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The Good Night Out Campaign (GNOC) – evaluation of a nightlife worker training programme to prevent sexual violence (SV) in Liverpool

**WHAT WE DID**

- 135 trainees completed a pre and post training survey.
- Surveys measured trainee’s knowledge on sexual violence, sexual violence myth acceptance, and readiness and confidence to intervene in incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability in nightlife.
- The post training survey asked additional questions about trainee’s views on the GNOC training, and their personal experience of nightlife related sexual violence.

**WHAT WE FOUND**

Findings suggest that the GNOC training programme is associated with: improvements in knowledge; improved attitudes towards sexual violence; and, greater readiness and confidence to intervene in sexual violence, amongst nightlife workers. Future evaluation of the GNOC should explore if engagement with the campaign leads to changes in approaches to preventing and responding to sexual violence at a venue, nightlife worker and nightlife patron level.

**CONCLUSION**

The GNOC was developed for licenced premises and aims to support those who work in nightlife settings to better understand, respond to and prevent sexual violence (www.goodnightoutcampaign.org). In 2019, GNOC facilitators (from Liverpool Local Authority and RASA Merseyside) worked with 11 nightlife venues to engage them in the GNOC, providing guidance on preventing and responding to sexual violence, training for over 150 nightlife workers, and materials to display in venues to raise awareness of the GNOC and encourage nightlife patrons to report incidents.
INTRODUCTION

Nightlife environments play a key part in contemporary leisure practices and offer nightlife users space to socialise and have fun. However, evidence has shown that there are a number of risks associated with nightlife environments, such as excessive alcohol use (1), injury (2,3) and sexual violence (4). Sexual violence is a significant public health, human rights and gender equality issue, which places considerable burdens on individuals’ health and well-being, local services and community’s (5,6) (Box 1). Nightlife-related sexual violence can include incidents that occur within nightlife, as well as any incidents that occur before or after a night out (e.g. at home), and spans all forms of sexual violence including harassment, unwanted sexual touching and rape (7).

Across England and Wales, 20% of females and 4% of men are estimated to have experienced some type of sexual assault, with females aged 16 to 24 years being the demographic most likely to be the victim of a sexual offence (8). A few studies have indicated the extent of nightlife-related sexual violence. In a study of UK nightlife patrons (aged 18+), 11% reported experiencing sexual violence whilst on a night out in the past three months (9). Other study’s also suggest that nightlife workers can experience sexual violence. Surveys with nightlife staff in three European countries found that 56% of respondents had experienced sexual violence either on a night out (36%) or whilst working in the nightlife environment (26%) (10).

The development and implementation of prevention strategies that target sexual violence within nightlife settings is critical. However, few prevention strategies exist that specifically aim to address nightlife-related sexual violence, and even less are formally evaluated (7). There is some evidence to suggest that bystander intervention programmes can have success in preventing and responding to sexual violence in the nightlife environment. For example, recent studies in the USA and Europe examining the impact of nightlife worker bystander training programmes suggest positive impacts on altering rape myths and barriers to intervention, including bartenders’ willingness to intervene (7,9,11).

In the United Kingdom, the Good Night Out Campaign (GDOC) aims to end sexual violence in nightlife settings and festivals through an accredited education and awareness programme. This includes a review of current practice and production of a venue agreement, signed by the venue manager, which provides examples of best practice and in-depth legal information. Additionally, a training programme (Box 2) is provided for nightlife staff as well as posters (see Figure 1) to display in venues that aim to increase awareness of the campaign and encourage nightlife users to report sexual violence. In 2019, as part of a community level multi-component approach to preventing sexual violence, partners from Liverpool Local Authority and a local sexual violence support service (RASA Merseyside) were trained to deliver the GNOC across Liverpool’s nightlife. Over a nine-month period, partners delivered the GNOC training to over 150 nightlife workers from 11 venues. To inform the development, and future continuation of the training, Liverpool John Moores University have implemented an evaluation of the training programme.

**Box 1 World Health Organization definition of sexual violence**

“Sexual violence is any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, or other act directed against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting. It includes rape, defined as the physically forced or otherwise coerced penetration of the vulva or anus with a penis, other body part or object” (6).
EVALUATION METHODS

A series of surveys were administered to nightlife venue staff who took part in the GNOC training sessions:

**Survey One** was completed prior to the commencement of the GNOC training. This survey collected baseline data about the participant’s awareness and knowledge of sexual violence in nightlife settings, as well as measuring the participant’s attitudes relating to sexual violence, and their readiness and confidence in intervening if they witnessed sexual violence or other vulnerabilities.

**Survey Two** was completed at the end of the training session. This survey reflected on the participant’s experience of the GNOC training. Questions concerning the participant’s awareness of sexual violence in nightlife settings as well as their attitudes to sexual violence, and readiness and confidence in intervening if they witnessed sexual violence or other vulnerabilities were also repeated. Additionally, the survey enquired about the participant’s own experiences of witnessing, intervening or experiencing sexual violence in nightlife settings.

The trainer provided a verbal description of the study prior to the training commencing, and those who were interested in taking part were provided with a participant information sheet and survey one. Survey two was provided at the end of the training session, along with a plain sealable envelope to allow participants to return their surveys securely. All quantitative data analysis was carried out using SPSS, and a range of statistics were used to explore differences between the pre and post training surveys. The two surveys were anonymously linked in order to provide comparative data. The study had approval from Liverpool John Moores University Research Ethics Committee.
FINDINGS

Sample characteristics
135 trainees completed the pre and post training survey. The majority of respondents were male (57.9%), and aged 18-29 years (92.6%). Just under half (47.3%) of participants stated they held a bar tender role, and 55.3% had worked in the night time economy (NTE) for less than two years (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Participant demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 18-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 22-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged 30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar supervisor/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other job role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years worked in NTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+ years worked in NTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge on sexual violence
In the post-training survey, the majority of trainees agreed (strongly agree/agree) that the training had improved their knowledge in relation to: the nature and extent of sexual violence in the nightlife environment (98.5%); how to respond to sexual violence in the nightlife environment (97.8%); and, where to go for help and support in cases of sexual violence (99.3%) (Figure 2).

Sexual violence myth acceptance
Three questions assessed participant’s sexual violence myth acceptance: unwanted sexual advances are a normal part of a night out, if someone who is experiencing sexual violence is drunk they are at least partly to blame and sexual violence is never the fault of the victim. Prior to training commencement, 29.2%, 3.8% and 76.3% of trainees agreed (strongly agree/agree) with these three statements, compared to 24.1%, 6.7% and 83.7% post training (Figure 3).

To compare changes in pre and post-training sexual violence myth acceptance at an individual level, scales were coded from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree), and mean scores were compared. Overall, compared to pre-training, post-training participants were significantly less likely to agree with sexual violence myths (mean average score, pre 3.3 and post 4.2; p<0.001.).

---

1 Using Wilcoxon signed rank test. Sexual violence is never the fault of the victim scores were reserved prior to inclusion in combined scores (to match the direction of other measures in the combined score).
Figure 2: Proportion of participants who agreed that the training had improved their knowledge on selected indicators (n=135)

- The nature and extent of sexual violence in the nightlife environment: 98.5%
- How to respond to sexual violence in the nightlife environment: 97.8%
- Where to go for help and support in cases of sexual violence: 99.3%

Figure 3: Proportion of participants who agreed with statements relating to sexual violence myth acceptance, and readiness to intervene, pre and post training (n=135)

- Unwanted sexual advances are a normal part of a night out: Pre-training 29.2% / Post-training 24.1%
- If someone who is experiencing sexual violence is drunk they are at least partly to blame: Pre-training 3.8% / Post-training 6.7%
- Sexual violence is never the fault of the victim: Pre-training 76.3% / Post-training 83.7%
- I don’t think sexual violence is a problem in nightlife: Pre-training 3.7% / Post-training 13.0%
- I think I can do something about sexual violence in nightlife: Pre-training 70.0% / Post-training 91.9%
Readiness and confidence to intervene in incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability

Two questions assessed participant’s readiness to intervene in sexual violence: *I don’t think sexual violence is a problem in nightlife* and *I think I can do something about sexual violence in nightlife*. Prior to training commencement, 13% and 70% of trainees agreed (strongly agree/agree) with these two statements, compared to 3.7% and 91.9% post training (Figure 3).

To compare changes in pre and post-training readiness to intervene at an individual level, scales were coded from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree), and mean scores were compared² (Table 2, Appendix 1). Overall, compared to pre-training, post-training participants were significantly more likely to be ready to intervene (mean average score, pre 2.1 and post 1.6; p<0.001).

Prior to training commencement, one in eight trainees reported that they would feel confident (confident/really confident) in intervening in incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability, based on selected scenarios. Following the training, proportions increased for all scenario’s presented (Figure 4).

To compare changes in pre and post-training confidence at an individual level, scales were coded from one (really not confident) to five (really confident), and mean scores were compared (Table 3, Appendix 1). Overall, compared to pre-training, post-training participants were significantly more likely to feel confident to intervene (mean average score, pre 4.0 and post 4.2; p<0.001).

Figure 4: Proportion of participants who reported that they would feel confident intervening in selected incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability (n=135)

² Using Wilcoxon signed rank test. *I don’t think sexual violence is a problem in nightlife* scores were reserved prior to inclusion in combined scores (to match the direction of other measures in the combined score).
Exposure to incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability in nightlife

Trainees were provided with a list of scenarios of intervening in sexual violence or vulnerability in nightlife and asked if they had engaged in these behaviours in the three months prior to attending the training session (Figure 5). One in five (21.5%) trainees reported that, on at least one occasion, they did something if they saw a woman in a bar, pub or nightclub surrounded by a group of men, and she looked very uncomfortable or upset. Under a fifth reported that: if someone said they had an unwanted sexual experience but didn’t call it rape, they had expressed concern or offered to help (14.8%); or they had let someone they didn’t know who they suspected had been sexually assaulted know that they were available for help and support (14.8%). 7.4% indicated that they had spoken up to someone who was making excuses for forcing someone to have sex with them.

Over half (53.1%) of trainees reported that they had been a victim of sexual violence whilst in a bar, pub or nightclub in their lifetime; 49% whilst on a night out and a third (31.9%) whilst working (Figure 6). Significant differences in lifetime (i.e. night out or working) and night out prevalence of sexual violence were observed between genders (lifetime: females, 80.6%; males 35.6%; p<0.001 / night out: females, 77.1%; males 29%; p<0.001). Amongst those who reported experiencing sexual violence in the night-time economy (NTE):

- 62.2% stated that it had occurred within the last three months.
- 55.3% reported that the perpetrator was male, 40.5% female.
- 89.5% reported that the perpetrator was a stranger; 5.3% someone working in a venue; 5.3% a partner.
- 65.8% stated that they had not reported the incident to anyone.

Figure 5: Proportion of participants who reported intervening in incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability in nightlife in the three months prior to training attendance (n=135)

3 Whilst in a bar, pub or nightclub, has anyone ever touched you sexually in a way that you did not want to be touched or done something else sexual to you that you did not want them to do?

4 Trainees could tick more than one option, and or prefer not to say.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The findings from this study suggest that following the GNOC training, participants had less acceptance of sexual violence myths, demonstrating the trainings efficacy in changing misconceptions around the subject. Additionally, when examining readiness and confidence to intervene, there was a marked increase post training in participants’ agreement that they feel willing and able to intervene in incidents of sexual violence or vulnerability in nightlife. Future evaluation of the GNOC should explore if engagement with the campaign leads to changes in approaches to preventing and responding to sexual violence at a venue, nightlife worker and nightlife patron level. Of concern, a large proportion of participants reported that they had been a victim of sexual violence whilst in nightlife, including whilst working, and had not reported the incident to anyone. This should be a key consideration for future delivery of the GNOC, and broader sexual violence prevention activities.
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## APPENDIX 1

### Table 2: Readiness to intervene and sexual violence myths, pre and post training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness to intervene</th>
<th>Pre-training</th>
<th>Post-training</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Change (n)</th>
<th>Agree more</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Agree less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think sexual violence is a problem in nightlife</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I can do something about sexual violence in nightlife</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average combined score*</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual advances are a normal part of a night out</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone who is experiencing sexual violence is drunk or wasted, they are at least partly to blame</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual violence is never the fault of the victim</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average combined score*</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses ranged from one, strongly agree to five, strongly disagree * Item scores reserved prior to inclusion in combined scores: I don’t think sexual violence is a problem in nightlife; Sexual violence is never the fault of the victim. NS=not significantly different.
Table 3: Confidence to intervene, pre and post-training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-training</th>
<th>Post-training</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Change (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something if you see a woman in a venue surrounded by a group of men and looking uncomfortable</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing concern if someone said they had an unwanted sexual experience but didn’t call it rape</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting someone who you suspected has been sexually assaulted know that you’re available for help and support</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking up to someone who is making excuses for forcing someone to have sex with them</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average combined score*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses ranged from one, strongly agree to five, strongly disagree * Item scores reserved prior to inclusion in combined scores: I don’t think sexual violence is a problem in nightlife; Sexual violence is never the fault of the victim. NS=not significantly different.