several neighbors were watching. Darley and Latané (1968) subsequently coined the term ‘bystander effect’ to describe the phenomenon of bystanders not taking action especially in situations in which many people are present. Today, the concept is viewed as outdated and is no longer supported by the recent literature (Levine et al., 2019). In their meta-analysis, Fischer et al. (2011), for instance, showed that the bystander effect does not hold in violent or dangerous situations nor in situations with many onlookers. Instead, a focus on the beneficial roles of bystanders thus seems warranted.

Banyard et al. (2020) distinguish two types of bystander interventions: reactive and proactive. Reactive ‘bystanding’ concerns both the negative or positive actions that a person undertakes in response to a high-risk situation (McMahon & Banyard, 2012; Rothman et al., 2019), where negative reactive bystanding is defined as either a lack of action or unhelpful actions (e.g., making fun of the victim, applauding the perpetrator’s conduct) immediately before, during or after an incident of sexual violence. Reversely, positive reactive bystander behavior encompasses all potentially helpful actions directly before, during or after an incident, i.e., at the time of an immediate risk or an ongoing, witnessed event of sexual violence.

Proactive bystander behavior is, in contrast, not restricted to one specific incident but comprises all supporting behaviors aimed at ameliorating or preventing sexual violence in general, (which may, for instance, include taking a course on sexual violence or remaining aware and perceptive of its risk or occurrence; Banyard et al., 2020). In the literature, people who take responsive and helpful actions in emergency situations are also labeled as ‘actionists’ (Rothman et al., 2019), ‘upstanders’ (Ferrans et al., 2012), ‘defenders’ (Pozzoli et al., 2012), or ‘prosocial bystanders’ (Banyard, 2011). In the present study, the terms positive bystander(s) and positive bystander behavior include both reactive and proactive onlookers and interventions.

Positive bystanders play an important role in maintaining a safe environment, and over the last decade the development, implementation, and evaluation of bystander interventions has received more attention in research, policy-making and practice than ever before. By educating people about sexual violence and bystander options, peer norms, attitudes, and beliefs can be changed. Adequately intervening in situations of sexual violence is not only beneficial to the victim and might stop the perpetrator, it also models the desired behavior, potentially encouraging fellow-bystanders to do the same on future occasions. In addition, positive bystanding may also reduce the risk of victimization and perpetration in bystanders themselves (Banyard, 2015).

A variety of bystander intervention programs in the context of violence is available. Most were developed in the United States and mainly focus on the prevention of sexual and dating violence on college campuses (e.g., Miller et al., 2012; Palm Reed et al., 2015). Some of these bystander programs have been systematically reviewed and were found to be effective in reducing the risk of both types of violence. Banyard and colleagues (2004, 2007), for example, showed that one- or three-session programs had improved attitudes and increased knowledge, and, most importantly, engendered prosocial bystanding behavior in 389 male and female undergraduates.

In their study, Levine and colleagues (2019) explored key factors involved in violence reduction and bystander interventions. Firstly, they emphasize that intervening in violent or hazardous situations is already the social norm among bystanders, even though interventions may not always be successful. Secondly, the authors stress that people do intervene even when others are present, thus showing that the popular belief that people do not act in the presence of other witnesses is a fallacy, making this a vital message to convey in bystander campaigns. Another major issue they describe is that people often think it is not safe to intervene. However, the researchers found the opposite: the chance of being victimized while

intervening is quite low. The final finding they report on concerns the social identity relationship between bystander and victim or perpetrator: bystanders are more likely to intervene in situations involving members of their own social or ethnic group are being victimized (e.g., friends, family, and acquaintances). To make prevention programs even more effective, Moynihan and Banyard (2008) recommend instructing course participants to not focus on possible perpetrators or victims only but rather on all stakeholders in the organization or environment given the notion that all members of a community have a role in preventing violence or harm and that everyone can become a bystander. Banyard (2015) states that prevention programs should be directed at promoting pro-active and reactive behaviors among *all* members of a given community.

When aiming to promote active bystander behavior, we first need to analyze its constituent parts. Before taking action, any bystander will, consciously or unconsciously, go through several, interlaced stages. First of all, they will have to note and interpret a situation as a problem. Next, they should feel the responsibility to do something about it, for if they do not, they will not take action. When they do experience a sense of responsibility, they will subsequently need to figure out what to do and, if a decision is reached, eventually choose to take action (Banyard, 2011). Each of these constituent stages can be influenced by different environmental conditions and psychological constructs such as (i.e., behavioral determinants; Bartholomew Eldredge et al., 2006). A first step in developing successful bystander intervention programs is gaining insight into the determinants of each sub-behavior.

In this paper we report the results of our study into the determinants that contribute to positive bystander behavior in youth sport coaches to inform the development of a dedicated coach-bystander training program to counter sexual violence in (youth) sports. To this end, we adopted the reasoned action approach (RAA; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010) as a theoretical framework. This model that builds on the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and the

theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) explains why people decide to perform (or not to perform) a certain behavior (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). The RAA states that the intention to carry out a behavior, such as intervening in case of a violent event, is determined by a person's attitude towards the behavior, their idea of how relevant others perceive the behavior (perceived norms), and their sense of behavioral control. For people with high intention to intervene, actual and successful execution of the behavior also depends on their abilities and skills, as well as environmental factors. The RAA explicitly does not address automatic behaviors (e.g., habits). Since positive bystander behavior is only infrequently called for, it firmly belongs to the domain of reasoned action.

Attitude, the first construct of the RAA, is defined as a person's subjective evaluation of the consequences of a behavior, conceptualized as favorable or unfavorable. Fishbein and Ajzen (2010) distinguish instrumental and experiential attitude, where in the first the individual sees the outcome as instrumental to their goal (e.g., "If I intervene, this is likely to end the sexual violence."), whereas experiential attitude is about the anticipated affective consequences of the behavior (e.g., "If I intervene, it is likely that I will feel confident").

Perceived norms refer to a person's perception of the approval or disapproval (injunctive norms) and behavior (descriptive norms) of relevant social referents. Injunctive norms are all about what you think others expect of you in a particular social context (e.g., "People important to me would approve of me protecting children from sexual violence"). An example of descriptive norms would then read "Most people like me will protect children from sexual violence" (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010).

Perceived behavioral control is a person's perception of their capacity and autonomy over their behavior, where capacity entails the level of confidence a person has in being capable to perform a behavior (e.g., "I am confident that, if I want to, I can protect children from sexual violence"). Autonomy refers to people's belief that they have control over the

behavior and that performing the behavior is up to them (e.g., “It is me who decides whether I protect children from sexual violence”; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010).

Because educational programs cannot directly change behavior but can change behavioral determinants, understanding which determinants primarily influence a given behavior in a given population is an important first step in developing behavior change interventions (Crutzen et al., 2017). Besides establishing which determinants are the most promising targets for an intervention, it is important to identify critical sub-determinants, i.e., determining underlying beliefs. Thus, if perceived norms play a prominent role, it is vital to learn which social referents matter the most (i.e., peers, family, or other persons or groups). If behavioral control is the problem, we need to identify the perceived barriers or the (sub)skills people feel they lack.

The study presented below focuses on youth-sport coaches as key players in the prevention of sexual violence towards child athletes in local sport settings. Almost all athletes begin their sport careers in local clubs at an early age, making safe sport environments crucial for their wellbeing and development. Since coaches play such a prominent role in youth sport, they are necessarily critical in their protection from harassment and abuse, most particularly sexual violence. We therefore conducted a survey among youthsport coaches to systematically identify the most relevant determinants of positive bystander behavior for future inclusion in a coach-bystander training program.

Method

Participants

This study uses a convenience sample of currently active adult youth-sport coaches in Flanders, Belgium. After providing their informed consent (see Procedure), 1,741 respondents aged ≥ 18 years started the online survey; 323 were excluded as they did not meet

the inclusion criterion of having been actively involved as a youth-sport coach in the past 12 months. Meeting the inclusion criteria, the remaining 1,422 respondents completed the full survey. The average age of the respondents was 36.7 years ($SD = 14.06$, range 18-79; the majority were men ($n = 883$, 63.7%). Most of the respondents worked as a volunteer ($n = 1,150$, 80.9%), had a coach qualification ($n = 865$, 60.8%), were members of a sports club with both recreational and competitive divisions ($n = 979$, 68.8%), and had more than one year experience as a coach ($n = 1,238$, 93.4%). There was an equal distribution in the age groups they coached (athletes aged below 12 years: $n = 549$, 38.6%; 12-18 years: $n = 321$, 22.6%; both groups: $n = 552$, 38.8%). All sociodemographic characteristics and details of the coaching context are summarized in Table 1.

Measures

Our group developed the online questionnaire “And what would you do?” specifically for our coach survey into their notions on bystander behavior with respect to sexual violence. As stated, we used the RAA (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010) as a theoretical framework to select and formulate the items. We divided the questionnaire into five parts with a total of 87 items (see Appendix 1). First, three questions probed the coaches’ personal experiences with active bystander behaviors in response to incidents of sexual violence during their coaching activities in the last 12 months.

Each subsequent section assesses the determinants of four target behaviors in four different phases: (1) The coach is vigilant for signs of sexual violence, (2) The coach sets explicit boundaries in case of (signs of imminent) sexual violence, (3) The coach intervenes in case of an incident of sexual violence, (4) The coach reports the incident to the club’s safeguarding officer. In order to contextualize the four target behaviors, two hypothetical scenarios of sexual violence (one of verbal sexual harassment and one of sexual assault) set in a local sport club were randomly presented to the participants.

The first item of each target behavior assesses behavioral intent (e.g., *“Being a coach, it is my intention to be vigilant for signs of sexual abusive behavior”*, *“If I find myself in such a situation, it is my intention to take action”*) while the subsequent items test the determinants (i.e., attitude, perceived norms, and perceived behavioral control) of the bystander behavior in question.

In accordance with the RAA, we gauged instrumental and experiential attitude, both operationalized as (i) ‘belief expectation’ (for instance, for instrumental attitude: *“Thinks that reporting to the safeguarding officer will improve the situation”*, and for experiential attitude: *“I feel comfortable setting firm boundaries in situation of sexual violence”* and *“I feel determined when I intervene in such a situation”*) and (ii) as ‘belief evaluation’ (*“I believe it is important to report an incident of sexual violence to a safeguarding officer”* and *“I need to feel comfortable when intervening”*, respectively).

Secondly, perceived norm was operationalized as injunctive norms and descriptive norms, with the first being divided into ‘motivation to comply’ (e.g., *“I like to act the way fellow coaches would want me to act”*) and ‘perceived referent approval’ (e.g., *“The club board will approve of my intervening in an incident involving sexual violence”*). Descriptive norms were assessed as ‘perceived referent behavior’ (e.g., *“Most people like me would set boundaries in such a situation”*) and ‘identification with referent’ (e.g., *“I want to do what fellow coaches would do when it comes to reporting the case to a safeguarding officer”*).

Finally, perceived behavioral control was assessed in terms of ‘autonomy’ and ‘capacity’, with autonomy being further divided into ‘power of condition’ (e.g., *“Whether I intervene in a situation is completely up to me”*), ‘presence of condition’ (e.g., *“My club has drawn up a code of conduct”*) and capacity into ‘subskill importance’ (e.g., *“I think the ability to explain what is wrong and what is appropriate behavior is important”*) and ‘subskill presence’ (e.g., *“I feel confident about being able to set boundaries”*).

Depending on the scale anchors, some determinants were rated on a bidimensional 7-point scale and others with a unidimensional 5-point scale, but always with question-specific anchors (Cf. Gehlbach & Brinkworth, 2011).

Procedure

The questionnaire was put online in June 2020 using (social) media channels of the project's partners, including the Flemish School for Coach Education, the Ethics in Sport Center, and several Flemish sport federations. Data were collected from 2020-06-29 up to 2020-08-11. Upon accessing the questionnaire, respondents were briefed about the survey objectives, informed that no personal data would be collected, and asked for their informed consent. Approval for the research protocol was obtained from the University Ethics Committee of the lead researcher (G-2020 12 2035).

Statistical Analyses

Descriptive analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics for Macintosh, Version 25.0.

All determinants were recoded into a scale ranging from 0 to 1 to facilitate visual comparison, with the percentages of maximal possible method (POMP) generating raw maximum scores (Cohen et al., 1999). Given the problems with regression analyses for determinant selection (Crutzen & Peters, 2021), the relevant importance of the determinants of the coach-bystander behaviors tested was analyzed using confidence interval-based estimation of relevance (CIBER) technique (Crutzen et al., 2017). CIBER visualizes the mean of each sub-determinant and the associations with the behavioral outcomes depicted in two panels, where the left-hand panel shows each variable's distribution using raw data, as well as 99.99% confidence intervals (CIs) for the means (i.e., how low or high participants score on the scale) presented as diamonds along the continuum of possible scores. The fill color of the diamonds gives an indication of the item means, with the color green

representing higher means, blue means close to the scale center, and red lower means. The right-hand panel presents the correlation coefficients of the sub-determinants and the specified target (e.g., the behavior measure) with a 95% CI. Here the diamonds' color reflects the association's strength and direction, with green indicating a strong positive association. The grayer the diamonds are, the weaker the association, where a red diamond signifies a strong, negative association. Combined, the panels show associations with behavior and the degree of room for improvement. The CIBER plots were created using the R package *behaviorchange*.

Since with CIBER we seek to identify the most relevant (sub-)determinants of positive coach-bystander behaviors, we look for those factors that show either low-to-average means and a positive association with the target behavior, or those with average-to-high means and a negative association (Crutzen et al., 2017). Next, we calculated the potential for change index (PCI or $P\Delta$), which quantitatively combines the room for improvement with the association with behavior (e.g., the product of (1) the difference between the (sub-)determinant's mean and the scale maximum and (2) the squared correlation with intention). In other words, the PCI provides a quantitative summary of the information shown in the CIBER plots (Knittle & Peters, 2019). A threshold PCI value of $\geq .05$ were taken to indicate (sub-)determinants relevant for inclusion in the coach-bystander intervention based on the patterns observed in the CIBER plots in combination with the corresponding PCI (note that this threshold represents our decision process in the context of this study and does not represent a heuristic meant for general application despite its coincidental similarity to the common default alpha). The PCI can conveniently aggregate much information into one quantitative metric, but because that inevitably also obfuscates potentially important information, we combined PCI and CIBER plots.

Results

The majority of the coach-respondents reported not to have noted or witnessed any case of sexual violence in their sports club in the previous 12 months ($n = 1,184$, 90.3%), while 78 (5.5%) had witnessed one such event, of whom 52 (3.7% of the subsample) had intervened. Another 49 coaches (3.4% of the total) reported to have witnessed several situations involving sexual violence, with six coaches not taking any action and nine having only rarely done so; 11 had acted on some occasions, 10 had intervened in most instances, while 13 coaches had intervened in each event.

Next, we will describe the (sub-)determinants our analyses identified as the most relevant for the promotion of positive coach-bystander behavior. Figures 1, 2, and 3 provide examples of the analysis process for several of these target behaviors.

Target behavior 1: The coach is vigilant for signs of sexual violence

The intention of coaches to be vigilant for signals of sexual violence was high ($M = .92$, $SD = .15$). Inspection of the CIBER plots and PCIs suggested that as regards instrumental attitude belief evaluation ($M = .87$, $SD = .18$, $r = .61$, $P\Delta = .05$) was the most relevant determinant for this target behavior (see Table 2). This may seem surprising given the high mean but is explained by the high correlation coefficient. Perceived referent behavior ($M = .66$, $SD = .20$, $r = .29$, $P\Delta = .03$) and subskill presence ($M = .60$, $SD = .21$, $r = .27$, $P\Delta = .03$) were also positively associated with intention, with the determinants' mean scores falling in the middle of the scale. However, both the corresponding correlation coefficients and PCIs were low, suggesting that these determinants show little promise as intervention targets. Also the relevance of perceived referent approval ($M = .83$, $SD = .18$, $r = .36$, $P\Delta = .02$) was relatively low: the sample means were already high, indicating little room for improvement, while the correlation coefficient was moderate, meaning that, as a

result, the potential for change is low. Similarly, the associations with intention and the PCIs of the remaining determinants of this target behavior were too weak to warrant attention in an intervention.

Target behavior 2: The coach sets firm boundaries in case of an incident of sexual violence

The intention of coach-respondents to set firm boundaries was high ($M = .86$, $SD = .18$). Subskill presence ($M = .71$, $SD = .22$, $r = .46$, $P\Delta = .06$), two items regarding experiential attitude belief expectation ($M = .76$, $SD = .20$, $r = .48$, $P\Delta = .06$; $M = .69$, $SD = .22$, $r = .39$, $P\Delta = .05$), and two items on perceived referent behavior ($M = .62$, $SD = .22$, $r = .44$, $P\Delta = .07$; $M = .63$, $SD = .22$, $r = .39$, $P\Delta = .06$) were strongly associated with this target behavior (see Table 3 and Figure 1). Given their mid-scale means and moderate associations with intention, these determinants exceeded the PCI threshold (0.05) and are thus relevant for a coach-bystander intervention, which also holds for perceived referent approval ($M = .81$, $SD = .17$, $r = .56$, $P\Delta = .06$) and instrumental attitude belief evaluation ($M = .75$, $SD = .14$, $r = .71$, $P\Delta = .12$) given their high correlation coefficients manifesting in high PCIs. The other determinants of this target behavior all had relatively high sample means. One group (instrumental attitude belief expectation, belief evaluation, subskill presence, and perceived referent approval) had a low association with intention ($r = <0.40$), rendering these determinants immaterial since they will not induce behavior change. Although the remaining determinants had high associations with intention ($r = >0.40$), they showed little room for improvement, as was reflected by their low PCI values.

Target behavior 3: The coach intervenes in a situation of sexual violence

The overall intention was high ($M = .82$, $SD = .21$) and seven determinants of this target behavior were identified as eligible for inclusion in the intervention (see Table 4 and Figure 2): instrumental attitude belief evaluation ($M = .78$, $SD = .22$, $r = .63$, $P\Delta = .09$), two

items regarding experiential attitude belief expectation ($M = .65$, $SD = .25$, $r = .66$, $P\Delta = .15$; $M = .54$, $SD = .28$, $r = .55$, $P\Delta = .14$), and two items regarding subskill presence ($M = .68$, $SD = .25$, $r = .65$, $P\Delta = .14$; $M = .79$, $SD = .22$, $r = .51$, $P\Delta = .05$). Two items of perceived referent behavior ($M = .61$, $SD = .23$, $r = .41$, $P\Delta = .07$; $M = .61$, $SD = .24$, $r = .34$, $P\Delta = .05$) had a moderate correlation coefficient, with the PCI score meeting the threshold. The associations with intention and the PCIs of the remaining determinants of this target behavior were too weak, excluding them as targets for the intervention.

Target behavior 4: The coach reports the situation to the safeguarding officer

Intention was high ($M = .78$, $SD = .24$), with nine determinants appearing relevant for the intervention (see Table 5 and Figure 3): instrumental attitude belief evaluation ($M = .72$, $SD = .27$, $r = .80$, $P\Delta = .18$), perceived referent behavior ($M = .58$, $SD = .24$, $r = .52$, $P\Delta = .12$; $M = .57$, $SD = .25$, $r = .49$, $P\Delta = .10$), subskill presence ($M = .72$, $SD = .24$, $r = .53$, $P\Delta = .08$), instrumental attitude belief expectation ($M = .73$, $SD = .18$, $r = .43$, $P\Delta = .05$), two aspects of experiential attitude belief expectation ($M = .60$, $SD = .27$, $r = .47$, $P\Delta = .09$; $M = .54$, $SD = .21$, $r = .36$, $P\Delta = .06$), two regarding perceived referent approval ($M = .82$, $SD = .17$, $r = .53$, $P\Delta = .05$; $M = .77$, $SD = .18$, $r = .44$, $P\Delta = .05$), and two regarding perceived referent behavior ($M = .58$, $SD = .24$, $r = .52$, $P\Delta = .12$; $M = .57$, $SD = .25$, $r = .49$, $P\Delta = .10$). All these determinants showed moderate-to-high correlations and PCIs $\geq .05$. The associations with intention and the PCIs of the remaining determinants of this target behavior were too weak and are thus not considered for the intervention.

Discussion

We adopted the CIBER approach to evaluate determinants of desired coach-bystander behaviors to help prevent sexual violence in youth sport. The majority (90.3%) of the 1,422 coaches responding to our custom-built online survey reported not to have witnessed any incident involving sexual violence in the last 12 months. This could mean that there were no

actual incidents or that coaches may not have been successful in detecting (signs of) sexual violence (Mountjoy et al., 2016; Vertommen et al., 2016). Additionally, due to the COVID-19 lockdown (June 2019–June 2020) that coincided with a large part of the study period, the opportunities to witness any incidents may have been relatively scarce. Nevertheless, the fact that 10% did report witnessing one or more incidents in the given timeframe highlights the importance of raising awareness among coaches about the prevalence of sexual violence.

By combining CIBER plots with the potential for change we were able to identify the most relevant factors contributing to the four coach-bystander behaviors that could be targeted in sexual-violence prevention programs for coaches. Reassuringly, we found high intention for all four target behaviors, reflecting that the coaches in our sample would be inclined to intervene when witnessing sexual violence during their watch, with the majority of those having observed an actual incident following up on this intent by taking action. Still, some did not intervene. Two of the reasons given were that the respondent had failed to recognize the behavior was unacceptable at that time or that the perpetrator was higher placed.

Of the 24 determinants that our analysis identified as worth promoting or reinforcing, one applied to *vigilance*, seven to *setting boundaries*, seven to *intervening*, and nine to *reporting to the safeguarding officer*. Since 46% of these were related to attitude, 37% to perceived norms, and 17% to perceived behavioral control, attitude (i.e., subjective evaluation of the consequences of one's behavior) and perceived norms (i.e., one's perception on whether relevant social referents would approve of/respond well to the behavior), it follows all would be key aspects to address in a coach-bystander intervention, most pertinently experiential attitude in terms of belief expectation, perceived referent behavior, and instrumental attitude in terms of belief evaluation, as well as perceived referent approval.

Like Witte et al. (2017), who observed that many bystanders who had intervened in a violent situation reported their actions had made them feel positive, proud and empowered (with far fewer reporting negative sentiments), we found that all but one of the items gauging the respondents' expectations about their behaviors, and most specifically their experiential attitude on belief expectations (i.e., affective consequences), were selected and thus core targets for a prevention program. We wish to note that the sub-determinant "*As a coach I feel comfortable being vigilant for signs of sexual abuse*", not approached the threshold score (.05) but may still be relevant as an intervention target.

Of perceived referent behavior, the second most relevant factor we identified, only the (sub-)determinants of vigilance were not relevant. All other items (e.g., "*Most people like me will set boundaries in case of sexual violence*" and "*Most people like me would intervene in a situation of sexual violence*") appeared important for fostering positive bystanding. Levine et al. (2019) earlier highlighted the importance of utilizing shared group membership through which intervening becomes the 'social' norm among peers when threatening or violent events are being witnessed. A sexual-violence prevention program for coaches of local sport clubs should then focus on this sense of group membership and prevailing (pro)active peer behavior.

Looking at instrumental attitude, we found belief evaluation (i.e., how one rates the value of a particular behavior; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010) to be relevant for all four target behaviors - and the only determinant that was significant for vigilance (target behavior 1). This latter would suggest that a prevention program should also be aimed at reinforcing coaches' willingness to be watchful for (signs of) sexual violence.

Of perceived referent approval (i.e., appreciation by relevant referents), subskill presence, played only a role in two target behaviors: setting firm boundaries and reporting to the safeguarding officer. Although there are various studies on topics ranging from child

maltreatment to sexual violence that show that higher levels of confidence are related to a greater willingness to offer help (i.e., Moynihan & Banyard, 2008; Mudde et al., 2007), in our survey perceived behavioral control proved the least relevant attribute to target since the scores for all its determinants, barring a few items on subskill presence, were too low.

Summing up, our study shows that the coaches in Belgium that responded to our survey already show high levels of intention to engage in the desired (pro)active bystander behaviors we evaluated but that there is room for improvement. Our results will aid the development of a well-founded sexual-violence prevention program for youth-sport coaches. Finally, although determining features of target behaviors can differ per population, region, and over time, the patterns we identified in the youth-sport context may still prove useful for prevention professionals in other settings who lack the means to conduct determinant studies themselves (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010).

Limitations and future research

Several limitations warrant mentioning. Essentially, our study is restricted to active coaches and their role in preventing sexual violence in (youth) sports. The results do not necessarily apply to other members of the sport community or other types of harmful behaviors.

Our survey touches on a sensitive topic and it is likely that only coaches already taking an interest in the prevention of sexual violence chose to complete our questionnaire (Sedgwick, 2014), which might then also explain why the intention for all targeted bystander behaviors was high. Arguably, our recruitment procedure may have excluded coaches with low interest and less positive intentions.

The majority of respondents reported not to have witnessed any incidents within the last 12 months. Since we used two hypothetical instances of sexual violence to explore coach-bystanding behaviors, it is feasible that they never did, but it is also possible they did

not report noteworthy events because they did not identify them as harmful. Speculatively, some coaches may even have seen signs or incidents but were reluctant to report this because they had failed to take action and, in hindsight, felt embarrassed. Either way, their responses may not necessarily reflect true intentions or behaviors. As alluded to above, the COVID-19 measures may also have limited observations of harmful incidents. Since verification of actual behaviors poses marked problems, we need to rely on assessments of intentions to exhibit the desired (pro)active bystander behaviors, where intentions need not reflect actual behavior when this is called for.

We based our survey on the RAA. Although it is one of the most widely utilized theories in the field of health promotion and behavior change, other models may add to our findings and help further explain or identify more determining features of positive bystander behaviors.

We opted for CIBER since it has the advantage of combining the measures of room for improvement and association strengths. However, the quality of the output depends on the quality of the operationalizations, in our case the selection and formulation of the (sub)determinants (Crutzen et al., 2017).

We feel that our survey analysis has yielded interesting leads for the development of an intervention for coaches aimed at preventing sexual violence in youth sport and, bearing in mind that the patterns we observed may differ, they may inform prevention strategies for other areas of abuse or violence and other sport contexts. We do recommend conducting a dedicated determinant study when the necessary resources are available. The focus of this research should then be on identifying bystander behavior in, among other areas of abuse, psychological or physical violence, and include all bystanders in the given setting. If we can develop programs to educate and train all actors in local or national sports, i.e., besides coaches the athletes themselves, their parents or partners, and club managers, and if we

manage to procure endorsement by (inter)national umbrella organizations, we will be far better able to ensure that sports can be practiced in a safe environment.

Conclusion

The CIBER approach was applied to gain a better understanding of the predictors of positive coach-bystander behavior with respect to sexual violence. The results showed that for the prevention of sexual violence in sport, coach-bystander interventions should target specific (sub-)determinants of their attitude toward and perceived norms of the desired (pro)active behaviors. Although determining factors may vary for different types of abuse and sport settings, the outcomes presented can also inform other violence-in-sport prevention campaigns.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims*, 23(1). <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. (2015). *Toward the Next Generation of Bystander Prevention of Sexual and Relationship Violence*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-23171-6>
- Banyard, V. L., Mitchell, K. J., Waterman, E. A., Rizzo, A. J., & Edwards, K. M. (2020). Context Matters: Reactive and Proactive Bystander Action to Prevent Sexual and Dating Violence in High Schools. *Journal of School Violence*, 499–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2020.1752221>
- 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>
- Bartholomew Eldredge, L. K., Markham, C. M., Ruiter, R. A. C., Fernandez, M. E., Kok, G., & Parcel, G. S. (2006). *Planning health promotion programs: An intervention*

mapping approach. Jossey-Bass.

Bjørnseth, I., & Szabo, A. (2018). Sexual Violence Against Children in Sports and Exercise: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 27(4), 365–385.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2018.1477222>

Cense, M., & Brackenridge, C. (2001). Temporal and Developmental Risk Factors for Sexual Harassment and Abuse in Sport. *European Physical Education Review*, 7(1), 61–79.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X010071006>

Cohen, P., Cohen, J., Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1999). The Problem of Units and the Circumstance for POMP. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 34(3), 315–346.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327906MBR3403_2

Crutzen, R., & Peters, G.-J. (2021). The Regression Trap: Why Regression Analyses Are Not Suitable For Selecting Determinants To Target In Behavior Change Interventions. Preprint. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/jsfz9>

Crutzen, R., Peters, G.-J. Y., & Noijen, J. (2017). Using Confidence Interval-Based Estimation of Relevance to Select Social-Cognitive Determinants for Behavior Change Interventions. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 5(165), 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00165>

Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander interventions in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 377–383.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0025589>

Ferrans, S., D., Selman, R., L., & Feigenberg, L., F. (2012). Rules of the culture and personal needs: Witnesses' decision-making processes to deal with situations of bullying in middle school. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82, 445–470.
<https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.82.4.4u5v1n8q67332v03>

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention and behaviour: An*

introduction to theory and research. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). *Predicting and Changing Behavior: The Reasoned Action Approach*. Taylor & Francis.

Gehlbach, H., & Brinkworth, M. E. (2011). Measure Twice, Cut down Error: A Process for Enhancing the Validity of Survey Scales. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(4), 380–387. <https://doi.org/10/bnn2s3>

Knittle, K., & Peters, G.-J. (2019). *Potential for change (PA): New metrics for tailoring and predicting response to behavior change interventions*. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/25EWR>

Koontz, J. S., Mountjoy, M., Abbott, K. E., Aron, C. M., Basile, K. C., Carlson, C. T., Chang, C. J., Diamond, A. B., Dugan, S. A., Hainline, B., Herring, S. A., Hopkins, B. E., Joy, E. A., Judge, J. P., LaBotz, M., Matuszak, J., McDavis, C. J., Myers, R. A., Nattiv, A., ... Roberts, W. O. (2021). Sexual violence in sport: American Medical Society for Sports Medicine Position Statement. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 55(3), 132–134. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-102226>

Levine, M., Philpot, R., & Kovalenko, A. G. (2020). Rethinking the Bystander Effect in Violence Reduction Training Programs. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 14(1), 273–296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12063>

McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When Can I help? A Conceptual Framework for the Prevention of Sexual Violence Through Bystander Intervention. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, 13(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015>

Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., Stetkevich, N., Brown, E. W., Moideen, F., & Silverman, J. G. (2012). “Coaching Boys into Men”: A Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial of a Dating Violence Prevention Program. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 51(5), 431–438.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.01.018>

Mountjoy, M., Brackenridge, C. H., Arrington, M., Blauwet, C., Carska-Sheppard, A., Fasting, K., Kirby, S., Leahy, T., Marks, S., Martin, K., Starr, K., Tiivas, A., & Budgett, R. (2016). The IOC Consensus Statement: Harassment and abuse (non-accidental violence) in sport. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 50, 1019–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2016-096121>

Moynihan, M. M., & Banyard, V. L. (2008). Community Responsibility for Preventing Sexual Violence: A Pilot Study with Campus Greeks and Intercollegiate Athletes. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 36(1–2), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852350802022274>

Mudde, A. N., Hoefnagels, C. J., Van Wijnen, L. G. C., & Kremers, S. P. J. (2007). Bystanding an abused child: Testing the applicability of the stages of change construct. *Health Education Research*, 22(1), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyl056>

Palm Reed, K. M., Hines, D. A., Armstrong, J. L., & Cameron, A. Y. (2015). Experimental evaluation of a bystander prevention program for sexual assault and dating violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 5(1), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037557>

Pozzoli, T., Gini, G., & Vieno, A. (2012). The role of individual correlates and class norms in defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying: A multilevel analysis. *Child Development*, 83, 1917–1931. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01831.x>

Rothman, E. F., Edwards, K. M., Rizzo, A. J., Kearns, M., & Banyard, V. L. (2019). Perceptions of Community Norms and Youths' Reactive and Proactive Dating and Sexual Violence Bystander Action. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 63(1–2), 122–134. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12312>

Sedgwick, P. (2014). Non-response bias versus response bias. *BMJ*, 348(apr09 1), g2573–g2573. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g2573>

Spaaij, R., & Schailée, H. (2019). Unsanctioned aggression and violence in amateur sport: A multidisciplinary synthesis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 44*, 36–46.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.11.007>

Vertommen, T., Laureys, M., Stockman, D., Verhelle, H., & Aga, N. (2019). “Jij kan de absolute top bereiken, maar alleen als je me vertrouwt”. Plegerkenmerken van seksueel kindermisbruik in de sport vanuit slachtofferperspectief. *Panopticon, 40*(4), 254–272.

Vertommen, T., Schipper-van Veldhoven, N., Wouters, K., Kampen, J. K., Brackenridge, C. H., Rhind, D. J. A., Neels, K., & Van Den Eede, F. (2016). Interpersonal violence against children in sport in the Netherlands and Belgium. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 51*, 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.10.006>

Witte, T. H., Casper, D. M., Hackman, C. L., & Mulla, M. M. (2017). Bystander interventions for sexual assault and dating violence on college campuses: Are we putting bystanders in harm's way? *Journal of American College Health, 65*(3), 149–157.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2016.1264407>

Table 1*Sociodemographics of the coach-respondents and coaching context*

Characteristics	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Male	883	62.1
Female	490	34.5
Unknown	49	3.4
Age of athletes coached		
Younger than 12 years old	549	38.4
Between 12 and 18 years old	321	22.6
Both groups	552	38.8
Athletes with disability		
Yes	105	7.6
No	1278	92.4
Coaching context	109	7.7
Recreational sport only	294	20.7
Competitive sport only	979	68.8
Both		
Competition level athletes/clubs coached	600	42.2
Local level	721	50.7
Regional level	497	35.0
National level	99	7.0
International level		
	1150	80.9
Coaching status	176	12.4
Volunteer		
Employed or self-employed		
	865	60.8
Coaching qualification	457	32.1
Yes		
No		

Table 2*Target behavior 1: The coach is vigilant for signs of sexual violence*

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PΔ	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Instrumental attitude belief evaluation	<i>Believes vigilance to be important</i>	.05	.61	.87 (.18)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes others would be vigilance</i>	.03	.29	.66 (.20)
Subskill presence	<i>Feels confident about detecting abilities</i>	.03	.27	.60 (.21)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks others approve of his/her being vigilant</i>	.02	.36	.83 (.18)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels comfortable being vigilant</i>	.02	.25	.66 (.21)
Power of condition	<i>Being vigilant is own decision</i>	.01	.22	.80 (.19)

Note. All sub-determinants were recoded to a 0-1 scale.**Table 3***Target behavior 2: The coach sets firm boundaries in case of an incident of sexual violence*

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PΔ	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Instrumental attitude belief evaluation	<i>Believes setting clear boundaries is important</i>	.12	.71	.75 (.14)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes others would also set boundaries</i>	.07	.44	.62 (.22)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks others would approve of his/her setting boundaries</i>	.06	.56	.81 (.17)
Subskill presence	<i>Feels confident about being able to set boundaries</i>	.06	.46	.71 (.22)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels determined when it comes to setting boundaries</i>	.06	.48	.76 (.20)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes fellow coaches would also set boundaries</i>	.06	.39	.63 (.22)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels comfortable setting boundaries</i>	.05	.39	.69 (.22)

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PΔ	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Instrumental attitude belief expectation	<i>Believes setting boundaries will help improve the situation</i>	.04	.42	.75 (.22)
Instrumental attitude belief evaluation	<i>Believes improving the situation is important</i>	.03	.50	.90 (.13)
Subskill presence	<i>He/she is able to explain what is (not) allowed</i>	.03	.42	.82 (.19)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Finds approval from fellow trainers for setting boundaries important</i>	.03	.41	.81 (.17)
Importance subskill	<i>Finds being able to explain what is (not) allowed important</i>	.02	.32	.81 (.19)
Identification with referent	<i>Likes to act like fellow coaches regarding boundaries</i>	.02	.23	.58 (.29)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks the club board would approve of his/her setting boundaries</i>	.02	.36	.86 (.15)
Power of condition	<i>Setting boundaries is own decision</i>	.01	.32	.87 (.17)
Motivation to comply	<i>Likes to act the way fellow coaches would want him/her to act</i>	.01	.15	.55 (.28)
Power of condition	<i>Finds the club having a code of conduct important</i>	.01	.21	.75 (.25)
Presence of condition	<i>Thinks the club probably has a code of conduct</i>	.01	.16	.73 (.29)
Motivation to comply	<i>Likes to act the way the club board wants him/her to act</i>	.01	.14	.60 (.28)

Note. All sub-determinants were recoded to a 0-1 scale.

Table 4

Target behavior 3: The coach intervenes in a situation of sexual violence

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PΔ	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels determined when intervening</i>	.15	.66	.65 (.25)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels comfortable intervening</i>	.14	.55	.54 (.28)
Subskill presence	<i>Feels confident in his/her ability to intervene</i>	.14	.65	.68 (.25)
Instrumental attitude belief evaluation	<i>Believes intervening to be important</i>	.09	.63	.78 (.22)

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PA	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes fellow trainers would also intervene</i>	.07	.41	.61 (.23)
Subskill presence	<i>He/she is able to explain what went wrong and what appropriate behavior is</i>	.05	.51	.79 (.22)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes others would also intervene</i>	.05	.34	.61 (.24)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks important others would approve of his/her intervening</i>	.03	.43	.83 (.16)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks fellow trainers would approve of his/her intervening</i>	.03	.34	.77 (.17)
Identification with referent	<i>Likes to be like fellow coaches regarding intervening</i>	.02	.21	.56 (.29)
Motivation to comply	<i>Likes to act the way fellow coaches would want him/her to act</i>	.02	.19	.50 (.28)
Presence condition	<i>Thinks the club probably has a code of conduct</i>	.02	.25	.74 (.29)
Power of condition	<i>The decision to intervene is entirely up to him/her</i>	.02	.34	.87 (.17)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks the club board would approve of his/her intervening</i>	.01	.29	.83 (.16)
Experiential attitude belief evaluation	<i>Thinks having a sense of determination is important</i>	.01	.18	.68 (.22)
Instrumental attitude belief expectation	<i>Thinks intervening will help improve the situation</i>	.01	.18	.72 (.17)
Motivation to comply	<i>Likes to act the way the club board would want him/her to act</i>	.01	.14	.57 (.27)
Importance subskill	<i>Thinks the ability to explain what was wrong and what appropriate behavior is very important</i>	.01	.18	.82 (.20)
Power of condition	<i>Thinks there needs to be a code of conduct explaining when to intervene</i>	.01	.14	.78 (.23)
Experiential attitude belief evaluation	<i>Thinks feeling comfortable to intervene is important</i>	.00	.02	.60 (.25)

Note. All sub-determinants were recoded to a 0-1 scale.

Table 5*Target behavior 4: The coach reports the incident to the safeguarding officer*

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PA	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Instrumental attitude belief evaluation	<i>Believes reporting is very important</i>	.18	.80	.72 (.27)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes others would also report</i>	.12	.52	.58 (.24)
Perceived referent behavior	<i>Believes fellow coaches would also report</i>	.10	.49	.57 (.25)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels comfortable about reporting</i>	.09	.47	.60 (.27)
Subskill presence	<i>Feels confident that he/she would report</i>	.08	.53	.72 (.24)
Experiential attitude belief expectation	<i>Feels loyal to fellow trainers when reporting</i>	.06	.36	.54 (.21)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks important others would approve of his/her reporting</i>	.05	.53	.82 (.17)
Instrumental attitude belief expectation	<i>Thinks reporting will improve the situation</i>	.05	.43	.73 (.18)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks fellow coaches would approve of his/her reporting</i>	.05	.44	.77 (.18)
Identification with referent	<i>Likes to be like fellow trainers when it comes to reporting</i>	.03	.27	.56 (.28)
Motivation to comply	<i>Likes to act the way fellow coaches would want him/her to act</i>	.03	.25	.51 (.28)
Motivation to comply	<i>Likes to act the way the club board want him/her to act</i>	.03	.26	.57 (.27)
Perceived referent approval	<i>Thinks the club board would approve of his/her reporting</i>	.03	.41	.83 (.16)
Subskill presence	<i>He/she is able to report any situation discreetly</i>	.02	.37	.86 (.18)
Power of condition	<i>Deciding to report is own decision</i>	.01	.30	.87 (.17)
Instrumental attitude belief evaluation	<i>Believes improving the situation is important</i>	.01	.28	.84 (.19)
Presence condition	<i>Thinks it is important to have a safeguarding officer to facilitate reporting</i>	.01	.20	.78 (.23)
Power of condition	<i>The presence of a safeguarding officer facilitates reporting</i>	.01	.15	.76 (.32)

Determinants	Sub-determinants	PΔ	Correlation (r)	Means (SD)
Experiential attitude belief evaluation	<i>Thinks maintaining a sense of loyalty is important</i>	.00	.09	.59 (.26)
Importance subskill	<i>Feels being discreet when reporting is crucial</i>	.00	.06	.83 (.20)

Note. All sub-determinants were recoded to a 0-1 scale.

Figure 1.

Ciberplot target behavior 2: The coach sets firm boundaries in case of an incident of sexual violence

Figure 2.

Ciberplot target behavior 3: The coach intervenes in a situation of sexual violence

Figure 3.

Ciberplot target behavior 4: The coach reports the incident to the safeguarding officer