TARGETS, STRATEGIES, AND CONTEXTS: UNDERSTANDING THE FIGHT AGAINST GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AT UNIVERSITIES AS A SOCIAL MOVEMENT

by

ARIALLE KAYE CRABTREE

(Under the Direction of Patricia Richards)

ABSTRACT

Gender-based violence at colleges and universities results in a host of negative consequences, including disrupting students' access to education. In attempting to understand this social problem, scholarship on this issue has been dominated by criminological, public health, education, and public policy perspectives. In this dissertation, I utilize a social movement perspective to examine students' violence prevention efforts at the local and national level. How do social movement organizations at the national and local level work to address the problem of gender-based violence? How do activists select and engage with movement targets? How do the social, political, and cultural contexts in which students are situated shape their activism? I address these questions based on interviews, observations, and content analysis of documents related to the activities of students involved in Cavaliers Against Violence, a student organization at a university located in the southern region of the U.S., and Survivors Fighting Violence, a national social movement organization. Through this research, I challenge monolithic representations of the campus anti-violence movement and demonstrate the importance of contexts in shaping student activists' goals, targets, and strategies. Furthermore, I highlight how marginalized survivors' needs are being centered in proposed anti-carceral

solutions to violence on campus and, simultaneously, ignored in local contexts that reproduce the white institutional spaces of campus within organizations. Finally, I call for the use of feminist epistemology to guide the interdisciplinary and intersectional study of gender-based violence in educational settings.

INDEX WORDS: Gender-based Violence, Social Movements, Student Activism, Title IX, Political Shifts, Culture, Whiteness, Intersectionality

TARGETS, STRATEGIES, AND CONTEXTS: UNDERSTANDING THE FIGHT AGAINST GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AT UNIVERSITIES AS A SOCIAL MOVEMENT

by

ARIALLE KAYE CRABTREE

BA, North Carolina State University, 2012

BS, North Carolina State University, 2012

MA, University of Georgia, 2015

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTORATE OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2021

TARGETS, STRATEGIES, AND CONTEXTS: UNDERSTANDING THE FIGHT AGAINST GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE AT UNIVERSITIES AS A SOCIAL MVOEMENT

by

ARIALLE KAYE CRABTREE

Major Professor: Patricia Richards

Committee: Pablo Lapegna
Jody Clay-Warner

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2021

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank all those who participated in this research and students across the country who are working to eliminate gender-based violence on college campuses. Through this research, I met incredible student activists who are bravely sharing stories of survivorship, balancing coursework and activism, and fighting for innovative solutions to gender-based violence at the campus, state, and federal levels. I also want to acknowledge students who were drawn into this movement out of a sincere desire to help friends, family, and peers on campus. These individuals work within university systems to educate their friends, instructors, and college administrators about how violence interferes with survivors' education. Gender-based violence too often goes unnoticed and unaddressed. These students and survivors are working to change that.

I want to offer a sincere thanks to each member of my dissertation committee. Since my first year at UGA, Patricia Richards has offered sound advice, direction, and encouragement that allowed me to reach this point in my scholarly career. She consistently leads by example, showing her students and colleagues what it means to be a feminist scholar. As I worked through the dissertation process, she was constantly available to help me navigate multiple IRB offices, Covid-19 related delays and changes to my research plan, and issues that arose during fieldwork. Her guidance and critical feedback has undoubtedly made me a better writer. I am deeply grateful for the kindness you have shown and the time you have invested in me over the past eight years. I would never have conceived of this project had it not been for taking, Gender, Crime, and Justice with Jody Clay-Warner and Social Movements with Pablo Lapegna. Jody

Clay-Warner graciously agreed to serve on my dissertation committee. Her feedback and guidance consistently remind me of the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to research. Pablo Lapegna has acted as a mentor throughout my graduate career. He has introduced me to theories, research, and perspectives that shape how I understand social movements. Thank you both for your guidance, writing letters as I navigated a difficult job market, and supporting my decision to complete my doctoral studies from another state.

I also want to thank my wife, Tara Sutton. She has supported me throughout each step of this process as a spouse, friend, and fellow sociologist. You have been my biggest advocate, and I am eternally grateful for your love and support. I apologize for all the times that I left you to manage all three dogs on your own, especially over this past year. As a colleague and sociologist, I am incredibly grateful that you were willing to read this dissertation and offer such insightful comments. I also want to say thank you to a group of anonymous graduate students, all of whom study gender-based violence, who have created an incredible community of learning and support. I am also lucky to have so many encouraging friends and supportive colleagues: Matt Gromlich, Bryan Cannon, Jeff Shelton, Britta Girtz, Eric Klopack, Kait Boyle, Elizabeth Culatta, Kimberly Kelly, Courtney Thompson, Scott DiGiulio, Maggie Hagerman, Eric Viver, Gabe Miller, Robby Lozano, Shane Miller, Kerri Matthews, Ashley Vancil-Leap, and Braden Leap.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to my family. Thank you all for your patience, love, and support! Despite missed holiday gatherings, birthdays, and family trips, you have stood by my side throughout this process. My mom's, Janiece, phone calls and words of encouragement mean more to me than I can say. Thank you to my dad, David, and step-mom, Angie, for reminding me of the importance of self-care. My sister, Kayla, I couldn't ask for a better friend. LaCosta, my

sister, and Montana, my brother, thank you both for your love and support. My in-laws, Tracy and Tami Sutton, and Taylor Sutton and Megan Neary have also provided words of encouragement throughout this process. Lastly, thank you to Blue, Eva, and Griff for being adorable fur friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1: RESPONDING TO GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE ON CAMPUS

> *"Not every survivor in the campus antiviolence movement was raped. Some were stalked, or were physically, verbally, or emotionally abused in relationships, or were sexually harassed at school, at work, or on the street, or had other horrifying experiences. Our movement is diverse because the people in it are diverse and their experiences of abuse are diverse."* (Princess Harmony 2016: 138)

College is often described as a place where students can learn about themselves and the world around them, form lasting friendships, and engage in the process of self-exploration; however, college has also been shown to be a site of gender-based violence (Office on Violence Against Women 2017).

> In the broadest terms, "gender-based violence" is violence that is directed at an individual based on his or her perceived adherence to socially defined norms of masculinity and femininity. It includes physical, sexual, and psychological abuse; threats; coercion; arbitrary deprivation of liberty; and economic deprivation, whether occurring in public or private life (Khan 2017: 7).

A considerable amount of research has focused on the prevalence of gender-based violence at institutions of higher education (IHEs), structural and individual factors that influence victimization, the effectiveness of prevention programs, survivor resources, and legislation, and factors associated with the likelihood that universities offer programs and services for victims (Amar et al. 2014; Boyle, Barr, and Clay-Warner 2017; Fedina, Holmes, and Backes 2018; Fisher, Cullen, and Turner 2000; Krebs et al. 2007; Krebs et al. 2009; Office on Violence Against Women 2017). Armstrong and colleagues (2018: 115) argue that research on sexual violence has often been relegated to the margins of sociology. As such, the discipline is "complicit in the silencing of sexual violence."

This silence has been perpetuated by the limited research on social movement organizations involved in the fight against gender-based violence (Krause et al. 2017). Although this literature is growing, as demonstrated by the 2019 special issue regarding activism to end gender-based violence on campus in *Violence Against Women*, there is a need to elaborate specifically on the perspectives and experiences of student activists in this movement. While this particular issue included accounts of students' involvement in efforts to address gender-based violence, only Page, Bull, and Chapman's (2019) contribution described the efforts of a student advocacy group, 1752, founded by Ph.D. students in the UK to address staff-student gender-based violence. The guest editors identify Page and colleagues as "activist academics;" this is accurate as their activism has been used to inform their research agendas and vice versa (Lewis and Marine 2019).[1] However, there remains a need for work that highlights the role of students, not as researchers but as activists addressing violence at the national and local level.

Nona Gronert (2019) argues that sociologists, particularly gender and legal scholars, are well-positioned to study sexual violence and adopt an interdisciplinary approach that accounts for law, campus policies, and social movements. In this dissertation, I adopt an interdisciplinary and social movement perspective to examine the efforts of Survivors Fighting Violence (SFV), a national social movement organization, and Cavaliers Against Violence (CAV), a student organization at a large university located in the southern region of the US. I address three questions: (1) How do social movement organizations at the national and local level work to address the problem of gender-based violence? (2) How do activists select and engage with movement targets? (3) How do the social, political, and cultural contexts in which students are situated shape their activism?

Situating Student Activism in Existing Research on Gender-based Violence

While gender-based violence refers to numerous forms of harm, public attention and research have centered on sexual assault on campuses. In college, approximately one out of five women will experience completed or attempted sexual assault (Krebs et al. 2009).[2] According to a 2007 study of undergraduate men and women at two large public universities, 1 out of 16 male-identified students reported having experienced completed or attempted sexual assault (Krebs et al. 2007). However, college students also experience other forms of gender-based violence, including emotional and physical partner abuse, stalking, and unwanted sexual contact (Baum et al. 2009; Fedina, Holmes, and Backes 2018; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner 2000). Researchers have identified several factors that influence the likelihood of victimization, including race, sexual orientation, gender identity, consumption of alcohol, marital status, prior history of victimization, number of sexual partners, participation in hook-up culture, attendance of fraternity or athlete parties, and type of housing (Armstrong, Hamilton, and Sweeney 2006; Becker and Tinkler 2015; Fisher et al. 2000; Johnson, Matthews, and Napper 2016; Krebs et al. 2007; Martin and Hummer 1989; Sutton, Simons, and Tyler 2019; Wade et al. 2014).[3] These studies show that systemic oppression and institutional structure and culture of college campuses may contribute to the likelihood of victimization and play a role in how gender-based violence manifests on campus. Furthermore, colleges and universities promote prevention strategies that focus on

[2] Krebs and colleagues distinguish between completed and attempted sexual assault to draw attention to the that various types of sexual assault that individuals experience. This study is not intended to explain perpetration or experiences of gender-based violence; therefore, I will not distinguish between completed and attempted sexual assault rather I will refer to various forms of gender-based violence using participants' terms and descriptions.

[3] Living on campus is associated with an increased risk of being sexually assaulted during college.

women, present women as vulnerable bodies, and promote messages of mistrust and a need for supervision of women (Bedera and Nordmeyer 2015).

In response to the prevalence of violence on campus, service providers, activists, and politicians have advocated for federal legislation that requires universities to respond to this issue (Potter 2016). One of the most influential mechanisms of oversight regarding gender-based violence on college campuses has been Title IX. Title IX is part of the Education Amendments of 1972 and is enforced by the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) (U.S. Department of Education 2015). Title IX states:

> No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (U.S. D.O.E. 2015)

This amendment allows the OCR to investigate and sanction schools that fail to provide a safe environment for students. Anyone who feels a university or college has violated Title IX may file a complaint with OCR. If this person (or persons) is affiliated with the university, he/she is protected from any retribution by the university under Title IX (Reynolds 2018). Despite efforts to address this issue through Title IX and other legislation, such as the passage of the Clery Act in 1990[4], gender-based violence continues to be a serious problem on campuses. In 2011, the new campus anti-violence movement emerged as students began to file complaints with the OCR regarding universities responses to violence on campus (Blustein 2017; Heldman et al. 2018; Whittier 2018)

[4] The Clery Act requires that any college that receives federal funding must report crime statistics to the Department of Education and issue 'timely' warnings when an active threat is on campus (End Rape On Campus).

Catherine Heldman, Alissa Ackerman, and Ian Breckenridge-Jackson (2018) provide one of the most extensive overviews of the new campus anti-violence movement, which they refer to as the new campus anti-rape movement. They outline the history of anti-violence organizing in the US, and describe the emergence of this movement, identify key figures and national organizations, draw attention to laws utilized by organizers, and highlight the power of social media within this movement. In her 2016 American Sociological Association Presidential Address, Ruth Milkman (2017) argues that U.S. millennials have led this movement, and these activists have worked to address sexual violence on campus through conventional means such as legislative reform, policy and procedural changes within educational institutions, cultural reform, and achieving justice and support for survivors.

Nancy Whittier (2018) and Ava Blustein (2017) also describe the campus anti-violence movement, noting the connections between current activists and former feminist organizers, student activists mobilization around Title IX and violence prevention efforts such as bystander intervention programming on university campuses, and the continued use of events such as Take Back the Night to draw attention to high rates of violence on campus. Furthermore, Blustein (2017) explains the privileging of white survivors from elite universities in media depictions of this movement. These accounts of the campus anti-violence movement provide a valuable picture of this movement and point to critical strategies such as the use of social media to shame universities into compliance and the use of Title IX as a mechanism of oversight to shape universities' policies.

Other work has examined activism as a pathway to recovery for survivors, meanings associated with events such as Slut Walks and Take Back the Night, and collaborations among faculty, staff, and students to draw attention to violence on campuses (Carr 2013; Kretschmer

and Barber 2016; Leon 2016; Page, Bull, and Chapman 2019; Reger 2015; Ricci and Bergeron 2019; Vemuri 2018). I build upon this foundation by adding depth to existing accounts of this movement. By focusing on how political, social, and cultural contexts shaped SFV and CAV goals and strategies, I demonstrate that this movement is multifaceted, and student activists vary in their approaches to fighting against gender-based violence.

Taking a Multi-Institutional Politics Approach

Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) challenge scholars to empirically examine various collective actions against non-political targets as social movements, calling upon us to study the actors, targets, goals, and strategies associated with such movements. This study is an acceptance of this challenge, and as such, will use a "multi-institutional politics" perspective to examine the movement against gender-based violence at IHEs. This section will provide an overview of the multi-institutional politics approach as outlined by Armstrong and Bernstein (2008). In the early 1970s, resource mobilization theory and political process theory emerged as explanations for social movements (McAdam 1999). Resource mobilization theory (RMT) emphasizes the consistency of social strain and the fluctuations in resources among social movement organizations (SMOs) to explain the rise and fall of movements. Political process theory (PPT) places the success of social movements in relation to political opportunities and the structure of SMOs (McAdam 1999). These theories reoriented social movement studies to focus on the importance of structural factors in explaining movement emergence, sustenance, and decline.

In 2001, in response to criticisms of RMT and PPT, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly developed the contentious politics perspective. Their approach focuses on the environmental, cognitive, and relational mechanisms that lead to social movements (McAdam et al. 2001). However, the contentious politics approach still defines social movements largely in terms of

political and economic structures. While McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly (2001) acknowledge how culture influences cognitive frames, they do not center localized cultures and the role of emotion in social movements (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008; Polletta 2004). Furthermore, RMT, PPT, and the contentious politics approach situate the state as the target of all social movements (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008). The multi-institutional politics perspective moves beyond these state-centered theoretical approaches.

Armstrong and Bernstein (2008:75) argue, "This view of society assumes that domination is organized by and around one central source of power – the state." By positioning the state as the single source of domination, previous social movement theories have failed to acknowledge non-political institutions that dominate individuals' lives and serve as mechanisms of social control. As a result, these previous theories do not recognize collective action against non-political institutions as social movements. Armstrong and Bernstein's (2008) multi-institutional politics perspective reflects the work of other scholars who have long argued the state and culture are mutually constituting (Alvarez, Dagnino, Escobar 2018; hooks 2015; Steinmetz 1999). This perspective focuses on the multiple institutions that make up society. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008: 82) utilize Friedland and Alford's work (1991: 248), describing institutions as "organizationally structured, politically defended, and technically and materially constrained." In other words, this theory is based upon three core assumptions: (1) society is formed by cooperative and conflicting institutions with specific organizational structures and rules; (2) these institutions may be non-political but are still related to the political sphere; and (3) institutions consist of material and symbolic elements (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008: 76). The research questions addressed in this study are designed based upon these assumptions.

Social Movement Targets

A multi-institutional politics perspective reintroduces targets as a focus of research by identifying multiple political and non-political institutions as potential targets of social movement claims (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008). An empirical examination of targets is particularly important when examining the campus anti-violence movement. Efforts to address gender-based violence at IHEs have centered around universities and colleges. These institutions have a complex structure with multiple administrators, departments, and programs that have different responsibilities regarding addressing violence on campus. In discussing the university as a non-state institution target, I recognize the differences among the various offices and positions on campus and remain sensitive to activists' relationships with each.

As social movement scholarship has extended beyond the political realm and begun to explore institutional targets, scholars have researched and theorized the implications for movement targets. Bartley and Curtis suggest that targeting actors is "an accomplishment of social movements." Using the example of anti-sweatshop activism, they found that large companies with positive reputations were more likely to become movement targets. Furthermore, they argue that corporate targeting is a dominant strategy of the anti-sweatshop movement, and further research is needed to determine how targets shift over time. Bartley and Curtis (2014: 674) suggest that sociological understandings of social movement targets can be improved by qualitative research investigating how activists select and approach social movement targets. Such research may provide a richer understanding of "contingent events and interpretive process involved." Following Bartley and Curtis' (2014) suggestions for future research, I seek to evaluate the campus anti-violence movement to determine how characteristics of universities influence activists' targeting process and how strategies such as shaming traverse between state

and non-state targets. In doing so, I advance theoretical and empirical understandings of multi-institutional movements.

Social Movement Tactics and Repertoires

Just as social movement scholarship now explores the expansion of targets beyond the state, scholars have also turned their attention back to the selection and use of tactics and repertories (Walker, Martin, and McCarthy 2008). Movements employ different tactics depending upon the targeted institution (Wood 2004). Walker, Martin, and McCarthy (2008) argue that social movements consider the type of institution when choosing tactics and the characteristics of the targeted institution. They argue that the following three institutional characteristics influence social movement tactics: (1) Openness to influence is the degree to which institutions are susceptible or willing to engage with movement actors, (2) Vulnerabilities to delegitimation is the degree to which the reputation and legitimacy of institutional power can be challenged, and (3) Vulnerability to non-participation, is determined by whether or not actors can refuse to participate or engage with an institution.

These last two points warrant further discussion. Educational institutions may be more vulnerable to attacks on their legitimacy (Walker et al. 2008). This suggests that social movements that seek to influence educational institutions may utilize tactics that threaten the institution's legitimacy in the public sphere. Furthermore, non-state targets are often more vulnerable to non-participation than state institutions (Walker et al. 2008). In other words, while actors can refuse to attend a school or boycott a business, it is difficult to disengage entirely from the state. States can better respond to social movements and restrict the types of tactics and repertories used by social movements. Walker and colleagues (2008) argue that social movement tactics fall along a continuum between contained and transgressive tactics with lobbying and

lawsuits on one end and riots and attacks on the other with rallies and civil disobedience falling in the middle. They show social movement organizers are more likely to use contained tactics against state institutions and transgressive tactics against non-state institutions. Beyond the characteristics of institutional targets, familiarity plays a role in this process. Social movements may continue to use tactics and repertories that they used in the past, despite changes in institutional targets or the vulnerability of targets (Walker et al. 2008).

Political opportunity theory suggests that social movements may appeal to states in many ways, and "divided elites" provide multiple opportunities for movements to influence states (McAdam 1996). Walker and colleagues (2008) claim that non-state institutions may be less complex than state institutions; therefore, these institutions may not provide movements with as many opportunities to influence institutions' outcomes. However, as discussed above, universities have multiple offices and administrators tasked with addressing gender-based violence on campus in one way or another. This study evaluates the movement against gender-based violence to understand how tactics and repertoires are influenced by opportunities afforded by state and non-state institutional targets. I will extend on Walker and colleagues' (2008) assertion that tactics are selected based on institutions' characteristics by showing how characteristics of institutions may also shape activists' goals and outcomes.

Political, Social, and Cultural Contexts

Finally, to fully understand the fight against gender-based violence on campus, it is necessary to look at the context in which this activism occurs. Social movements' targets and tactics are constructed within political, social, and cultural contexts (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008; Cress and Snow 2000; Larson 2013; Meyer 2004; Rucht 1996). Hanspeter Kriesi (2004) argues that political context consists of political structures, configurations of power, and interaction context.

This includes the strategies of political elites and collective actors, and political opportunities. Dieter Rucht (1996:190) defines social context as "the embedding of social movements in their social environment." As noted above, social environments and the structure of students' social lives have been shown to influence the prevalence of gender-based violence at these institutes (Armstrong et al. 2006). In this dissertation, I examine how these social relations also influence student activism related to violence on campus. Cultural context can be understood as attitudes and behaviors of those associated with social movements (Rucht 1996). Cultural contexts may be especially relevant in this study, as Polletta (2004) argues that culture is essential to the process of meaning-making, and challenges to culture often result in changes within the political sphere. I examine how these contexts shape the movement against gender-based violence at intuitions of higher education and vice versa.

Much of the research concerning movements and political context has focused on political opportunity structures. Sidney Tarrow (1998:19-20) defines political opportunities as "consistent—but not necessarily formal, permanent, or national—dimensions of the political struggle that encourage people to engage in contentious politics." Meyer (2004) advocates for utilizing a process-oriented approach in studies of political opportunities recognizing that these opportunities occur in multiple contexts, involve various actors and organizations, and elicit multiple responses. Adopting this perspective reveals shifts in the political context and how these changing contexts influence actors' targets and tactics (Adams and Shriver 2016). Acknowledging the importance of political opportunities and the impact of shifting context upon movements is significant given the recent change in political leadership and the resulting consequences for federal support of the movement against gender-based violence mentioned above. I extend work on political opportunities by looking at social and cultural context as

equally important to the development of social movements. Just as there are political opportunities in multiple contexts, I argue that the social and cultural context in which activism occurs may provide opportunities to enact social and cultural change.

Paying attention to the social context requires focusing on relationships between students, administrations, and groups on campus. This allows for an assessment of how this movement operates within the context of these institutions. The cultural context deals with ideologies and beliefs of those within the movement and affiliated with the movement. Attention to this context helps to unveil the internal dynamics, including contentions within movements, and how activists engage with those who oppose them not just political figures but also public critics and counter-movements. Furthermore, in applying a multi-institutional politics approach, I examine whether specific contexts matter depending on the targeted institution and composition of actors.

This dissertation extends work on multi-institutional social movements by showing how organizations within movements also vary in target selection, strategies, and goals. By placing context at the center of my analysis, I demonstrate limits of broad movement descriptions and highlight contentions within the campus anti-violence movement. Furthermore, I show how activists navigate shifting political and cultural climates by re-examining their relationships with state and non-state institutions.

Methods

To examine how context shaped activists' experiences of the campus anti-violence movement at the national and local level, I selected two social movement organizations for this research, Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence.[5] SFV represents what Belinda

[5] These are pseudonyms used to protect the identity of organizational members and the university included in this study. I also used pseudonyms for participants interviewed in this study, although they were given the option to request their names be included. In addition to the use of

Robnett (2000: 24) referred to as a "primary formal organization," these organizations are recognized by powerholders within the state and "represents the movement to the media, public, and state." SFV members were heavily involved in national conversations within the legislature and White House regarding violence on campus. Furthermore, members were interviewed by nationally syndicated newspapers in stories regarding sexual violence on campus. They epitomize a primary formal organization in this movement. CAV represents a secondary formal organization. Secondary formal organizations "are viewed as legitimate but not at the forefront of current movement activities" (Robnett 2000:25). CAV was a registered student organization at Big South University. This organization was viewed as the leading anti-violence advocacy group on campus; however, they did not have a presence on the national stage. Robnett (2000:24) argues that "movements may be analyzed in terms of organizational types in relation to one another." I highlight the contrast between CAV's and SFV's organizational approaches to demonstrate key points of distinction within the gender-based violence movement and emphasize how different contexts shape activism. These discussions are not intended to represent direct comparisons of like organizations.

I utilized a three-prong approach to evaluate the targets, goals, and strategies used within these organizations. I conducted participant observation at CAV from Fall of 2018 to Fall 2019 and direct observation of SFV's public training sessions and web-broadcast from Fall 2018 to Spring 2020. Throughout these observation periods, I conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews with twelve current and one founding member of CAV and five members of SFV. Additionally, I collected hundreds of organizational documents, including a comprehensive

---

pseudonyms, I have changed the names of positions and offices within the university, as well as slightly reworded tweets or information from documents collected during this study that otherwise could be used to directly identify these organizations.

strategic action plan from SFV that includes over 50 pages of detailed organizational strategy for campus organizers. I also analyzed organizational websites, Facebook pages and Twitter accounts, as well as news articles that highlighted the actions or interviewed members of these organizations, op-eds by SFV members, and organizational press releases. I also reviewed two lawsuits filed against BSU.

Originally, I planned to include a historically Black college or university (HCBU) as a third site in this research project. I felt this was especially important because HBCUs have been under-studied in research related to gender-based violence on campus (Fedina et al. 2018). I contacted one HBCU in the Fall of 2018 and was initially told I would be able to receive IRB approval. After completing the application process, I was told by an office assistant working for the university's internal review board that the application had been approved; however, I never received documented confirmation of this approval, despite multiple efforts on my part. I therefore began searching for a new historically Black public university. I received approval to conduct interviews with students and participant observation at a historically Black university located in the southern region of the US in the Fall of 2019. At an initial site visit to this university, I learned that most of the university's violence prevention programming was implemented during Sexual Assault Awareness month in April. I planned to begin conducting interviews and observing activities related to violence prevention at this university in spring of 2020 after concluding my observations at Big South University. However, this plan was thwarted by the pandemic, as the university moved online in response to Covid-19.[6] The inclusion of this site would have allowed me to draw comparisons between students working to address gender-based violence on the local level. Still, the findings from this dissertation demonstrate how

[6] Other complications related to Covid-19 are discussed in the conclusion.

social, political, and cultural context shaped the targets, goals, and strategies of student activists at the local and national levels.

Participant Observations

I conducted participant observation with Cavaliers Against Violence (CAV) from Fall 2018 to Fall 2019. BSU is a large public university located in the southern region of the United States. It was considered the flagship university within this state. The student population was composed of around 17,000 undergraduate students and 3,000 graduate and professional students. According to the universities' own report on demographics of the student body, approximately seventy-six percent of the students on campus were white, twelve percent Black, three percent Latinx, and five percent Asian. This university had a large percentage of out-of-state students; students perceived the breakdown between in-state and out-of-state students as nearly even, although in reality, almost forty percent of students were non-state-residents. Thirty-two percent of undergraduate students participated in Greek life on campus. I selected this university because of the large percentage of students in Greek life and the strong focus on athletics—specifically football, characteristics that have been associated with higher rates of sexual violence on campus (Armstrong et al. 2006; Griffin et al. 2017). Additionally, research has shown that schools located in the South have been less likely to comply with federal regulations (Griffin et al. 2017). BSU had taken several steps to comply with federal regulations, provided students with resources and training, and attempted to improve the campus climate. For example, on the school website, BSU provided definitions for multiple forms of gender-based violence and effective consent, and had mandated awareness and prevention training for incoming students, staff, and faculty. In addition to institutional responses to gender-based violence, the active presence of CAV made this an ideal site to examine efforts to address gender-based violence within a

university that was likely to have high rates of violence but had taken steps to address this violence.

As I was not affiliated with this university (a strategic choice to avoid conflicts as a mandatory reporter) I had to apply to the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness, and Planning for permission to conduct research on Big South University's campus (BSU). Once I had received permission to conduct this research, I contacted Mason, the President of CAV, in the 2018 term. This introduction was facilitated by Denise, the head of the Survivor Advocacy Center. Denise was new to the position that year and had just begun to work with CAV. Mason suggested I come to the next executive board meeting to introduce myself and explain my research. In interacting with CAV members, I emphasized my status as a graduate student and established rapport over time, volunteering at CAV events and becoming "part of the team." In the Fall of 2018, my observations were limited to two meetings, a few days of tabling, the day-long peer educator training session, and two events that were part of It's On Us week. I was unable to attend bi-weekly meetings that semester due to my own teaching obligations. In order to ensure that I was able to observe a full year of CAV meetings and events, I maintained an active presence with CAV throughout Spring and Fall of 2019, which represented a full year for the executive board members included in this study.

In addition to observing CAV activities, I viewed all public Survivor Fighting Violence webinars between the Fall of 2018 and Spring of 2020. I obtained permission from SFV to observe these trainings and interview members of the SFV team. However, SFV does host weekly phone calls with team members, utilizes a group chat service for internal communications, and hosts an annual retreat. These meetings were not included in this research, as I did not receive permission to observe these interactions. Given that my focus in this

dissertation is mainly on strategic practices and goals, I felt that I would be able to obtain this information without access to SFV internal meetings. As one of SFV's primary goals was to assist local organizers, their website contains detailed documentation of their organizational strategies and suggestions for campus, state, and federal advocacy. In addition to these documents, I utilized interviews to ensure my perceptions of SFV's mobilizing processes, goals, and strategies were accurate. This is in some ways a reverse on many approaches to qualitative studies, which rely on interviews as primary sources that are supplemented by observations and content analysis; however, this strategy allowed me to conduct analysis and answer my research questions while ensuring the comfort of my participants. I did not simply seek to gain permission to observe meetings but wanted to ensure my presence was welcomed. The decision to focus on SFV despite being unable to participate in weekly phone calls or internal organizing events also gave me the time to focus on CAV and engage in the in-depth analysis characteristic of a case study.

In-Depth Interviews

In addition to participant observation, I conducted semi-structured, in-depth interviews with student activists involved in CAV and SFV. Demographic data for participants is included in Appendix A. Interviews ranged between thirty minutes and two hours. Recruitment messages were emailed to organizational listservs and posted to relevant social media sites. I also utilized snowball sampling, asking interviewees to refer me to other members. This strategy was particularly effective in CAV, whereby I was referred to Lisa, one of the founding members. I maintained an active presence on Twitter and followed members of SFV who had public Twitter accounts. When Twitter users are mutual followers, they are able to send direct messages to one another. Several participants were recruited using this strategy. All interviewees, except for Lisa

and Lexi, were undergraduate or graduate students at the time of the interview. I made the strategic choice to focus solely on student activists rather than including service providers and administrators for two reasons: first, a practical concern with obtaining permission from universities to conduct interviews that might be perceived as interrogations of their responses to gender-based violence on campus, and second, I sought to center the experiences of student activists in this research. Nevertheless, I had extensive contact and exposure to service providers on BSU's campus through their interactions with CAV. The perspectives of service providers, administrators, and politicians would represent a valuable extension of this research and may be included in future research projects but were beyond the scope of this study. All interviews were digitally recorded. Interviews were conducted in person with members of CAV on campus or at local coffee houses, and members of SFV were interviewed over the phone. SFV members were given the option to meet via video conference, but all interviewees expressed a preference for phone interviews.

Although this research includes a small number of interviews, saturation was achieved as these organizations are small, consisting of 8-20 active members. I interviewed the entire 2019 CAV executive team, multiple peer educators, a founding member of CAV, and a student who was technically a member of CAV as she was part of the listserv but only attended a few CAV events. My interviews with SFV included members of the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 team. Two of these interviewees were members of the organization throughout both terms. I interviewed the SFV team manager and members of the communications, policy advisory, and student engagement teams. These interviews provided me with a comprehensive view of the organizations' mobilization efforts and participants' experiences within these organizations. Mira Crouch and Heather McKenzie (2006) note that sample size has little relevance to qualitative

research projects concerned with discovering characteristics of social situations and an account of how meaning is manifested in these situations. The interviews consisted of questions regarding the purpose and structure of these organizations, organizational goals, targets, and tactics, participants' motivations for joining the movement and role within the organization, and interviewees' perspectives of the causes of gender-based violence on campus and challenges to addressing this issue including contentions amongst student anti-violence activists.

Discourse and Content Analysis

Finally, I engaged in discourse analysis to understand how different organizations identify and express grievances and communicate with other members of the movement and the public. Organizational discourses are produced by "the activists, committees, and functionaries at various levels of the SMO" (Klandermans and Staggenborg 2002:68). Focusing on organizational discourses allowed me to avoid reproducing monolithic frames or discourses that tend to privilege the voices of elites and ignore internal contentions within social movements (Benford 1997). I gathered physical documents from all CAV events, including training materials from the full-day peer educator training program. I also used the campus newspaper archives to search for all mentions of CAV, sexual assault, sexual misconduct, rape, stalking, Title IX, or violence. Search results for "violence" included information that did not relate to gender-based violence on campus and were excluded from my final sample of documents. In addition to campus newspapers, I conducted the same search of keywords in the regional and local newspapers. These searches resulted in nine articles between September 2018 and February 2019. I also analyzed posts and Tweets from CAV's Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts and the organizational website and emails sent to the CAV listserv. The listserv represented their primary form of communication with CAV membership. Additionally, I reviewed public filings

related to two lawsuits against BSU regarding their Title IX process and claims of bias against respondents.

Documents related to SFV were collected through their website, social media, email messages, and newspapers. SFV's website included a campus strategic action plan that detailed general information regarding gender-based violence, best practices for addressing violence on campus, and organizing strategies. Their website also included information regarding organizing strategies against the state, reporting sexual misconduct on campus, Title IX resources, information on the Clery Act, and resources directed at survivors and friends and family members of survivors. Additionally, SFV released a smaller toolkit that included specific information regarding the DOE's proposed Title IX rules and strategies for opposing these rules. This document was later followed by information about how universities could follow the final 2020 rules and revise sexual misconduct policies on campus to protect survivors. In addition to these organizing resources and informational webpages, SFV's website included links to all organizational press releases, news articles which included interviews with SFV members, and op-eds by SFV members. All news articles, op-eds, and press releases published between September 2018 and May 2020 were included in the final sample of 78 articles or press releases. Finally, I used the website allmytweets.net to collect over 3,000 tweets and retweets from the SFV Twitter account posted between September 2018 and May 2020.

I used the speech-to-text software Dragon to transcribe digitally recorded fieldnotes taken as I drove from my research site following each meeting and event. These digital recordings were usually transcribed within 24 hours of the meeting and reviewed in combination with hand-written jottings to ensure accuracy. I personally transcribed all interview recordings. I used a modified version of Tesch's (1990) eight-step coding process described by Marshall and

Rossman (2016). Following each transcription of interviews and fieldnotes, I recorded impressions and initial thoughts in a Word document. I selected and re-read key interviews, fieldnotes, and articles to develop open codes and potential concepts and themes using Atlas.ti. I repeated this process until I developed a list of thematic codes. I used "in-vivo" concepts and codes to ensure that participants' words were reflected in the final analysis (Marshall and Rossman 2016). Themes were sorted into primary, secondary, and supplementary topics. I then engaged in line-by-line coding, applied these thematic codes, and noted new codes. I grouped codes together where appropriate and developed descriptive topics. Finally, I created a final list of codes and topics. Throughout this process, I revisited relevant literature and theories and re-analyzed and re-coded the data as necessary.

Mapping this Dissertation

In the next chapter, I outline the history of the anti-violence movement in the U.S. and the emergence of the new campus anti-violence movement. I situate SFV and CAV within the historical context of anti-violence activism and provide a detailed account of the structures and activities of these organizations. I highlight how CAV and SFV identified different root causes of gender-based violence and how these views guided their organizational strategies. I also connect these views of gender-based violence to a long legacy of anti-violence organizing.

In Chapter Three, I draw attention to narratives of feminist organizers as radical revolutionaries or reformists. CAV and SFV are perfectly positioned to fall within these categories; however, I highlight activists' personal experiences of organizing to demonstrate that personal growth occurs within movements. Student activists contend with experiences of trauma and activism come with a risk of burnout. Organizations facilitate personal sustainability through community care and practices of social learning. In working to sustain membership within

organizations, student activists often experience growth that transforms how they view gender-based violence and responses to this issue. I argue that moving along a continuum of learning is also a vital part of personal sustainability and growth within movements.

Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 set the stage for Chapter 4. Here, I explore how the social context in which SFV and CAV are situated determines their approaches to organizational targets. Much of this chapter centers around CAV, outlining how social relations on BSU's campus led the CAV executive team members to utilize cooperative strategies in their advocacy work. In contrast, SFV members had experienced institutional betrayal that led them to become involved in anti-violence work and relied on more contentious practices in their role as a national organization, assisting local organizers to pressure schools into compliance and offer more support for survivors on campus. I argue that the utility of cooperative and contentious organizational strategies depends upon the context in which activists operate. Furthermore, attempts to cast social movement organizations as co-opted often ignore activists' agency and the strategic decision-making process that led them to partner with powerholders. Using the example of CAV, I show how partnerships between organizers and non-state institutions can have mutually beneficial outcomes.

Chapter 5 describes how SFV and CAV responded to the political and cultural contexts in which they were situated. For SFV, the Trump administration represented a dramatic shift in political opportunities. The DOE, which had once been responsive to their demands to hold universities accountable, now aligned with a growing counter-movement of men's rights activists and select lawyers using claims of due process to roll back protections for survivors. Under these conditions, SFV shifted organizational strategies, targeted the federal government, and looked for new advocacy opportunities at the state level. Additionally, this cultural shift and growing

public concern with police killings of Black individuals highlighted old debates within the anti-violence movement regarding carceral and anti-carceral approaches to addressing violence. SFV was an abolitionist anti-violence group. They emphasized the importance of avoiding reliance upon the carceral state in educational settings, yet they were also situated within a broader movement culture wherein survivors dealt with the trauma associated with violence. I note how SFV attempted to navigate this internal contention by centering on the needs of survivors rather than focusing on punishing perpetrators. These national political and cultural shifts were not felt in the same ways within CAV. CAV members usually events and programming focused on gender-based violence within BSU. Attention to national politics or cultural events, such as public discourse around sexual abuses by R. Kelly, were one-time discussions and did not represent ongoing concerns for CAV leaders. Instead, the local campus culture shaped CAV's organizational practice. BSU is located in a conservative state, and CAV members sought to take an apolitical stance on campus to avoid appearing as divisive. I acknowledge how this desire to remain apolitical was driven by their attempts to remain an educational force on campus. However, I note that these practices also reified existing power dynamics, including the white institutional space and heteronormativity of BSU's campus.

In the final chapter, I discuss three sociological implications from these findings. First, I discuss how multi-institutional movements, such as the campus anti-violence movement, develop strategies that are adaptable yet specific to state and non-state institutional targets. I also critique representations of movements as monolithic. I stress the importance of considering social, cultural, and political contexts in which activists operate when examining a social movement. Second, and relatedly, I argue that universal accounts of social movements contribute to the erasure of movement objectives that challenge the status quo and reproduce inequalities within

movements. Third, I advocate for a feminist epistemic approach to the study of gender-based violence. I discuss how centering the voice of survivors and student activists can extend research agendas and lead to collaboration between students, researchers, service providers, and powerholders who seek to eliminate violence on college campuses. Finally, I make recommendations for future studies and practices related to violence prevention.

CHAPTER 2: LEGACIES OF ANTI-VIOLENCE ORGANIZING

> "Survivors don't all have the same political views or intentions. After you're raped, you don't get like a handbook, "Welcome to the sisterhood! Here's your play-by-play book of what we support, what we don't, and what to do." Survivors come from all different political backgrounds. Have all different views on rape, and sexuality, and gender." -Lexi, Team Leader of Survivors Fighting Violence

In this chapter, I situate the recent campus anti-violence movement, what Heldman and colleagues (2018) termed the new campus anti-rape movement (CARM)[7], within the history of feminist anti-violence organizing in the United States. The new campus anti-violence movement represents a period of renewed attention to the problem of gender-based violence on college campuses beginning in 2011 and continuing today (Whittier 2018). Using content analysis from documents collected during this research, interviews, observations, and secondary sources, I contextualize the goals and strategies of Survivors Fighting Violence (SFV) and Cavaliers Against Violence (CAV) within the new campus anti-violence movement and the broader history of anti-violence activism. By emphasizing the sociohistorical circumstances in which these organizations operate, I demonstrate how student activists' understandings of gender-based violence reflect the continuation of long-held rifts within the anti-violence movement regarding the root causes of gender-based violence and, therefore, the best responses to prevent violence. As stated in the quote above by Lexi, the Team Leader of Survivors Fighting Violence, survivors and student-activists come from various political backgrounds and hold different beliefs about

[7] I use the term new campus anti-violence movement, rather than the new campus anti-rape movement (CARM), to acknowledge that student-activists who have led this movement have worked to build understandings of gender-based violence on campus that expand beyond rape (Blustein 2017).

the best ways to respond to gender-based violence on campus. In this chapter, I draw attention to these diverging perspectives and internal contentions within this movement.

My analysis demonstrates how histories of activism, power, and inequality are maintained and transformed in the current campus anti-violence movement. The arguments in this chapter also lay the groundwork for further chapters that explore student-activists' goals, strategies, and targets. For example, I discuss how students' perceptions of the causes of gender-based violence and strategies for addressing violence are shaped by their own identities and lived experiences in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, I explain how student anti-violence activism exists on a spectrum between contention and cooperation. Finally, I describe the influence of political and cultural context on activists' strategies in Chapter 5. To better explain the nuances of and diversity within this movement, I first offer a holistic picture of this movement to address violence within institutions of higher education.

This chapter begins with a brief overview of feminist anti-violence activism between 1960-2010. Next, I describe the emergence of the new campus anti-violence movement. I then provide a detailed account of the goals and strategies of Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence. Finally, I explain how activists' perceptions of gender-based violence reflect historical legacies of feminist anti-violence organizing and how these perceptions, in turn, shaped organizers' responses to violence on campus.

History of Anti-Violence Feminist Movement: 1960-2010

The new campus anti-violence movement is a continuation of feminist organizing against gender-based violence beginning in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Greenberg and Messner

2014; Richie 2012; Whittier 2018).[8] Feminist anti-violence activism in the 1960-70s focused on shifting discourses related to sexual violence. Speak-out events and consciousness-raising groups brought women's experiences of sexual violence into the public dialogue, drew attention to the silencing of women, and explained rape as a mechanism of social control and gender inequality rather than a product of men's unchecked desires (Whittier 2018). However, these feminist anti-violence activists were not the first to argue that sexual violence was a social problem and control mechanism. Black women had long recognized the use of sexual violence as a tool of oppression; however, the centering of these discussions within the dominant U.S. women's movement brought national attention to the problem, helped secure resources for survivors, and prompted political action (Heldman et al. 2018). This early anti-violence movement was also critiqued for excluding and ignoring concerns of racially marginalized women, particularly Black, Indigenous, and Native women (Baker and Bevacqua 2017; Richie 2012).

On college campuses, *Take Back the Night* events were organized to raise awareness about sexual violence on campus and reclaim public spaces (Blustein 2017). Survivors recounted their experiences of sexual violence, and participants marched through campus, chanting slogans that affirmed safety as a right and disavowed survivor blaming claims (Blustein 2017). The Clothesline Project, an event that displays t-shirts with survivors' experiences of assault, originated from a Take Back the Night event in 1990 (Blustein 2017). These early mobilization

[8] For a detailed overview of feminist anti-violence activism between 1960s and 2010s see Greenberg & Messner 2014; Whittier 2018. Heldman et al. (2018) also describes four peaks of the anti-rape movement in the US, identifying the new Campus Anti-Rape Movement as the fifth peak. Beth Richie (2012) provides a rich description of anti-violence activism between 1960s and 2010. Her account of this movement draws attention to tensions between radical grassroots organizers and bureaucratized organizations, as well as the privileging of the needs of white middle-class and wealthy women largely at the expense of Black women, poor white women, and other marginalized groups.

efforts created “political and cultural opportunities” for members of the new campus anti-violence movement (Whittier 2018: 133). Furthermore, events like Take Back the Night persisted on college campuses and remain popular even as anti-violence activism within the larger women’s movement diminished (Whittier 2018).

During the peak of feminist mobilization against sexual violence in the 1970s, feminist organizers established rape crisis centers around the country; activists rallied to support women as they navigated healthcare, legal, or educational systems after being assaulted; and self-defense classes became part of rape prevention strategies (Whittier 2018). Many of these services were first delivered by grassroots organizations, including community and campus-based rape crisis centers. Eventually, these organizations became institutionalized, acquiring paid staff, government funding, and hierarchical leadership structures and transforming into formal organizations (Martin and Schmitt 1999; Richie 2012; Whittier 2018). During the 1980s, as rape crisis centers became institutionalized and leadership transferred away from early feminist organizers, these centers transitioned to more conventional and "unobtrusive" means of prevention. They persuaded social institutions to adopt policies, such as providing training for schools and law enforcement, that better serve survivors (Martin and Schmitt 1999). Beth Richie (2012) observes that during the 1980s to early 1990s, anti-violence organizers formed coalitions that acknowledged how gender violence intersects with other forms of inequality, especially racism and classism. Simultaneously, members of the feminist anti-violence movement sought to build partnerships with a growing conservative movement. This partnership led to splits in the anti-violence movement, mimicking contentions between liberal and radical feminists (Richie 2012).

Heldman and colleagues (2018) write that sexual violence on college campuses became a central concern of the anti-violence movement in the 1980s-1990s. This movement was, in part, inspired by publications such as Mary Koss' "Date Rape: A Campus Epidemic" in *Ms. Magazine* and growing recognition of acquaintance rape in the general public (Blustein 2017; Heldman et al. 2018; Sweet 2014). Responses to gender-based violence on campus manifested in different ways, including, but not limited to: debates regarding consent on campuses (Gold and Villari 2000), survivors publicly naming rapists (Blustein 2017), and the formation of coalitions made up of students, faculty, and service providers who advocated for violence prevention programming (Gold and Villari 2000). While students worked against gender-based violence, their activism was often limited to specific campuses and did not garner wide-spread and sustained national attention (Whittier 2018).

By the 1990s, activism related to sexual violence decreased in scale; however, formal women's organizations persisted and focused on transforming the legal landscape to address sexual violence (Richie 2012; Whittier 2018). Many of these efforts took on a carceral feminist approach by changing the criminal legal system through establishing rape shield laws, marital rape laws, and mandatory arrest policies in intimate partner violence cases (Whittier 2016, 2018). In addition to advocating for changes within the criminal legal system, these organizations were critical in passing legislation that shaped future violence prevention efforts on college campuses. Anti-violence activists did not universally accept these policies. For example, many Black women organizers recognized the criminal legal system as a racist institution used to perpetuate inequality against Black individuals and other racially marginalized persons in the U.S. As such, these organizers were reluctant to rely upon this system to address gender-based violence (Richie 2012). During this period of institutionalization, many women from racially marginalized

groups, as well as young men and women who had not been part of these institutionalized feminist networks, formed grassroots organizations, such as INCITE!, that focused on community intervention and shifting cultural norms related to sexual violence (Baker and Bevacqua 2017).

A few of the federally mandated laws and procedures passed during this time period directly addressed sexual harassment, and eventually, sexual violence on college campuses. Most notably among these federal mandates are: (1) The Clery Act, (2) The Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights, (3) The Violence Against Women Act, and (4) Title IX. I will describe each of these key legal reforms in turn.

The Clery Act and Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights

The Student Right to Know Campus Security Act was passed in 1990 and renamed the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Crime Statistics in 1998, commonly referred to as the Clery Act (Jessup-Anger et al. 2018). This act requires federally-funded colleges and universities to report crime statistics to the Department of Education and issue 'timely' warnings when an active threat is on campus (End Rape on Campus). In 1992, the Higher Education Act was amended to include the Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights (Jessup-Anger et al. 2018). Institutions of higher education were now required to adopt and publicize sexual assault policies that addressed prevention and resources, and outlined the investigation and adjudication process (Jessup-Anger et al. 2018).

Violence Against Women Act

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994 was, in part, made possible by the efforts of an intersectional, carceral feminist coalition (Whittier 2016). This legislation provided federal funding for many victim services used on college campuses today. Furthermore, VAWA

reauthorization has acted as a mechanism whereby survivors' rights were extended through amendment of the Clery Act by the introduction of the Campus Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, Education and Prevention act (commonly referred to as Campus SaVE) (Heldman et al. 2018).

Title IX

Title IX, which was adopted in 1972, focused on preventing sex-based discrimination in education (U.S. Department of Education 2015). This wide-reaching mandate has provided legal recourse for women's rights and feminist advocates to address a range of issues related to gender-based inequality in education, including employment in higher education, women in sports, and sexual harassment (Heldman et al. 2018). In 1997, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) released guidance that included definitions of sexual harassment in the form of quid pro quo and hostile environment sexual harassment. OCR's guidance demonstrated that sexual misconduct was part of sexual harassment writing:

> Sexual harassing conduct (which can include unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature) by an employee, by another student, or by a third party that is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive to limit a student's ability to participate in or benefit from an education program or activity, or to create a hostile or abusive educational environment. (U.S. DOE 1997, 2)

In 2001, OCR released further guidance defining sexual harassment as follows:

> Sexual harassment is unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature. Sexual harassment can include unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature (U.S. DOE 2001, 2).

As explained in Michelle Hughes Miller's (2017) detailed account of the responses to sexual harassment and sexual violence under Title IX, the famous 2011 Dear Colleagues letter was discussed by OCR as a supplement to OCR's 2001 guidance, and 2001 guidance was a limited addition to the 1997 guidance. She argues that the 1997 and 2001 guidance both failed to define

sexual violence as a form of sexual harassment clearly; however, both provided examples in the procedure section of instances where educational institutions may need to accommodate the needs of students who experienced sexual assault (Miller 2017). The 1997 guidance also explicitly recognized that sexual harassment may occur between two students, including students of the same sex (Miller 2017).

The connection between these evolving legal landscapes and the new campus anti-rape movement cannot be overstated (Gronert 2019). Nancy Whittier (2018: 8) demonstrates the centrality of Title IX to this movement, writing, “While sexual assault is an issue off campus and among all age groups, college students have been in the forefront of this movement, not because they are uniquely affected by sexual violence, but because they have a unique mechanism for legal pressure.” In 1999, the Supreme Court ruled that Title IX required schools to address sexual assault and harassment. This ruling established that students have the right to file federal complaints if they feel a university has failed to effectively address these issues (Jones 2010).

In the 11 years following this ruling, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) received many complaints despite few students knowing such options were available. However, OCR rarely ruled that schools violated Title IX. Even when OCR did rule that a violation had taken place, the office was unable or unwilling to enact penalties in most cases (Jones 2010). This OCR's history reveals that students have long filed Title IX complaints to express their frustration with universities handling gender-based violence. In 2011, the public reception, political, and institutional responses to sexual assault on campus shifted, creating new opportunities for survivor organizing, but these shifts were made possible, in part, due to the lengthy history of feminist anti-violence organizing (Whittier 2018).

Emergence of the New Campus Anti-Violence Movement

The start of the new campus anti-violence movement, also referred to as the new campus anti-rape movement (CARM), has been placed between 2011 (Whittier 2018) and 2013 (Heldman et al. 2018). In 2011, the Department of Education published the "Dear Colleagues Letter." This letter explicitly described sexual violence as a form of sexual harassment and defined sexual violence:

> Sexual violence, as that term is used in this letter, refers to physical sexual acts perpetrated against a person's will or where a person is incapable of giving consent due to the victim's use of drugs or alcohol. An individual also may be unable to give consent due to an intellectual or other disability. A number of different acts fall into the category of sexual violence, including rape, sexual assault, sexual battery, and sexual coercion. All such acts of sexual violence are forms of sexual harassment covered under Title IX (Ali 2011: 1-2).

In addition to defining sexual violence, the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) described schools' obligations under Title IX, including: (1) policies and procedures related to instances of sexual violence and obligations to investigate, (2) prevention efforts, (3) rights of complainants (4) compliance with other relevant legislation such as Clery and FERPA, and (5) examples of how to enforce these policies and use of the preponderance of evidence standard (Ali 2011). The release of the DCL signaled that student activists now had support within OCR as well as broader political support to address sexual violence on campus in a way prior generations had not.

As OCR released the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter, student activists mobilized to hold universities accountable for their failure to protect students from sexual violence and to adequately respond to the needs of survivors. A month before the 2011 DCL was released, students at Yale University filed a Title IX complaint noting that the university failed to address a sexually hostile environment (Heldman et al. 2018). In 2013, another group of students filed a

Title IX complaint against the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, arguing the university mishandled sexual assault cases (Kingkade 2014). Students across the country followed suit. By January 7, 2015, ninety-four universities were under investigation by OCR for possible violations regarding sexual assault and harassment complaints (Kingkade 2015). Students across the country mobilized through social media. They shared resources and helped one another to utilize Title IX in new ways making this one of the most effective tools in the new campus anti-violence movement (Heldman et al. 2018; Potter 2016; Whittier 2018).

As these networks grew, students, faculty, and service providers collaborated to form a series of organizations that represented national leaders in the campus anti-violence movement. Organizations such as Know Your IX, End Rape on Campus, and SurvJustice have created sustained platforms whereby local student activists can connect to a larger network of survivors, acquire resources to change policies on their own campuses or file Title IX complaints, as well as access support from these highly connected activists with national platforms. Ava Blustien (2017) has described these organizations as "radically decentralized," with national organizations focusing on supporting local activists, respecting that different campuses may require different approaches, and advocating for policy changes at state and federal levels. The size and institutionalization of these organizations vary. Some are composed of student and faculty membership, yet others are completely student-led. They also vary in their approaches and perspectives around carceral and anti-carceral approaches to sexual violence, as discussed in Chapter 5. Still, they share a focus on holding universities responsible, working to prevent violence, and addressing the needs of student survivors.

This movement has been led by students, many of whom are themselves survivors of gender-based violence. Milkman (2017) argues that U.S. millennials involved in this movement

are primarily “social insiders,” most of whom are white, economically secure, and heterosexual. Still, other scholars have characterized this movement as composed of a diverse group of activists formed by students of varying racial identities, ethnicities, embodiments, sexualities, and gender identities. (Blustein 2017; Heldman et al. 2018; Whittier 2018). These diverging accounts may, in part, be explained by reporters’ focus on white, straight, non-disabled women many of whom attended elite schools (Blustein 2017). Such depictions not only erase those survivor activists who do not fall within these parameters but also serve to misrepresent the movement at-large. These contrasting perspectives on the leadership of the new campus anti-violence movement will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

Student-activists within the new campus anti-violence movement have used a variety of tactics to combat gender-based violence on campus. Blustein (2017) notes that national organizations that have come to represent the campus anti-violence movement have worked to offer support to activists on the ground. These organizations educate students on how to use Title IX to pressure universities into compliance, as well as connecting local activists to legal support. Student activists have engaged in public campaigns to rally student bodies and raise awareness around this issue. The continuation of events like Take Back the Night, The Clothesline Project, and Slutwalks serve to show support for survivors and challenge practices of gendered dominance that undermine survivors' attempts to seek justice (Whittier 2018). Members of the new campus anti-violence movement also advocate for policy changes and programs to support survivors and prevent violence at the local, state, and national levels (Blustein 2017).

Lastly, social media has been a major tool utilized as part of this movement (Heldman et al. 2018). Survivors have long used storytelling to personalize the impact of violence and garner public support for prevention efforts; however, the internet and social media, in particular, have

allowed survivors' stories to reach beyond local and campus newspapers (Heldman et al. 2018). Student activists have used social media to connect with one another and form national advocacy organizations. Social media has also been used as a tool to shame universities into complying with survivors' demands. Demonstrations such as Emily Sulkowicz's senior thesis where she carried a 50lb. mattress throughout campus for a year not only brought attention to her experience of sexual violence but Colombia University's failure to protect students and effectively meet the needs of survivors (Heldman et al. 2018). These tactics have been shown effective as violence on campus has received increased attention and support for activists has grown among the general public. The popularity and widespread reach of films such as *The Hunting Ground* (2015) demonstrate how effectively the movement has worked to reach large audiences (Blustein 2017). The attention drawn by these films, coupled with the #MeToo movement, which I discuss in Chapter 5, made sexual violence on campus a national issue.

In addition to public support, the new campus anti-rape movement had political opportunities in the form of a favorable presidential administration (Whittier 2018). In 2014, President Obama formed a task force to "Protect Students from Sexual Assault" and launched a campaign called "It's On Us" aimed at preventing sexual assault in institutions of higher education (Eilperin 2014). The campaign involved leaders from almost 200 colleges and universities, provided grants to schools to focus on creating new policies to address sexual assault on campus, and sponsored celebrity public service announcements to raise awareness (Eilperin 2014). At the launch, former President Obama addressed student leaders, saying, "You are not alone. And we have your back and we are going to organize campus by campus, city by city, state by state. The entire country is going to make sure that we understand what this is about and that we're going to put a stop to it" (Eilperin 2014).

According to Know Your IX's website, these acts were a direct response to advocacy efforts by students in the campus anti-violence movement. This claim is supported by the inclusion of student leaders from multiple national social movement organizations at the campaign launch. During this period, activists appealed to the state to influence colleges and universities. The Obama administration offered structural and public support for this movement providing activists with an opportunity to enact reforms. This political landscape altered with Donald Trump's election in 2016, and survivor activists' strategic initiatives and plans shifted in response. This is another focus of Chapter 5, which looks at the influence of political and social context on this movement. Still, it is important to note the favorable conditions under which the new campus anti-violence movement emerged to understand how this shaped the initial goals and strategies of student activists and social movement organizations including those within this study.

Survivors Fighting Violence: Goals and Strategies

Survivors Fighting Violence (SFV) was founded at the beginning of the new campus anti-violence movement by two student-survivors who filed Title IX complaints against their respective universities. They were part of another organization composed of survivors working to ensure that the Department of Education issue guidance related to sexual violence on campus, demanding greater transparency from schools, and identifying schools under investigation. Initially, SFV was envisioned as a legal resource for survivors. As the new campus anti-violence movement grew, the organizational goals expanded to better support survivor student-activists' direct action and advocacy work.

SFV was established as a non-profit organization under a larger organization that supports youth activists working on various social justice initiatives. While SFV’s status as a

non-profit organization may imply bureaucratization, SFV still functions as a decentralized, horizontally-organized group with a small team of ten to twenty volunteer members and one paid team leader. SFV quickly became a leader in the national conversation regarding gender-based violence on campus. SFV members were, and continue to be, interviewed by nationally syndicated news outlets. They were recognized as leaders within the movement by politicians and helped create a network of student-activists across the country.

Survivors Fighting Violence, as shown on their organizational website, has three goals: (1) educate students, both those enrolled in institutions of higher education and high school, about their rights to a violence-free education, (2) support student survivor activists, and (3) promote policies at schools, within states, and at the federal level that work to address gender-based violence. Like other national organizations established at the onset of the new campus anti-violence movement, SFV sought to promote organizers' rights and work with students on campuses across the nation. While they provided training and suggested strategies to local campus activists, SFV members focused on supporting student organizers' self-directed actions.

Survivors Fighting Violence was dedicated to building a more inclusive anti-violence movement. Octavia, a Black queer woman, discussed this as one of the organization's goals that distinguishes SFV from other organizations within the campus anti-violence movement.

A: What does it mean to build an organization that is inclusive?

> O: When I say inclusive, I mean including marginalized communities so Black women, trans women, disabled folks, undocumented folks, incarcerated survivors. Because in my opinion, my experience with sexual violence, what we see a lot in this movement, especially in the mainstream movement, is that we see the same faces and the same stories. And when I say faces, we see the same heterosexual white women stories are being centered, and their narratives are always being pushed in the media. We really don't see Black women. We don't see trans women. We don't see incarcerated folks. We don't see stories that happen to everyday people, although we should. Although white women are experiencing violence as well. I think we should. I think it's very, very important to center

> marginalized communities and communities that are more likely to be affected by sexual violence.
>
> A: And would you say that's a goal that SFV shares broadly, or is that a goal that varies between members?
>
> O: I think that's a goal that SFV shares broadly. Our team is very, very focused on centering marginalized communities, which is something that I don't see in every sexual assault organization.

Nancy Whittier (2018: 141) notes that, similar to previous feminist movements, the new campus anti-violence movement has "struggled with issues of race." She states that such critiques are represented in remarks about the centering of white women in the movement, and there is little data on this topic (Whittier 2018). The centralization of the concerns of white women in this movement is also exacerbated by the criminalization and continued reliance on "racialized sex stereotyping" through Title IX regulation and policy (Cantalupo 2019). Octavia's account supports these observations and draws attention to the need to study internal contradictions within movements, especially feminist movements that have historically excluded marginalized persons. The exclusion of marginalized members from leadership positions not only shapes how gender-based violence is addressed on campus, but how this problem is understood, as I will demonstrate in the next section.

To accomplish their goals, SFV's membership was divided into three teams: policy advisors, student engagement, and communications. The policy advisor team evaluated new state and federal policies and organized events or lobbying efforts to promote anti-carceral policies that support survivors and oppose those that do not. The campus organizers visited campuses and shared training materials with other student organizers across the country. The communications team was tasked with raising awareness and promoting calls to action. This team approach was a strategic choice to ensure that all members shared in the organization's leadership, mimicking

grassroots style organizing over hierarchical bureaucratization that characterizes many of the women's rights organizations founded in the 1980s-1990s. SFV's Team Leader, Lexi, also noted that, in reviewing SFV team membership applications, they purposely sought to include survivors from marginalized groups. These strategic actions demonstrate how SFV connected organizational goals to praxis.

While some of these goals align with those of the broader campus anti-violence movement, the centering of marginalized students and commitment to anti-carceral solutions to gender-based violence represent points of division and contention within this movement. I argue that these divisions must be understood as part of the historical legacies of feminist anti-violence organizing that often focused on carceral approaches and ignored the needs of survivors from marginalized populations. In other words, these points of contention are not new to anti-violence organizers. These *old arguments* are being debated within a *new context* through a focus on education and universities as non-state-based institutions. Furthermore, we must acknowledge that the re-emergence of these points of division demonstrates the persistence of systemic inequalities that shape lived experiences of activists and social structures in which organizing occurs.

Cavaliers Against Violence: Goals and Strategies

Cavaliers Against Violence was founded as a student organization at Big South University after a screening of the documentary, *The Hunting Ground* (2015). This screening was hosted by Big South University's Survivor Advocacy Office, Title IX, and the Counseling Center. Lisa, a white bisexual woman in her mid-20s and one of the founding members of CAV, described this event:

> At the end of the film, they said if you are interested in learning more, or something along those lines, you are welcome to come down and talk to us. Whether that was talking to a counselor…so maybe that was a way to mask-- for people who were affected by [the] film. [Students] could go down to have a

> conversation or something. So, I and several other students went down there saying, "This is really crazy what's going on, on college campuses, and what does [Big South] do to prevent sexual assault and how do we support survivors? How do we educate folks on Title IX? Who is our Title IX representative? You know all these sorts of questions, and we were kinda shocked to hear that there'd been efforts in the past. I think we did a Green Dot program.[9] Um, but we were shocked to find there really wasn't a current student-led effort. That [Tiffany the former Director of Survivor Advocacy Office] was a one-woman office. And I guess we were a little bit surprised to find that we were doing more than the bare minimum, right? We had a Title IX coordinator **and** [emphasis added] [Tiffany's] position, which the university had been *so kind to create* [said in a sarcastic manner]. So we were pleased to hear that, but we were like, "What can we do as students?" And so [Tiffany] got out a piece of paper and said, let's write your emails down and we can figure something out. So there were four people who emerged from that as the main leaders.

She explained that these four women led the charge to establish CAV as a student organization, developing organizational goals, as well as programming related to gender-based violence prevention. CAV's initial focus was on creating and implementing a peer educator program based on Tiffany's suggestion. Lisa explained that, given survivor services were provided by the SAO, they focused on developing the peer educator program, expanding CAV membership, advocating for a second employee in the SAO, and hosting a few awareness events such as Take Back the Night. When I initially established contact with CAV and began attending events in the Fall of 2018, only the outgoing President (CAV leadership positions began in the Spring semester and end the

[9] Green Dot is a bystander intervention program originally developed by the Violence Intervention and Prevention Center at the University of Kentucky (VIP Center 2021). This programming was offered by a nonprofit company, Green Dot, etc., Inc. (renamed Alteristic) and includes education on gender-based violence, consequences of violence, and intervention strategies (Alteristic 2021). The Green Dot program was found to be effective at reducing sexual harassment and stalking victimization on UK's campus among students who had and had not received Green Dot training; however, Green Dot training did not have an impact on unwanted sexual contact or dating violence victimization (Coker et al. 2015).

following Fall) had been part of the organization under the leadership of these founding members.

While some of these initial goals shifted between the organization's founding and the rise of a new group of student leaders, many Cavaliers Against Violence events, programs, and strategies were initially implemented by the founders. They established an organizational structure that persisted after they left campus. This is not a small accomplishment for a student organization, given students are only on campus for four years and organizations often compete for student involvement. Both Lisa and current CAV members mentioned the difficulty of maintaining student involvement at Big South University. They perceived this problem to be especially difficult at their university because many students were already involved in multiple student organizations and had limited availability. CAV's board meetings often included brainstorming sessions about maintaining the organization and recruiting new students for the board and peer educator program. Lisa noted that, although any student who attended meetings was considered a member, only board members and peer educators were "really involved." This hierarchical structure persisted after these founders left. CAV was run by a small student board composed of eight to ten students. This student board made all decisions regarding CAV activities. Peer educators were selected by this board and encouraged to attend meetings, and these were often the only non-board members at CAV bi-weekly meetings.

Cavaliers Against Violence aimed to prevent and raise awareness about gender-based violence on campus. The organization had three explicitly stated goals: (1) raise awareness about the pervasiveness of gender-based violence on college campuses, (2) educate students about affirmative consent and resources available to survivors, and (3)

teach students to intervene as active bystanders. These goals were embedded into the CAV mission statement, which each member of the student board memorized almost verbatim. The mission statement and goals were shared at each event and peer education training session.

In addition to these expressed organizational goals, members also shared their priorities for violence prevention on campus. Many CAV members aimed to prevent violence by combating rape culture on campus, rape myths, sexism, and street harassment. During my observations of CAV meetings, members expressed a desire to better address sexual harassment at tailgating events and on the street near downtown bars frequented by the student population on the weekends. However, the board did not plan any new events or initiatives to address this issue during this study. Several members also believed that they could shift campus culture through interpersonal interaction and viewed confronting everyday sexism and heterosexism as a duty of CAV membership. Lance, a straight white man who served as the head of the peer educator program and was involved in a social fraternity on campus, described how he sought to intervene within his friend group after joining CAV.

> Lance: It's made me think about things my friends say. In terms of simple jokes, simple phrases we pick up from our parents, from the culture here. I don't think the guys that I hang around with are bad people. I just think a lot of things they say are bad, and that's because a lack of education. So when my friends, unless it's something completely crazy, when my friends say something I don't agree with when it relates to…especially when it relates to CAV, rape, sexual assault, gender discrimination, I'll always say, "Hey man. Come on. Why are you saying that?" And, a lot of times…sometimes they'll say nothing. Sometimes they explain their reasoning. And that's when I try to explain my reasoning. Why you shouldn't because we've got to educate people, and get people to realize just cause they're not like you, don't do what you do in life, they're not bad people. It doesn't mean you have a right to say bad things about them.
>
> A: Can you give an example of that kind of interaction?

> L: So the most common one is "man, that's gay." Or, "that's queer." And, as a kid, you don't think anything about it. But as I got older and when I became a member of CAV and realize[d] what those words mean, it made me think twice about…Would I want someone going around using my name or what I identify as—as a term of stupidity, or weirdness, or awkwardness? So I try not to use those phrases anymore. Or every now and then, I might catch myself doing it, but I try to make sure that the things I say aren't about other people, but they're about me. So why should I be using a slur or language that refers to a community I can't talk about? That I'm not a member of, especially if it's going to subject that community to shaming.

Lance's example focuses on combating heterosexism as a form of gender discrimination.[10] Other members discussed similar interactions that focused on dispelling rape myths or sexist jokes. CAV members also encouraged non-CAV affiliated students to take up this mission by utilizing the pledge from "It's On Us" which calls on students to take small actions that shift campus cultures.

Cavalier Against Violence focuses on education and prevention in many ways that mimic early anti-violence organizers' actions in the 1960s and 1970s. As discussed below and demonstrated by Lance's comments, CAV members saw a lack of education as a major factor contributing to gender-based violence on campus. Sexual violence was often discussed as something "new," and the organization focused on raising awareness as a strategy of prevention. Lisa recalled that the founding members of CAV had been surprised to learn that students had previously organized around this issue. The quick turnover between students on campus can contribute to students' lack of knowledge about previous advocacy efforts. This was reflected in

[10] All of the men in this study discussed confronting sexist or heterosexist language and behavior in their interactions with other men. Given that there were only four men involved with CAV during the period of this research, it is beyond the scope of this study to explain how men involved in the new campus anti-violence movement understand and confront the normalization of gender-based violence during "friendly" interactions. However, I plan to use these interviews to construct a future study that will further explore this theme.

CAV members' fears that they would lose the years of progress the organization made in bringing awareness about this issue to campus if they could not recruit new membership. However, student turnover alone does not explain CAV's strategies as this organization successfully maintained student involvement when founding leaders graduated and left. CAV members' perceptions of gender-based violence, identities, and position within specific political and cultural contexts also determined this organization's goals and strategies.

Noticeably absent from CAV's stated goals was advocacy. While CAV participated in "It's On US" week and organized Take Back the Night, they viewed these events as awareness-raising efforts that signaled support for survivors. When moments arose, either on campus or at the national stage, related to new policies concerning gender-based violence, the CAV student board often debated how to handle such incidents. The degree to which advocacy should or should not be an expressed goal of the organization was contested and tied to concerns about the organization's ability to remain effective in adversarial campus culture. Again, we see in these debates echoes of past organizing. Scholars have criticized rape crisis centers and institutionalized feminist organizations for being co-opted by the state and abandoning radical transformation in favor of smaller reforms (Martin and Schmitt 1999; Richie 2012; Whittier 2018). I address how scholars may apply these critiques to the new campus anti-violence movement and, using CAV as an example, understand activists' approaches to targets as complicated by the social context of college campuses in Chapter 4.

Student and Survivor Leadership: Competing Approaches

While many of the differences between CAV and SFV result from their position within the new campus anti-violence movement, as local and national advocacy organizations. I argue in this section that their goals and strategies also reflect differences in their personal experiences of

gender-based violence. SFV which was composed largely of survivors of gender-based violence looked to the situated knowledge of those who had direct experiences of violence within education to drive their goals and tactics. CAV relied on knowledge produced by scholars and service providers, those who even when working in the best interest of survivors, remain on the outside of gender-based violence on campus. In this movement we see the same concerns arise that have arisen in previous feminist movements: whose perspectives are centered impacts what changes are made not just at the state-level, but in non-state institutions as well.

Survivors Fighting Violence was an organization founded and led by survivors. The pseudonym that I selected to represent this group is a reflection of this core-component of the organization. The new campus anti-violence movement has consistently been described as survivor-led, but little is known about what this means in the practice of activism. For Survivors Fighting Violence, this meant prioritizing and learning from the experiences of survivors. In their strategic action playbook, they encouraged other organizations to include and ideally be led by survivors. They were clear that this did not exclude allies from being involved in the movement, but they noted that the tactics and policies promoted by allies have at times "ignored the needs and goals" of those who have directly experienced gender-based violence. How did these activists' identities as survivors and their efforts to center survivors inform the goals and strategies they adopted?

One of the major outcomes of centering survivors in SFV was a focus on universities as targets of the organization and movement. This message was ubiquitous. SFV members described in interviews, on social media, and in op-eds or other media publications how schools across the country had mishandled gender-based violence on campus. Member relied on a variety of stories to demonstrate how schools harmed survivors, including a high school that

failed to act when students petitioned that a perpetrator be allowed to attend a school dance and the survivor be banned; a college student being pressured by a Title IX investigator at a flagship state university to avoid reporting and protect the future educational prospects of the man who raped her; and a survivor who was subjected to shaming by a Dean who questioned her behavior and wardrobe.

SFV emphasized that these stories do not exist in isolation from policies and procedures at colleges and high schools. One SFV tweet announced that "Institutional betrayal was reported by over 40% of those who experienced gender-based violence." Smith and Freyd (2013: 120) coined the term institutional betrayal to describe "sexual assault occurring in a context where an important institution acts in a way that betrays its member's trust will be especially damaging." As noted by SFV, emerging research demonstrates the persistence of institutional betrayal on college campuses and found that this motivated survivor activists to mobilize on their campuses for better treatment of survivors (Heldman et al. 2018; Linder and Myers 2018; Smith and Freyd 2014). I argue that these experiences of betrayal not only prompted survivors to join this movement but continually and actively shaped how they worked to address gender-based violence on campus.

In centering survivors within their organization, SFV recognized that universities often represent a threat to survivors and worked to target these institutions. They encouraged local activists to fight for campus climate surveys, which unlike Clery statistics, can include information on how universities handled Title IX cases and outcomes of investigations. As I discuss in Chapter 4, they also encouraged activists to work within and outside of the university structure to pursue change, cautioning organizers against putting extensive faith or trust in the promises of universities that claim to take the issue of gender-based violence "seriously." They

also centered survivors' experiences of betrayal when responding to changes in state or federal policies. For example, when then Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, released proposed changes to Title IX rules, SFV members worked to inform the general public and students about how these rules would impact survivors on campus. Lexi, an SFV member who was assaulted off-campus when she was an undergraduate student, explained that the new rules would have prevented her from accessing the protection of Title IX. She shared in op-eds and on social media that she would have "dropped out" if the new Title IX regulations had been in effect when she was a student. In a news article, another SFV member criticized the new proposed religious exemptions. She noted how survivors who attend religious universities, referring in particular to Christian institutions, are often pressured to "forgive" perpetrators without consideration for the immediate needs of survivors, including the desire to feel safe. She further argued that by allowing mediation, the new rule could enable these institutions to further entrench these practices in their standard approach to gender-based violence.

Unlike SFV, which was explicitly organized around survivors, the founding members of CAV were interested in creating student-led effort to address sexual violence on campus that focused on preventing gender-based violence through educating the general student-body. Supporting survivors was a secondary goal. This organization cared for survivors, but did not center them in practice. There was one self-identified survivor of violence in CAV, and there may have been additional survivors in the group who chose not to disclose their experiences, but highlighting the needs of survivors was not generally a tactic employed by the group. For instance, CAV sought to create a supportive space on campus for survivors to share their experiences at events such as Take Back the Night, but survivors' experiences were not explicitly used to create organizational goals or strategies. Most students who sat on the

executive board of CAV or became involved as peer educators joined because of a general interest in the topic or because a friend or family member was a survivor. In witnessing the consequences of this violence for friends and other loved ones, many CAV members expressed feelings of helplessness and joined CAV so they would be better prepared to support survivors in the future.

In contrast to Survivors Fighting Violence, where survivors' stories and lived experiences guided activism, CAV was led by a group of students who sought to support survivors but did not rely on survivors' narratives to guide their daily practice. They included information in their peer education program on how to respond to friends or family who disclose experiences of violence as well as resources for services available to survivors on campus. However, the majority of the presentation focused on prevention through consent education. These student activists reported relying on empirically supported best practices to address sexual violence. This sentiment was often expressed in justification and support for the bystander intervention program. Participants reported that bystander intervention was shown to be "the most effective way to address sexual violence." Similarly, CAV did not support or offer self-defense training because some advocates have argued this approach places blame on survivors and has not been shown in research to be an effective prevention strategy. However, few students knew where this information originated from or had been part of the original team that had devised these strategies. In CAV, student leaders looked to the practices established by founding members and Denise, the director of the Survivor Advocacy Office, for guidance on how best to prevent violence on campus.

Denise worked daily with survivors on campus. CAV utilized their partnership with this organization to determine how to support these students. For example, Lisa one of CAV's

founders noted that they had originally worked to secure a secondary staff member for the Survivor Advocacy Office, but these efforts were unsuccessful. CAV members were also embedded within the culture of campus, something that I elaborate on in Chapter 5. They were aware of instances of sexual harassment during tailgate season, increases in sexual violence at the beginning of the fall semester each year, and emerging problems on campus that could impact survivors such as a new cap on the number of university counseling sessions being offered to students. (Due to budget concerns, Big South University had announced that students would be directed to private counseling after 10 sessions.) In the first CAV meeting following this announcement, students discussed how this limit might impact survivors on campus. They felt it was their the responsibility to ensure that survivors needs were being met. In the following weeks, they worked with the Counseling Center to ensure survivors would receive additional sessions or assistance in locating mental health resources even if they could not afford private therapy.

CAV's response to this situation demonstrates their concern with the needs of survivors, but it also shows that they trusted university affiliated resources such as the Survivor Advocacy Office and Counseling Center as spaces where survivors would be safe from further harm. In over a year of observations at Big South University, offices on campus tasked with supporting survivors and those assigned to investigate Title IX complaints were engaged in best practices identified by research and survivor-led organizations such as SFV. However, the risk with these institutional resources is that a change in leadership or personnel in these key offices, Survivor Advocacy Office or Title IX, could lead to shifts in the way the university addressed gender-based violence and institutional betrayal among survivors. As SFV emphasized in their strategic action plan, student organizations that are led by allies may miss opportunities to assist survivors

especially those who are unlikely to seek university-facilitated support due to further marginalization.

Historically-Situated Perceptions of Gender-based Violence on Campus

Survivors Fighting Violence's and Cavaliers Against Violence's goals and strategies link these organizations to a lengthy history of anti-violence activism in the United States. Their goals and strategies illustrate how contentions related to racism, exclusion, and co-optation are replicated within this modern movement. The history of anti-violence advocacy is also reflected in how SFV and CAV members perceived the problem of gender-based violence on college campuses. As noted above, previous cohorts of feminists fought to raise awareness about the prevalence of gender-based violence, argued rape was linked to social control and power, and demonstrated how gender-based violence is intertwined with other systems of inequalities (Heldman et al. 2018; Richie 2012; Whittier 2016; 2018). In this section, I focus on the causes of campus gender-based violence as explained by members of Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence. Their opposing perspectives on the root causes of this problem demonstrate how understandings of sexual violence have both remained the same and evolved over time, and how perceptions of violence influence activists' strategies and tactics.

Gender-based Violence as Consequence of Inequality

Perceptions of gender-based violence within Survivors Fighting Violence reflect the decades-long legacy and collective knowledge of feminist theorizing and mobilizing against violence. SFV recognized sexual violence as a tool of gender oppression and as rooted in other systematic inequalities such as racism, classism, ableism, heterosexism, and cissexism, among others. SFV's website noted that women of color, students with

disabilities, sexual and gender minoritized individuals, and undocumented students experience higher rates of violence and unique barriers to reporting and receiving support services. As a result, they believed that campus anti-violence activism must recognize these survivors' needs and seek to understand how best to serve these survivors and student populations. For example, SFV warns international students that falling below 12 credit hours might jeopardize their status as students. They recognize that, following assault, students often need to reduce course hours. Thus, they provided a series of accommodation options and advised international students that they may wish to speak to a lawyer familiar with immigration and sexual violence law. Also, as noted above, SFV worked to build an inclusive team and center marginalized students within this movement.

Beyond recognizing and addressing marginalized student survivors' needs, SFV's advocacy work extended to addressing these oppressions. Their Twitter page often included links and quotes from articles recognizing the intersection of gender oppression and racism in sexual violence on campus. They drew attention to how racism and xenophobia were tools to delay visas for international students. They also retweeted members who provided overarching explanations of the ways racism, colonialism, and capitalism function in the US, especially within the education system. Furthermore, SFV promoted and referenced the work of other social movement organizations and activists working against racism, especially police violence, prison abolition, and oppressive immigration policies.

Survivors Fighting Violence members also noted that universities are built upon interlocking systems of oppression, which contribute to their unwillingness to address

campus violence effectively. Tanya, a Mexican woman working with SFV, like many other members, described the structure of universities as directly contributing to the problem of gender-based violence on campus. When asked to expand on how universities' structure allows for the persistence of gender-based violence, she explained:

> I think that many of the civil rights that are instituted in our country are created because institutions have not been willing to respect and uphold basic human decency. And so, institutions like colleges and universities learn on this model where they're constantly trying to make a profit off of students. And we see that with the rise of tuition charges. Where even now institutions have kind of recently shown that they are connecting [enrolling] students that wouldn't necessarily be a great fit for that university. It's all based on upholding an image for the universities. So a university values their image and tries to squander any kind of opposition or any kind of critiques that students might have. And so like, my university is a predominantly white institution, and there are times where there are huge amounts of concerns over racism, over discrimination, against people of color and specifically Black students. And so, this ignoring of these concerns students have…it's because the university wants to uphold its image. That it's a diverse institution. So diversity has become a buzzword and empty. Where institutions aren't equipped to respond to students' needs across these kinds of dimensions, and that includes not listening to students when they experience sexual violence. And sexual violence impacts students across a wide range of identities and so often disproportionately affects students that are already marginalized. And so, we see these repetitive patterns where students do not protect students from marginalized communities really reflects onto the university is not protecting students from marginalized communities experiencing sexual violence.

The theme of profit as a motivator for universities repeatedly emerged in interviews and my observations of Survivors Fighting Violence. They recognized that universities desire to maintain reputations and profits drove practices that suppressed survivors on campus. Researchers evaluating gender-based violence at universities in Canada and the US have noted that masculinities in neoliberal educational environments contribute to the problem of gender-based violence on campus, yet universities rely on consumer-based solutions to violence treating violence prevention as marketing initiatives (Atkinson and Standing 2019). SFV members viewed this as a weakness that could be exploited to inspire change.

As described above, Survivors Fighting Violence, like other organizations in the new campus anti-violence movement, utilized social media to shame universities that failed to protect survivors, thereby threatening schools' reputations. They also instructed survivors on how to file Title IX complaints and mobilize alumni to enact changes on campus. Both of these strategies are based on threatening schools' revenue streams and undermine neoliberal market-based solutions by drawing attention to failures of these policies to prevent and adequately address violence.

Also apparent in Tanya's statement is the recognition that the inequalities that contribute to experiences of violence are perpetrated by both individuals and institutions. These narratives reflect that SFV's perceptions of gender-based violence and inequality are inspired not only by early feminist anti-violence organizers but by social movements aimed at addressing racism, xenophobia, capitalism as well. SFV members also demonstrated an understanding of intersectionality, not as a buzzword to indicate overlapping identities, but as a framework to explain how systems of oppression overlap and reinforce one another (Collins 2000, 2004; Crenshaw 2003). I will discuss this intersectional approach to organizing more in Chapter 5.

Cavaliers Against Violence members also recognized that marginalized students experience sexual violence at higher rates, but this, unlike SFV, this was not a focus of the original programming. During the year in which I observed this organization, inclusivity was emerging as a goal for this organization. CAV's board worked with the Survivor Advocacy Office to include information about higher rates of sexual violence among racially marginalized and LGBTQ+ students. For the past two years, CAV hosted an LGBTQ+ panel where panelists were asked about the experiences of LGBTQ+ people

living in the South. And in the Spring of 2019, the CAV board organized a “Black Experiences of Sexual Violence” event in collaboration with the Black Student Union. As part of this event, they invited a Professor of Social Work, whose research focused on inter-generational trauma, to speak about “sexual violence within the African American community.” Her talk centered around the recent sexual abuses by R. Kelly and explained this within the context of post-traumatic slavery syndrome. She also posed discussion questions to the audience, asking, "How do we reconcile the fact that African American women posted his bail for him? How/why do Black women continue to support Black men and not feel supported in return? How [do] we reconcile that some of his most avid supporters have been women. Not just now but throughout the years." This was the only time over the course of this study that a CAV event centered Black women's experiences. This was also one of the few events that discussed how racism contributes to gender-based violence.

In conversations surrounding these events, it was apparent that many members of the student board recognized the risk marginalized students faced on campus. Still, most of these members did not have the language to explain intersectionality or the knowledge to fully grasp the role of intersecting systematic inequalities in perpetuating violence. As I argue in the following chapters, Cavaliers Against Violence members' understandings of violence and oppression are related to the makeup of the organization's leadership and the campus's larger cultural context.

Gender-based Violence as Misunderstanding Consent

One of the focal points for new campus anti-violence movements has been educating students about consent (Harris 2018). Indeed, most Cavaliers Against Violence members

identified this as the primary cause of violence on campus. Candace, a Black heterosexual woman in her third year at Big South University, was a new member of CAV and had recently been through the peer education program when we met for her interview. She identified a lack of knowledge about gender-based violence as the cause of this problem.

> I think one thing that perpetuates gender-based violence is peoples don't know that what they're doing, they don't take their actions heavy like they should. It's something that's taken lightly and doesn't have a big effect, but so therefore, they're ignorant to the fact that. Hey, what you are doing is very, very harmful. So I would say ignorance is like one of the biggest factors that perpetuates gender-based violence on this campus because a lot of people don't know.

Ashley, a white straight woman, later elected as co-President of CAV, shared this perspective:

> I think it does have to do with a lack of education. I think a lot of people don't know about gender-based violence and how it affects people. And, I mean I think it also has to do with inequalities of gendered norms and the norms society kind of projects on to us. I think that has a huge factor in violence whether it's gender-based or not.

Ashley identified a lack of education and knowledge as a major factor contributing to gender-based violence, but she also recognized that gendered norms and inequality contribute to sexual violence. However, when asked to provide examples of how inequality and lack of knowledge specifically contribute to this problem, she struggled to explain how inequality contributed to sexual violence but easily explained why misunderstandings regarding sexual violence was a major issue on campus.

> Ashley: Well. I mean, I think just the fact that people think women are more subject to sexual violence is kind of a norm…I don't know
>
> …
>
> A: You also mentioned lack of education. Can you say more about how you think that contributes to this problem?

> Ashley: I think people just don't know about gender-based violence. And what it is. And how it affects people. I think that lack of education and lack of knowing what it is creates more room for people to participate in gender-based violence. Because they don't know the implications of what it does or what it even is. Because I feel like a lot of people, when they do participate in gender-based violence, they don't know what it is. If they knew what it was, or what it entails, and the impact it has, I think it would occur a lot less.

Students new to CAV like Candice and established members like Ashley shared a belief that students at Big South University did not understand consent and the harm resulting from gender-based violence. The few CAV members who did not identify lack of education as a cause of gender-based violence focused on how the campus culture created an environment in which violence was permitted, and identified party culture, Greek life, and tailgating as environments that promote or normalize gender-based violence. This is explored in the next section, following an explanation of SFV's approach to consent.

Survivors Fighting Violence also discussed the importance of consent education in resources they provided for student-activists; however, SFV members did not identify this as the driving force behind sexual assault. Rather their focus remained on highlighting the role of power and privilege in gender-based violence. In discussing causes of gender-based violence, Lexi, the team manager of SFV, expressed concern with the continued focus on consent:

> And I think that an issue we have in combating, that is, most of our education and preventative programs don't address privilege and don't address entitlement. They simply are talking about bystander intervention and consent and rape. I personally have struggled with using consent as the only way to talk about sexual violence because I don't think it's that people don't get [as in understand] consent. I think it's that folks don't care to. And folks don't feel that I deserve the amount of respect that they would give my consent. Or that I am entitled to have control of my own body and what they do to it. **And so, I think that probably the biggest issue facing the movement is our inability to reckon with that. This isn't a lack of knowledge issue** (emphasis added by me). This is a power and dominance issue.

> I think I struggle looking at trauma intervention work with how do we get to the root of the problem. And that comes from education and "not showing your age?" Like you can't teach a 19-year-old [consent] and believe…they've developed that by now. Either they have it, or they don't. Like, let me go into it a bit more. You **can** teach a six-year-old [consent], and you **can** teach people in middle-schooler how to have that (emphasis added by Lexi). So I think we really have to start following this issue at a much younger age. Because folks see high school and college as the prevention age, and people are already being raped in high school, even into middle school. That is not the prevention age. That's when it's happening. That's when we've gone too far. And so I think we are looking to solve this way past the age that it happens.

Lexi's perspective on consent demonstrates SFV's acknowledgment that rape and gender-based violence are active forms of harm. They asserted that individuals should not frame perpetrators' actions as passive or a result of a lack of knowledge and that education is most effective before violence occurs. Survivors Fighting Violence used their social media platform to promote comprehensive sex education that addresses consent, including acknowledging that consent extends beyond sex and should be taught to children as well.

Survivors Fighting Violence also emphasized to campus activists that consent education is most effective when comprehensive and delivered over many sessions, rather than one training. SFV included practices commonly found in consent education, such as providing prevalence rates, confronting rape myths, defining consent, and offering examples of how to practice consent. They also recommended explaining how gender-based violence is linked to power and masculinity and discussing alcohol as a tool perpetrators' use to cause harm. Lastly, they called for programming specific to the needs of individual campuses. While SFV members did not view this as the most effective means of violence prevention, they were committed to meeting the needs of organizers at the campus-level organizers, like CAV (although CAV did not work with SFV or other

national campus anti-violence organizations), and worked to provide them with information about how to make consent education more effective, even if this programming is delivered amidst rather than before violence.

Survivors Fighting Violence viewed consent education as more than a means of interpersonal prevention. Defining consent on campus also provided opportunities to shift educational policies to better meet the needs of survivors. The new campus anti-violence movement continued the previous anti-violence activists' legacy of promoting "affirmative consent" (Whittier 2018). SFV promoted the “welcomeness standard,” which is based on civil rights rather than criminal law. Like affirmative consent, the welcomeness standard recognizes that consent is on-going, can be revoked at any time, and should be active—"yes means yes" rather than "no means no." Both standards recognize incapacitated individuals cannot consent to sexual activity. However, the welcomeness standard is sensitive to issues of power imbalances between individuals and practices of coercion.[11] SFV noted that the 2001 OCR guidelines promote a wellness standard and recognize that sexual harassment encompasses sexual violence rather than treating them as distinct, such as the case in criminal conduct matters. Lastly, SFV pointed out that the welcomeness standard acknowledges that individuals may not perceive behavior in the same manner. Welcomeness conduct notes that sexual conduct should be invited or, as the term implies, "welcome." This means one individual may not perceive their advances as offensive but the person subjected to these sexual advances

[11] This description of welcomeness is based on the student-activist guide provided by Survivors Fighting Violence.

may. Welcomeness standard calls on those who evaluate claims of sexual misconduct to consider subjective perceptions of sexual conduct and objective views of these behaviors.

I argue that SFV's focus on transitioning from affirmative consent to welcomeness is an outcome of their collective understandings of gender-based violence as a structural and interpersonal problem. Whereas CAV's focused exclusively on student interactions, educating their peers about the definition of consent and providing examples of consent in practice, or encouraging students to intervene when they think someone may not be able to provide consent to sexual activity. The contrast between these organizational approaches demonstrates that while consent is a feature of the new campus anti-violence movement, its role as a prevention strategy depends on activists' views of the causes of gender-based violence.

Gender-based Violence as Consequence of Culture and Social Structure

Student activists involved in Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence both cited campus culture and social structures as contributing to gender-based violence. Francessca Polleta (1999) argued that culture and social structure cannot be separated and are uniquely intertwined. This is reflected in activists' discussions of the causes of gender-based violence, and I treat the two as inextricably linked in this discussion.

Although most Cavaliers Against Violence members recognized campus culture as contributing to gender-based violence on campus, there was a clear split in activists' perceptions of this issue. Some CAV members saw the campus culture as creating an environment where unknowing perpetrators were likely to engage in sexual violence partly due to hookup culture and alcohol consumption. Still, others believed perpetrators intentionally used these spaces to enable their acts of violence. These perspectives also

overlapped at times. For example, CAV's peer educator training emphasized alcohol as the number one drug used to commit sexual assault and simultaneously emphasized how misconceptions around consent can result in violence when students are drinking at parties.

This division among CAV members was most apparent in their diverging perspectives on Greek life. Those involved in Greek life were quick to defend these organizations and argue that they received the blame for hosting parties where either Greek or non-Greek affiliated students might assault someone. Other members viewed Greek life as upholding party cultures in which sexual violence is normalized and dismissed. This tension was made more complicated by Cavaliers Against Violence's commitment to educating Greek organizations through the peer educator program. Even members who viewed Greek organizations as contributing to gender-based violence on campus were careful not to disparage these organizations in CAV meetings. Furthermore, members viewed the partnership with Greek organizations as a key opportunity to prevent sexual assault through bystander intervention training. Educating Greek life was a priority for CAV since its founding, and most of the Greek organizations on campus took part in CAV's bystander education.

In addition to discussing Greek-life parties as environments in which sexual assault is likely to occur, several CAV students acknowledged how party culture of the college campus, tailgates, and football act as rape permissive environments. Patrick, a white straight man, involved in CAV for several years, discussed how rape myths and gendered norms are sustained in these spaces.

> P: As a college in the South, I feel like [we] are specifically affected by the societal myths on that—that what you're wearing determines your willingness to

> engage in sexual activity. How much you drink or engage in drugs is a factor, or how much you. I feel like those are common societal—people perpetuate that. I feel like that nurtures an environment where survivors' voices are minimized, and violence is perpetuated as a result. I'm trying to think. I've never thought about it like that—the two things or a few things.
>
> A: You mentioned gender-based violence is shaped by society and culture. Could you give an example?
>
> P: Specific to this school, there is the game-day tradition of wearing special outfits when tailgating, but like I said, there is also this societal thing of what you're wearing determines your value. Or that's a conception people have. I don't know. I don't like that…I'm not saying it's like a causal thing that what you're wearing means that's the reason [someone would be assaulted]—but I am saying that there might be some sort of relation that, the culture of football, tailgating, and the devaluement of bodily autonomy. I don't know enough, but there is probably something to be said for women specifically being expected to, uh, dress a certain way when tailgating. Then how they're viewed and how their bodily autonomy is viewed.

Patrick acknowledges how rape myths are used to justify the violence that occurs in these spaces. In his explanation of factors that contribute to gender-based violence on campus, the role of sexism and the objectification of women's bodies is evident. However, these are not terms frequently utilized in Cavalier Against Violence events, peer educator trainings, or meetings.

Cavaliers Against Violence did not seek to abolish tailgating or Greek life or otherwise seek to combat party culture on campus. This is, in part, a reflection of institutional logics that have guided CAV since its founding. As CAV founder Lisa explained:

> There are certain camps that think that when someone is being done wrong or when things aren't exactly where they need to be, then you have the right to push things as hard and as fast and as far as you can to make changes. But Big South is a particular place. We are a little bit behind, I think. I think our campus, our student body is behind on these issues and that is a result of really poor sex education in the state. You know, I was a very ambitious and high achieving student, academically, and thought that I kind of knew what was going on, but I never even heard about this issue! I didn't know what Title IX was when I came

> [to] the college. So if that's what our highest academic achievers are coming into when they enter college, I cannot imagine folks who are just be-bopping through high school right, and then they get here. Of course, they've never heard of it. So for that reason we, I especially, but many of our leadership always took the approach that slow and steady wins the race. Just so that we could maintain semi-positive relationships with the student organizations on our campus, especially the fraternities, right? So we can at least talk to them about some things even if we weren't able to share the full message. Or really get them to do what we actually thought was right, we were getting them to do something, and we were afraid of getting shut out.

Cavaliers Against Violence recognized the difficulty of shifting campus culture, so, instead of aiming for structural shifts such as advocating for better sexual education in high schools, they targeted interpersonal interactions. Leaders like Lance sought to confront his fraternity brothers and friends when they made inappropriate comments. CAV implemented bystander intervention training to help students recognize instances of potential sexual misconduct and intervene. This training included information about the university's amnesty policy, which protects students from punishment in cases where they are intoxicated but acting to protect another student. Peer educators also taught students the three D's of bystander intervention: (1) Direct—directly approaching and interacting with potential perpetrator or potential survivor, (2) Distract—distracting either party to prevent assault, and/or (3) Delegate—finding a friend of one of the parties who can intervene. They discussed these strategies with students and often acted scripted interactions to demonstrate how to enact the three D's in hypothetical sexual violence situations. Peer educators were encouraged to cater these examples to different student groups, such as using a mixer as an example when presenting to a fraternity or sorority. All of these actions focus on the intervention at the individual and interactional level.

As demonstrated in Survivors Fighting Violence members' discussions of oppression, these survivor student-activists recognized that sexual violence results from a university system that fails to protect survivors. SFV's social media account often discussed confronting rape

myths and rape culture on college campuses. Survivors Fighting Violence criticized media representations of gender-based violence that perpetuate rape myths about who is most likely to experience sexual violence and that use passive language to describe assaults, thereby implying that survivors are responsible for perpetrators' actions. One of the strategies SFV used to dispel these myths was op-eds. Op-eds allowed survivors to shape cultural understandings of sexual violence on campus and present their own stories in their own words.

Survivors Fighting Violence also worked to confront political structures and transform laws to better address gender-based violence. Between September 2018 to May 2020, SFV spent a considerable amount of time educating students about Betsy DeVos' proposed, and then adopted, changes to Title IX and organizing opposition through the notice and comment period. SFV members used social media to provide information about how the new Title IX policy would negatively impact survivors. For example, they highlighted how the new policy allowed schools to retroactively apply for religious exemption if they have programs that treat students different on the basis of gender or allow for mediation in cases of sexual violence. Survivors Fighting Violence members also created a video that shared information about the notice and comments procedure, as well as what makes for an effective comment. Following DeVos' implementation of new rules on Title IX, SFV was one of several survivor-organizations to file suit against the Department of Education. These examples demonstrate how SFV responded to perceived structural causes of gender-based violence through direct action campaigns aimed at changing policies and procedures. Survivors Fighting Violence recognized the role of individuals in perpetuating violence, but also viewed the state and institutions of higher education as creating conditions under which survivors struggled to receive support. As such most of their collective

energies were directed at empowering survivors as individuals and creating structural support for survivors at the federal, state, and campus-level.

Conclusion

Lexi, the team leader for Survivors Fighting Violence, noted that, just as survivors of sexual violence come from different political and social backgrounds, so too do student-activists working to end gender-based violence. Accordingly, members of SFV and Cavaliers Against Violence held different views regarding the causes of gender-based violence on college campuses. As a result, they developed different strategic approaches to addressing this problem.

CAV members believed that sexual violence at Big South University largely resulted from a lack of awareness regarding what constitutes consent and the extent of harm associated with sexual misconduct experiences. These views were supported by the Title IX office and Survivor Advocacy Office. As a result, CAV focused on hosting awareness-raising events and bystander intervention trainings on campus. If gender-based violence is assumed to be an individual problem, it can be addressed by intervening at the individual level. Still, some CAV members believed that campus culture contributed to this problem. They sought to intervene by confronting rape myths and sexism on campus within the bystander intervention program and their day-to-day interactions with others on campus. However, they struggled to connect campus culture to broader social oppressions, including racism and sexism.

Survivors Fighting Violence viewed gender-based violence as an outcome of power, privilege, and overlapping systems of inequalities. SFV members argued that institutions of higher education were driven to prioritize profits, often at the expense of

protecting students from violence on campus. They sought to address these causes of gender-based violence by centering marginalized students' experiences within the movement, providing resources to student-activists working at the campus level, and building institutional support for survivors on campus through advocacy work at the federal, state, and local level.

These diverging perspectives on the causes of gender-based violence reflect historical approaches to addressing violence, ranging from raising awareness to attempts at dismantling systems of oppression that enable violence. SFV's and CAV's contrasting approaches to gender-based violence prevention resemble splits within the feminist anti-violence movement of the 1980-90s between organizers who sought to maintain radical grassroots movement and those who wished to build coalitions with a conservative movement through carceral approaches to anti-violence activism (Richie 2012). SFV focused on inequality and systematic causes of gender-based violence on campus, while CAV focused on raising awareness about this issue. CAV member's desire to maintain partnerships with fraternities and other campus organizations prompted them to avoid adversarial approaches and adopt tactics that would have broad appeal across campus. These internal contradictions within the new campus anti-violence movement demonstrate how former divisions are renewed within a new context of non-state-based activism.

CHAPTER 3: PERSONAL SUSTAINABILITY IN THE CAMPUS ANTI-VIOLENCE MOVEMENT

> "This year has really shown me that it is never acceptable to consider yourself an expert on a subject that you stop learning. You always have to be seeking out more information, looking up facts that you hear. Doing the research and seeing where facts are coming from, learning more, not just spouting out the talking points that your feed. Actually examining where these arguments are coming from and I think that continuing this learning process and not becoming complicit and not becoming complacent is really really critical of all activists. We are never done learning, growing, evolving. We have to keep doing that."
>
> Hailey, Survivors Fighting Violence

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, the study of social movements took an emotional turn. Scholars returned to the study of emotions in movements, exploring how emotions are used to mobilize public support and activists' experiences of emotion during political protests (Ferree and Merrill 2004; Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001; Gould 2004, 2009; Jasper 1998). Additionally, there has been considerable attention to how burnout among activists threatens the sustainability of movements (Cox 2011). Activists' feelings of being overwhelmed by the scope of the social problems they are working to eliminate, threats of backlash, and internal conflict within movements have all been shown to contribute to burnout among activists involved in social justice, racial justice, and animal rights movements (Chen and Gorski 2015; Gorski 2019; Gorski, Lopresti-Goodman, Summers-Effler 2010; and Rising 2019). Students involved in the campus anti-violence movement are aware of the potential for burnout and implement strategies to manage this risk.

Members of Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence identified several challenges and benefits to participating in this movement. I divide this discussion into

two sections. First, I describe how members of CAV and SFV experienced and dealt with emotional challenges associated with participation in this movement. Activists struggled with disappointment and emotional exhaustion following setbacks in the movement and experiences of cultural and vicarious trauma. Furthermore, student activists contended with the continued erasure of marginalized groups within the new campus anti-violence movement. I use Cox's (2009) heuristic of personal sustainability to describe the risk of burnout and other barriers to participation and participants' practices of resilience and strategies of self-care to avoid demobilization. According to Cox (2009, p. 53), "Personal sustainability… covers the conditions which make it possible for specific individuals to take up and maintain effective involvement in informal politics." This heuristic allows for a discussion of both the emotional costs of participation, and the work participants did day-in and day-out to stay involved in anti-violence work. I describe how SFV and CAV members used community-and self-care to cope with negative emotions and trauma.

Second, I identify personal growth and learning as significant benefits to participation in this movement. Members of SFV and CAV described their participation in this movement as transformative, helping them better understand factors contributing to gender-based violence. However, these activists entered the movement with different levels of experience and knowledge regarding gender-based violence. Feminist movements have been discussed as gender reform, gender resistance, and gender rebellion (Lorber 2005). Kathleen Fitzgerald and Diane Rodgers (2000) developed a model for examining radical social movement organizations as they contended that most social movement organizations adhere to a reformist orientation. Using the examples of SFV and CAV, I argue that these categories may fail to capture how participation within organizations transforms activists' perspectives and approaches to gender-based violence

on campus. I suggest that scholars treat learning as a process. This perspective serves to prioritize the agency of activists and examine how their positions on issues may change throughout their involvement within a movement. Recognizing learning as a process may be especially important in youth-led movements where organizers are new to movements and simultaneously challenging the status quo.

Managing Risk: Challenges to Participation

The emotional turmoil of those who work in the field of sexual violence prevention has been well-documented. Medical practitioners and victim service advocates report emotional strain and vicarious trauma (Baird and Jenkins 2003; Ullman and Townsend 2007; VanDeusen and Way 2006; Wasco, Campbell, and Clark 2002; Way et al. 2004; Wies and Coy 2013). Researchers have also reported experiences of vicarious trauma when studying sexual violence (Coles et al. 2014). Still, studies of activists' experiences within the anti-violence movement are sparse. Swanson and Szymanski (2020a) have shown that survivor activists' participation in the broader anti-violence movement helped to reduce shame and self-blame, as well as providing survivors with community support, a sense of purpose, and positive affect. Participation also contributed to post-traumatic growth. Survivor activists also described how their involvement created feelings of anger, burnout, and, at-times, triggered memories of their own experiences of assault (Swanson and Szymanski 2020b). This emerging research has shown how participation in this movement can help survivors to cope and regain control following experiences of violence, but also may lead to burnout and negative emotions. While this is important, as survivor activists have been saying, they are not defined by their experiences of gender-based violence. Further work is needed to understand how participation in this movement carries risks and rewards for those involved that may, beyond those connected to organizers' experiences of violence.

Setbacks and Backlash

The election of Donald Trump in 2016 had repercussions for the new campus anti-violence movement as this resulted in a dramatic shift in policy and political support for survivors' rights (Heldman et al. 2018). In chapter 5, I describe how activists responded to this new political landscape and adapted existing strategies and goals. However, it is also essential to recognize the personal costs of this transition. As I stood in my home office, I listened on the phone as Lexi, the team leader of SFV, transitioned from describing the positive impact this movement had on her life to sharing some of the challenges she has faced as an organizer:

> I think this year especially has been really emotionally taxing. I engaged a lot around the fight with Kavanaugh. I was really engaged in organizing with some high school students on the national scale to fight against Kavanaugh. And I definitely have not felt the same after that loss. I have not been able to move past the emotional exhaustion. And the emotional harm of it. I get emotional thinking about it and I am not an emotional person. I am very much like a shut it down. I don't have emotion. I don't cry very often and I've never really felt…I felt anxiety after my assault, but I now experience anxiety post-Kavanaugh organizing . And I talk to leaders in the movement that organized around Anita Hill and I remember asking them, 'When does this feeling stop? When does this go away?' And they were like, "Never". "This is your new normal now." I think that is really hard to think about the fact that engaging in this work also takes so much away emotionally. In my first year in the job stuff with Betsy DeVos, we were constantly waiting for the proposed rule to drop. We were constantly getting awful news from survivors about what their schools had done. I wasn't sleeping and was a mess. And I think it's so interesting to see, being a leader in this movement often means holding a lot and carrying a lot of stories with you. And that does take a toll after a while. I don't know, often, what to do with everything that I've heard. I don't know what to do with these stories and how to hold these stories within myself. And how to hold these realities within myself, and so what I do? I think that it has taken some years off my life honestly (small laugh). I feel like I am just, a new type of exhaustion that I never experienced following my assault. Organizing has given me the lowest lows in my life and the highest highs. And so I am grateful for the opportunities but I recognize it does really take a toll on a person.

Lexi acknowledged the emotional harm that comes from setbacks and political backlash against campus anti-violence organizing. She distinguished the anxiety and exhaustion she felt following

the confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh, from the anxiety she experienced after being assaulted. While much of the existing research on survivors' experiences within the anti-violence movement has focused on how participation relates to their personal experiences of trauma, Lexi's statement demonstrates the importance of what Jeffrey Alexander (2012) refers to as cultural trauma. Alexander (2012: 6) writes "cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways." This description separates personal trauma that individuals feel from cultural trauma, which is shared suffering among members of a particular social group. Suffering may manifest differently among group members, but their experiences are linked to a particular event, series of events, or circumstances surrounding an event of significance.

Lexi's term "post-Kavanaugh organizing" signals that this event holds particular significance among these organizers. Cavaliers Against Violence also recognized the significance of Kavanaugh's confirmation and hosted an event for members of Big South University to reflect and share their feelings.[12] The hearings and confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh inflected harm on this collective, as it provided clear evidence of disregard for the experiences of survivors among certain members of the general public, those who supported Kavanaugh, and many political elites. For members of this movement who joined during the Obama administration and had seen the public acknowledge the harm inflected on survivors in response to the #MeToo movement and #TimesUp, the confirmation hearings for Brett Kavanaugh signaled to survivors that social gains are often tenuous. As Lexi noted:

> And I think I have just struggled personally with that if you don't think rape is bad and you don't think rape harms people, I don't know how to convince you. And I think that's just been something that I've had to sit with especially around

[12] Unfortunately, I was unable to attend as I was teaching at the time of the event.

> Kavanaugh. Like if you can watch Dr. Ford share her story and be the most believable survivor I've seen in so long, who fits into our cultural ideas of believability, and still not believe her, I don't know what to do to change that.

Alexander (2012) claims that cultural traumas result from the inability of social groups to communicate the pain of these traumas to larger audiences successfully. This perspective implies that social groups are responsible for their experiences of cultural trauma. As such, society and powerholders are assumed to be ignorant of the causes and consequences of these traumatic events. Survivor activists' experiences challenge this claim because the pain associated with gender-based violence has been widely disseminated. Cultural trauma persists for survivors because so many members of the general public and powerholders refuse to acknowledge their pain and take steps to address these forms of harm.

Additionally, this harm is not new to anti-violence organizers, as signaled by the reference to leaders who organized in support of Anita Hill as she testified in the confirmation hearings of Clarence Thomas. Such historic events serve as reminders to members of the campus anti-violence movement that social change is not linear and rights previously won can be taken away. Cavaliers Against Violence members regularly referred to the "swing of the pendulum" and "back and forth" of federal policies on campus violence. The common narrative among CAV members was that, for years, there had been progress and universities were improving in responding to the needs of survivors, but now the political momentum was moving in the opposite direction towards respondents. This lack of political support leads to backlash on campus that directly effects survivors and those fighting for survivors' rights. Retaliation and threat of retaliation from state and non-state actors has been shown to compromise the emotional well-being of activists (Cox 2011).

Octavia, a member of SFV, described experiences of backlash on campus and the consequences felt by survivors:

> I think the challenges is getting these institutions and getting areas of higher education to actually want to hold themselves accountable and actually want to address the violence that's happening on these campuses. In my time as a community organizer on campus level, which is something I still do now, it was very hard for us to talk to administration or have these open and honest conversations with them. Because we know that sexual violence is happening on this campus, we know that it's not being handled the way it should, but administration doesn't believe that. They think that they handle it well. Also at the same time, they think survivors are not reporting or that campus crime statistics are extremely low and we know that's not the truth. So it's this very very hard issue of accountability and transparency on college campuses. And it makes it very difficult for survivors to want to report, and also that leads to activist burnout. With students just feeling exhausted and sort of like they're fighting for no reason. And I think that's a huge issue.

Octavia described the emotional exhaustion and risk of burnout that resulted from working to bring change within institutions that were unwilling or unmotivated to cooperate. In the context of a shifting political climate, the federal government was no longer a reliable associate of the movement because they could not depend on the DOE to hold universities accountable. Following the rescinding of the 2011 Dear Colleagues Letter, SFV noted that many campuses abandoned changes that they had made to campus sexual misconduct policies in the peak of campus anti-violence organizing. This back and forth increases the workload for activists and puts them at greater risk for burnout.

Lexi and other members of SFV also described backlash against the movement particularly from men's rights organizers and those concerned with the rights of respondents. Challengers on social media, especially Twitter, often accused SFV of dismissing due process, or claimed that they do not care about the consequences for men who are accused. This pushback was clear in my observations of SFV's social media posts and Tweets. SFV countered this point by emphasizing that the campus adjudication process is non-criminal and, therefore, the term due

process is misapplied. Furthermore, they emphasized that political shifts such as the 2020 Title IX rules did little to change the adjudication process. Instead, these rules "made it harder for survivors to access these procedures." Furthermore, SFV members sought to publicize legal interpretations of due process. For example, a news article from a former SFV member was posted highlighting how due process under the constitution requires the state to engage in specific procedures before enacting punishments. The rigor of these procedures depends on the severity of punishment. These attempts to clarify the meaning behind "due process" were often met with further insults or no response.

As noted in Chapter 2, social media has provided members of the new campus anti-violence movement with opportunities to network and implement new strategies, but this space also carries personal risk and subjects members of the movement to scrutiny, hostility, and even threats from those associated with counter-movements. In addition to the cultural trauma resulting from setbacks and backlash, allies and survivors within CAV and SFV acknowledged the vicarious trauma they experienced as members of the new campus anti-violence movement. CAV members described being an outreach person for friends, and others noted that many times students would disclose experiences of assault following peer education trainings. Representatives from the Counseling Center advised peer educators in the day-long training session to prioritize self-care and rest when needed. Many SFV survivor activists shared their own stories of survival in op-eds, on social media, and before policy makers, but these members, like Lexi, also heard the stories of survivor activists on the ground who their organization worked to serve. The emotional burden of constant exposure to stories of gender-based violence was felt by survivor and non-survivor student activists.

Researchers should continue to explore the impact of personal, vicarious, and cultural trauma on activists within this movement. Cultural trauma may be felt more so by survivor activists who have personally experienced the consequences of gender-based violence and, for many, institutional betrayal. Still, the harm inflected on communities as a result of political setbacks and cultural backlash was recognized by both members of Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence. Despite taking very different approaches to addressing violence on campus, SFV and CAV members are situated in a larger movement that has been subjected to harm by state and non-state institutions unwilling to adequately respond to gender-based violence. Students' experiences of this movement were shaped by cultural trauma and emotional harms linked to political backlash. This increased their risk of burnout. Furthermore, national and local student activists serve as contact points for survivors looking for resources or to mobilize. They carry the stories of these survivors. SFV and CAV sought to help their membership cope with the emotional cost of activism through personal and collective approaches. These practices of care are discussed later in this section.

Exclusion and Marginalization

In addition to the cultural trauma and vicarious trauma student activists experienced in this movement, practices of exclusion and marginalization of those most vulnerable to gender-based violence also contributed to activists' emotional exhaustion, frustration, and anger. Harm from marginalization within social movements is not limited to the new campus anti-violence movement. Racism within queer communities has been shown to lead to internal trauma especially as it violates expressed core-values of queer spaces as safe (Alimahomed 2010; Kelly et al. 2020; Ward 2008). Black and indigenous women who sit at the intersection of systems of inequality have often been ignored by women's movement and racial justice and indigenous

rights' movements (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 2006; Richards 2003, 2005; Robnett 2000). Gorski (2019) emphasizes that scholars who seek to understand activists' burnout need to consider identity-specific causes of burnout, and how marginalized individuals may experience burnout differently from those in their movements with privileged identities.

The new campus anti-violence movement has been described as intersectional due to the influence of millennial leaders who had exposure to language of intersectionality, but SFV members challenged this perception (Milkman 2017). They noted that both local and national organizations continued to erase perspectives of marginalized students in this movement. Hailey, a white woman who served in SFV for years, described one of these organizations as, "Big on saying the right thing and using the right language. But not actually living values." Other SFV members emphasized intersectionality as a practice within their organization, but noted it was treated as an identity among other activists in the movement. SFV criticized this as a misunderstanding and misapplication of the term. They argued that "intersectionality is a verb not a noun." CAV struggled to take an intersectional approach to violence prevention. These members recognized that racially marginalized and LGBTQ students experience gender-based violence, racism, and heterosexism. Still, they struggled to center these students in their practice and recognize how systems of oppression overlap. I elaborate on the reasons for these exclusions in chapter 5 as I describe how cultural and political context influenced the goals and strategies of this organization.

For those within the new campus anti-violence movement, the privileging of white middle-class straight women seen in earlier iterations of the anti-violence movement persisted as challenges to activists' involvement. Tanya from Survivors Fighting Violence, was an immigrant to the U.S. She explained how her experiences within organizing differed from those of others:

> I think that every activist and organizer would say that organizing is a pretty unique experience since violence doesn't look any one kind of way. Personally, if my background differs from other organizers, it's probably due to some of my identities. As an immigrant, that can be difficult to navigate in some organizing spaces. A lot of movement work can sometimes leave out other marginalized folx[13] and that can make it difficult to organize in these spaces effectively. But I think if I've had a better, easier time, it's because SFV has given me a platform to do this work.

SFV prioritized inclusivity and the voices of survivors from marginalized communities. SFV ensured that the leadership team included students from racially marginalized groups, disabled students, immigrants, and queer students. Just as they sought to center survivors, the organization's horizontal structure was an intentional attempt to ensure that individuals whose concerns were often overlooked in other organizing spaces were heard and centered. In addition to a horizontal team approach, the SFV team discussed each strategic action and nothing moved forward without "commitment from all" team members. They also consulted with students on the ground and communities associated with specific actions or tactics. For members such as Tanya who had experienced marginalization in other organizing spaces, this was key to improving her experience in the movement and thereby sustaining participation.

However, this support from SFV did not shield members from a larger movement that continues to prioritize white cisgender straight women's experiences of sexual violence. This tendency within some organizations excludes student activists from marginalized communities. Moreover, when they are included, these students often stand as the sole representative for these communities when decisions regarding survivors' rights and violence prevention are made. Octavia, a Black queer woman in SFV,

[13] In keeping with in-vivo coding, I have used the stylistic spelling of "folx" that was apparent in SFV social media posts.

described the personal cost of these practices of exclusion when recounting how she had been the only Black student at a legislative hearing for a new mandatory reporter bill that was to be implemented at the state-level[14].

> O: When I got on the stand I had to talk about Black issues. I had to talk about Blackness. I had to talk about Black women. I had to talk about trans women. I had to make sure that in every way possible marginalized communities are centered. I had to talk about queer women as well. LGBTQ students in general. Just making sure that every time I speak in regards to [mandatory reporting bill] I center marginalized communities. Because I knew that I would be the only person in the room to actually do it.
>
> A: How does it feel to carry that? [carry was a word that Octavia had continually used in our conversation to describe the personal costs of activism]
>
> O: It was a lot of pressure because I didn't want to exclude anyone and also you only have a certain amount of time. Roughly a few minutes to get your point across. And also, being in that space, speaking to a panel of majority white men, it was very intimidating for me. Even after my first time testifying, I remember just a lot of them just attacking me verbally. Saying, 'This is a lie. Black people are centered in this conversation and that every person in this country, in the United States, is treated the same.' It just took everything in me to not get upset. Cause I'm like, are you watching what's playing in the media right now? Are you looking at what's happening in society and how Black people are being treated? Why would you even tell me that every person in this world is treated equally when that's simply untrue? Having to fight for marginalized folx and stand up for myself. And make sure that they understand, 'Hey! I'm a Black student. I don't feel safe reporting to police because of issues of police brutality. Because of issues of police misconduct and this is why this bill should not happen.' I got so much backlash from these people that essentially just don't want to get it. [It] is very, very frustrating for me.
> …
> When I advocate for marginalized communities, I never want to get up there and share experiences that are not my own. I don't speak for every person that is a part of a marginalized community, but I know that I have to carry the weight of making sure their voices are centered because no one else will. I also have to carry the weight of me being a survivor and trying to speak up for survivors in my community. It's very, very difficult and it's very tricky for me because I don't want to over talk a community that I'm not a part of but I also want to make sure that their voices or their experiences are being heard at the same time.

[14] I have omitted the name of the state and bill to protect Octavia's identity.

Octavia's experience draws attention to two consequences of marginalization within the campus anti-violence movement (and likely other movements as well). First, she described the backlash she faced while testifying against the mandatory reporting bill. This backlash was not only tied to her experiences as a survivor of gender-based violence but as a Black woman who is a part of a community continually subjected to police violence. The backlash she experienced in this moment was different from that faced by her white counterparts because this backlash revealed overlapping cultural trauma linked to survivorhood and intergenerational community trauma against Black individuals in the U.S. Octavia's experience of backlash demonstrates that the identity-specific trauma Gorski (2019) observed among activists in racial justice movements on a predominantly white campus, were also present in the new campus anti-violence movement.

Second, Octavia referred to carrying the weight of representing not only Black women but trans women and LGBTQ students. The impact of these practices of marginalization are felt by the survivors who are excluded and activists like Octavia who often are called to stand as the sole representatives for entire groups of students. Furthermore, relying on singular activists or a few organizations such as SFV to represent all marginalized communities essentializes the experiences of single members as representative of diverse populations. As Octavia pointed out, this was a source of emotional strain and exhaustion for activists who know they are unable to accurately speak for all individuals who should be part of these conversations. As emotional exhaustion puts activists at risk for burnout, an additional consequence of exclusion is that those who are already under-represented in the movement may be at greater risk for burning out and exiting the movement.

Recognizing the emotional strain on these activists and the need to prioritize students from marginalized communities in policies related to gender-based violence, SFV sought to influence the internal practices of the campus anti-violence movement. Members of SFV wrote op-eds that called for members of the movement to address their role in perpetuating "transphobia, homophobia, anti-Blackness, anti-fatness, ableism" among other forms of inequality that persist within the movement and promoted accountability for violence that occurs in organizing spaces. Other articles written by SFV members called for the campus anti-violence movement, and broader anti-violence movement, to re-organize itself with those who are most vulnerable to violence at the center and to craft policies that reflect their experiences and meet their needs. They also worked with local organizers to help them write their own op-eds and ensure that marginalized voices were represented in news coverage.

Similar to how their social media platform was used to draw attention to universities that failed to protect survivors, these platforms were used to draw attention to practices within the movement that excluded survivors.

> Retweet: "Discourse related to sexual violence prioritizes cis women. To make progress, the movement needs to rethink its gender-binary language and rhetoric." [This was a quote pulled from a national newspaper story on transphobia in the #MeToo movement. SFV had retweeted the article]
>
> Tweet: This movement against sexual violence should also fight against state violence. [This was retweeted several times over the summer of 2020]
>
> Tweet: During the rise of the anti-rape movement in the 1970s, the contributions of Black women were largely erased by white women entering this area of political activism. For #BlackHistoryMonth we will recognize Black women in this movement.

The Tweets above have been slightly modified to protect the anonymity of participants, but the sentiment of the content remains unchanged. These tweets drew attention to

practices and acts of harm committed by other activists, and encouraged repairing this harm through inclusive practices and reorganization of the movement to better meet the needs of survivors from marginalized communities.

Like anti-violence organizers before them, student activists involved in the campus anti-violence movement must contend with the exclusion of marginalized members. Despite characterizations of the campus anti-violence movement as intersectional (Milkman 2017), members of Survivors Fighting Violence noted that many local and national organizations continued to discount the experiences of survivors from marginalized groups and replicate cultural trauma within organizing spaces. Cavaliers Against Violence represents such a group as they struggled to account for how systems of oppression such as racism and heterosexism overlap with gender-based violence. I will discuss the consequences of this in greater detail in Chapter 5.

These practices of exclusion not only carried personal consequences for members who had to contend with racism, heterosexism, or other forms of oppression in organizing spaces, but consequences for the movement as failure to incorporate the perspectives of marginalized survivors leads to policies that further disadvantage these groups. State and non-state institutions, such as universities, policies and practices may fail to consider the oppression these groups have faced. For instance, policies that force university officials to report to law enforcement ignore how police violence against marginalized communities may prevent Black, Native or Indigenous, undocumented, or transgender survivors, among others, from seeking university resources or reporting assaults. These survivors must not only be included but heard in organizing spaces for the impact of such policies to be realized and then opposed. Additionally, when the burden of representation falls on single individuals, such as in the case of Octavia, this

can lead to emotional exhaustion and burnout, resulting in these individuals exiting the movement.

Survivors Fighting Violence sought to address this problem by publicizing the historical and ongoing exclusion of various survivor communities within the movement and addressing how racism, heterosexism, and other forms of oppression are linked to the campus anti-violence movement. They made efforts to create a more inclusive movement by centering marginalized survivors. They also worked to retain these activists and produce policy outcomes that better serve all survivors.

Community and Self-Care

CAV and SFV utilized community and self-care to help sustain members of their organizations. However, these strategies were implemented in different ways. While CAV engaged in some community building activities, they tended to focus a bit more on promoting strategies of self-care. Community care was a key practice for SFV. Brittany, a white eighteen year old who was in her first year of enrollment at a four year university, explained how this community approached helped her avoid burnout:

> This varies at different times. Sometimes I can go three months and not have a single issue with burnout. Other times I'll do like a week of working and then I'll have to take a week off. And really just understanding what you need in that time is what's the most important. And my team at [SFV], I have to give them **so** much credit for not contributing to burnout [emphasis added by participant]. Because at the beginning of every single call we have, it's always checking in, what do you need, what support can we give you right not to keep you going, and if you can't then that's fine. Take a week that's ok. So I have to give them props for that because [SFV] right now we are under **a load of work** [emphasis added by participant] with the lawsuit [against new Title IX rule], with the new rule [referring to Title IX rule], petitioning because we have a deadline. It's a lot right now! But signing onto our phone calls and being able to talk about the supports I need that week, to see [hear], I just really need a check-in half way through the week to tell me, "Hey. Don't forget to do this." [It] really does help you in realizing that burnout can be fought. But also again, knowing yourself and knowing that right now I can continue on and be fine. Also knowing that, ya

> know, I need a week to not do anything related to activism and just take time to be with my friends and be with my family. Because you want, a lot of people I've seen when they get activist fatigue ,they'll quit. 'I'm so tired. This work is so much. I'm just gonna stop doing it.' You want to balance doing the work with actually being able to come back to it again. So just finding the time you need to say I can take a break from this, but just making sure you come back to it. Because the issues that you were fighting for aren't just gonna stop being issues because you're burnt out. So just finding that balance of you do need to return to the work, but saying how can I make sure I can return to that work.

Brittany noted that having a weekly check-in and a team that supported self-care was essential in helping her to maintain involvement in the movement. Each of the members of SFV that I interviewed praised SFV for prioritizing the wellbeing of the team and encouraging members to communicate their needs to the group. Lexi said "SFV is a family, not in the icky non-profit way, 'Like we're a family so you have to have allegiance to us.' Genuinely having community care." The words "checking-in," "genuine," "support," and "resources" consistently emerged in participants descriptions of their interactions with other members of the SFV team. Several interviewees also repeated variations of Brittany's words, "You want to balance doing the work with actually being able to come back to it again." Community care was a strategic tactic SFV used to help members "come back" to the fight against violence in education.

SFV not only prioritized community care internally but committed to helping organizations on the ground implement these practices. They posted information on social media about avoiding burnout and promoting activism as a form of self-care. They would also, at times, target other social organizers such as those fighting for gun control after an instance of gun violence, reminding activists of the importance of prioritizing oneself. SFV's strategic action plan encourages local student organizers to be sensitive to emotional needs of members and suggested establishing a point person who would be responsible for checking in on members and promoting the wellbeing of those in the group. They also recommended that someone be

available to talk if a member is triggered by a particular event or meeting. SFV also emphasized community healing that occurs when survivors validate each other's experiences and create networks of support.

Although none of the CAV membership had direct contact with anyone from SFV, they practiced this last strategy. At each CAV event, the Survivor Advocacy Office director, Denise, or one of the members from BSU's Counseling Center was in attendance. Often times both were present at large events such as a screenings of the documentary *Roll, Red, Roll* and an LGBTQ Panel on experiences of discrimination and violence in the queer community. The counselors also attended meetings where CAV was scheduled to discuss a particularly sensitive topic. For example, members of the Counseling Center were present at a meeting that focused on a presentation from a volunteer at a regional child sexual abuse advocacy center.

These practices demonstrate a recognition of the emotional strain associated with activism, particularly against gender-based violence, and a trauma-informed approach to organizing. Trauma-informed approaches prioritize individuals' wellbeing by providing support and empowering individuals in decision making processes (Davidson 2017; Hoch et al. 2015; Knight 2015). SFV incorporated community care into the structure of their organizations through check-ins and sharing the practical and emotional burdens associated with their activism. CAV also created check-in opportunities and ensured members were aware of resources on campus for those who needed additional support, such as the Counseling Center.

These organizations also ensured that members did not feel pressured to prioritize advocacy over their personal well-being. For SFV, members emphasized that clear communication about one's ability to engage in the work helped reduce emotional strain on all members. Similarly, CAV consistently signaled to members and attendees of events or peer

education presentations that their participation was optional. They announced that individuals should feel free to leave in the middle of presentations for any reason. At the peer educator training sessions CAV members would arrive early and place candy and stress relief toys on the tables. This is a tactic to reduce risk of retraumatization by allowing individuals to disengage and distract themselves if conversations or the content of presentations because emotionally distressing. Each time I attended these trainings, I would see individuals pick up one of these stress toys, draw in their notebooks, or play on their phones. Whether or not these individuals needed these outlets to distract themselves from the content of the peer educator training was irrelevant. Trauma-informed approaches emphasize control and empowerment, so CAV allowed students to decide what was in their best interest at these events. Members of CAV did not monitor or sanction the behavior of these new peer educators. Support and care were more important in that moment than ensuring that everyone stayed on task.

In addition to community care, activists engaged in self-care strategies to ensure their continued participation and avoid burnout. For some SFV and CAV members, friendships within the campus anti-violence movement became part of their self-care practice. For example, the use of dark humor and jokes among SFV members served as a strategy for "laughing about the awful reality." SFV and CAV members also described independent practices of self-care. Cooking, interior design, reading, Netflix binging, and many other activities provided these student organizers with an outlet that was not connected to their participation in the movement. At each of the peer educator training sessions I attended, the director of the Counseling Center would speak about self-care. Tod, a tall man in his mid-to-late 50s, described the importance of checking in on one's emotional state and acknowledging the stress associated with this work. He offered strategies and encouraged students to utilize tools such as mindfulness apps.

These efforts to promote personal sustainability may be even more important because, as organizers in this study—especially members of CAV— noted, students' time is limited. As youth-led movements generally have high turnover, and activism can lead to burnout and demobilization, self-care and community care are essential for working within this movement. However, these strategies have their limits as Octavia from SFV shared:

> I feel like there is honestly no way to combat activist burnout. It's just going to happen. It's very hard to protect or center your mental health when you're so passionate about an issue. Especially for me, I know that I am struggling with mental health issues, emotionally, and also physically. I am in therapy and I am getting the help that I need because I have access to these resources, but not every activist has resources or access to these resources. Not every activist can get the help that they need. So it's very hard to make sure we take care of ourselves when we're so passionate about this and when this issue is such a common thing. We're fighting against society in general. We're fighting against our institutions. We're fighting on campus so it's very hard for that not to happen. But having an organizing community or having a community like SFV where we do check in, where we show support, where we give resources, and where we make sure that we're okay before we continue the work and that we have a capacity to do the work. If we don't, we're able to communicate. That is very important in doing activist work.

None of the student advocates that I met left the movement during the period of this research. However, Octavia's statement serves as a reminder why it's critical to recognize the potential trauma and personal cost of activism, and for public scholars to support organizers' practices of self-care, community care, and trauma-informed organizing strategies.

Learning and Growing: Benefits of Participation

Thus far, I have focused on factors that lead to emotional exhaustion, strain, and potential burnout among activists, and discussed how SFV and CAV sought to address these issues and promote personal sustainability among members. However, these individuals also experienced emotional and personal rewards from their participation. Some of these rewards resemble those identified by activists in other movements such as thrill from organizing, feelings of solidarity,

and a sense of purpose. These rewards contributed to their continued involvement in the movement.

This section describes the personal growth and learning that occurred among members of SFV and CAV. In cultivating new knowledge about gender-based violence, student activists' experienced a sense of accomplishment and purpose. Furthermore, as they developed a deeper understanding of these issues, they engaged with new ideas and violence prevention strategies. In focusing on these learning outcomes, I argue that social movement scholars may observe how activists are not simply situated in reformist or radical organizations but along a continuum of understandings regarding how best to pursue social change.

Cavaliers Against Violence sought to educate both general members and those within the executive board about the causes and consequences of gender-based violence, as well as strategies of intervention. General members, anyone who had joined the CAV listserv, were invited to attend bi-weekly meetings and events that covered a range of topics related to gender-based violence including healthy relationships, child sexual abuse, suicide and mental health, Black women's experiences of sexual violence, and LGBTQ+ individuals' experiences of discrimination and violence. Taylor, a white gay man who had been involved in CAV since his freshman year, described his experience within this movement::

> I think the most obvious thing is education. Like I said earlier, in high school I knew what rape was obviously. I was like an intelligent teenager. I was a cognizant teenager, but I didn't know like the intricacies that went behind it. I didn't know what bystander intervention was**.** I didn't really realize how much one sexual violation can really impact someone's life. You know a lot of times we see it in TV, or shows, or movies, or books and you just watch it for that five minutes, then it's over. And you move on, so you think they move on. So I think the awareness is so powerful because ignorance is not always bliss. I don't think ignorance is an excuse for negligence either. So being aware I think is the most powerful tool I've gotten out of it. And also**,** I guess in the way I view myself. I know I was bashing this earlier, but I consider myself a student advocate. I dedicate time of my week to this cause. If I'm in a friend group and someone talks

> about things that are inappropriate I am not hesitant to tell them to stop. And I am also not hesitant to end that relationship if I need to. I think this is an important enough thing that any joking of any kind really does not need to be tolerated. And I know I slip into that too sometimes. I'm not entirely innocent. It's really easy just to make a quick comment that could hurt someone if you didn't realize their situation, but I'm, I don't think that's happened very much recently. But I am aware enough now to know right from wrong. And obviously, this is like an evolving issue and there is an evolving issue to combat it as well so I think everyone is learning together. But I think now I see myself as part of that movement, whereas in the past I would just be observing it.

Taylor recognized that he had a limited understanding of gender-based violence prior to joining CAV. By interacting with CAV members and learning more about gender-based violence via the peer educator program, which he mentioned earlier in the interview, he began to feel like a student advocate both as a member of CAV and in his personal life. Other CAV members shared Taylor's perspective that they had grown as people and were actively confronting rape myths, homophobia, or sexism in their day-to-day interactions. These interactions reminded members of the importance of this work and contributed to feelings of "empowerment" and "purpose." Learning about this issue and ways to address violence on campus helped these students to connect to the broader movement, and led them to think of themselves not just as another student group on campus but as organizers.

Members of SFV also described personal growth tied to their experiences within this movement and specifically SFV. Hailey, had been a member of SFV for three years she described how participating in this organization "radicalized" her:

> Aw man, I'm gonna cry. It's the best thing I've ever done. I love this team. This is gonna be my last year because I am older than I am supposed to be on the team and I cannot continue to lie about my age any longer [laughter]. But, I mean it has shown me that, first of all, it radicalized me. I was already pretty radical beforehand but SFV is constantly pushing me to think about how can all of my values be put into practice. That's what I love most about the team. The way that we live out our values and aren't afraid to stray from what the other leading opinion of other organizations are if we feel like it's not in our beliefs. So realizing that I can be a part of a team where I can have these big dreams. I can

> advocate for them. I can make them happen. And I can also help other people, teach other people, and help other people feel empowered by this. I mean it's huge. It's really, really, really great!

In her words, Hailey was already "radical" when she joined SFV but participation in this organization helped to push her further along this continuum towards a more radical practice. This was a common narrative among members of both SFV and CAV. Although these organizations' values and approaches to gender-based violence differed in significant ways, members learned new information about gender-based violence and perspectives on how to address this problem. Some of this learning was facilitated through interactions with other activists. Additionally, these organizations facilitated learning through their organizational structures.

Brittany describes how interacting with fellow activists, in combination with formal learning resources provided by SFV, helped her to develop a better understanding of abolition in the context of gender-based violence:

> B: There are only eighteen of us, but they are some of the most incredible people on that team. [They] come up with incredible ideas. I wouldn't even be able to think of. We all really push each other. Again like I said, when most of us joined the team we weren't necessarily abolitionist. But we like to make sure that [SFV] is a shared learning space in addition to an organizing space, so that we're learning from each other constantly. As well as trying to support students outside of [SFV], we are trying to support the students who are in [SFV].
>
> A: Can you tell me a little more about what shared learning looks like?
>
> B: Sure. In the context of abolition, when I joined I recognized that the divestment of the police was an important thing. Again because I come from [mid-size city], we see a lot of police brutality. We see a lot of poverty. So I recognized that this was an issue, but I didn't really recognize. I did what a lot of the survivor organizations are doing right now. I couldn't really reconcile being a survivor and being an abolitionist. And it really took me coming into [SFV] and having these conversations with people who had been doing abolitionist work for years to reconcile these two things and show me that, as a survivor, I can be an abolitionist at the same time by understanding that putting someone in prison isn't going to stop sexual assault. It's only moving the sexual assault to a place society cares

> about less. And so learning that and being given the resources to read and to watch on YouTube, to listen on podcast really, really helped. In fact, to join the [SFV] team, we had to read like fifteen different articles or like essays and listen to podcast to join the team. They make sure that when you come in, you need to have a basic understanding of the work that we do. And then once you get onto the team, we have a channel that is constantly being updated. Articles are being put in there. And like I said, we're working on a [SFV] reading group to talk about survivor work, abolition work, police divestment. So our main goal is to make sure we're always learning and we're always pushing each other, the thoughts that we have to see where else they can go.

SFV members had all engaged in organizing at a local level before joining this national organization. Still, they required members to engage in self-education about abolition and gender-based violence before joining the team, as well as respect the organizational values outlined in the previous chapter. They also emphasized that learning was a continuous process and provided members with resources so that they could continue to develop a deeper understanding of these issues. Members of SFV also described personal growth tied to their experiences within this movement and specifically SFV. They promoted accountability by establishing an organizational structure where members' voices were heard and acknowledged because strategic actions required the unanimous consent of all team members. In interacting with local student organizers on the ground, they found that these students sometimes advocated for carceral policies or were part of a student body that supported such policies. SFV viewed education as a critical strategy to helping these students recognize the harm of such policies and the benefits of restorative approaches to violence prevention. These instances demonstrate how SFV used education to strengthen radical values and practices of members and as a strategy for confronting ideological discrepancies within the anti-violence movement.

The contrast between the learning and growth that occurred between SFV and CAV members highlights differences in their introductions to this movement. As discussed in Chapter 2, SFV members relied on their own situated knowledge when developing strategies to address

gender-based violence. CAV, while including some survivors, did not center their experiences as basis for decisions regarding policy and practice. SFV accepted members who had already been involved in other forms of organizing prior to joining SFV, then required these organizers to engage in more "radical" conversations around abolition and marginalization. CAV treated all members as new to the subject and everyone underwent a basic training program. Both organizations emphasized continued growth through interacting with other members, reading, or participating in educational events. Participants' descriptions of learning within this movement show how their understandings of gender-based violence fall along a continuum of knowledge. Rather than classifying their understandings as radical or reformist perspectives, I emphasize how SFV and CAV experienced learning as a continuous process. Members' positions along this knowledge continuum had implications for organizational targets, goals and strategies, which are addressed in the following chapters.

Conclusion

Scholars have acknowledged how participation in the campus anti-violence movement can help survivors feel empowered and manage trauma associated with experiences of gender-based violence (Linder and Myers 2018; Swanson and Szymanski 2020a). Still, the emotional consequences of participating in this movement are not only tied to singular experiences of trauma. Members of SFV and CAV faced cultural and vicarious trauma due to political setback and backlash, marginalization within the movement, exposure to survivors' stories of violence, and practical obstacles such as limited time among students. They achieved personal sustainability through practices of community and self-care. SFV and CAV structured care into their organizations and encouraged members to practice self-care by baking, outdoor activities, mindfulness apps, or counseling. By drawing attention to these challenges and practices of

resilience, I seek to add to an emerging body of literature that has explored survivor activism as a pathway to heal from trauma and emphasize how activists experience emotional strain due to external and internal movement dynamics.

In addition to demonstrating the challenges associated with involvement in the campus anti-violence movement and organizations' attempts to manage those challenges, I highlight how participants benefited from participating in this movement. Again, much of the scholarship on this topic has focused on how activism helps survivors overcome experiences of trauma. This chapter demonstrates that activism may help survivors and non-survivor activists better understand gender-based violence and challenge their ideas about how to address this problem. SFV and CAV developed programs and provide resources to help student activists better understand gender-based violence and prevention efforts. These educational efforts result in a learning process that serves two functions in the campus anti-violence movement: (1) it helps to sustain participation through personal enrichment of activists' lives and identities, and (2) it pushes organizers to consider new approaches to the problem of gender-based violence on campus. In drawing attention to this learning process, I challenge scholarship that typifies organizations and activists as radical or reformist (Fitzgerald and Rodgers 2000; Lorber 2005). These categorizations suggest these ideological positions are fixed and risk discounting the agency of activists. Students in the campus anti-violence movement are learning about gender-based violence, and as they do so, their positions on the best ways to address violence are subject to change. I argue that how activists move along the continuum of learning within social movements is part of personal sustainability. Their understandings of the issues they seek to address directly contribute to their ability to effectively engage in strategies that promote change.

CHAPTER 4: COOPTATION, COOPERATION, AND CONTENTION IN THE CAMPUS ANTI-VIOLENCE MOVEMENT

Faculty, students, and staff have worked to address gender-based violence on campus through conventional means such as awareness campaigns, program creation to support survivors, and legislative reform, policy and procedural changes within educational institutions (Heldman et al. 2018; Milkman 2017). Students at the forefront of this social movement have been described as "social insiders," most of whom are white, economically secure, and straight (Milkman 2017). Such accounts provide a broad description of the movement's leaders, but monolithic representations can obscure differences between movement actors and the impact of social contexts on social movement organizations' strategies and goals at the national and local levels.

This chapter addresses the question: How does the social context in which students organize shape their activism? Dieter Rucht (1996:190) defines social context as "the embedding of social movements in their social environment." This includes the relationships between student activists, administrators, and service providers. Social environments are also informed by the social networks and organization of social hierarchies on campus. I explore the influence of the social environment on the strategies and goals of Cavaliers Against Violence and Survivors Fighting Violence organizing this discussion into three parts.

First, I describe the relationships between student organizers and service providers on BSUs campus. This relational approach allows me to avoid reproducing a singular representation of the campus anti-violence movement. Instead, I offer an in-depth examination of how a single student organization mobilized against violence within their campus environment. Second, I identify the benefits of cooperation between targets and social movement actors at SFV and

CAV. While most of this chapter focuses on CAV, SFV's work with local activists and contentious approach to organizing provides an excellent counter-example to CAV's cooperation strategy. Social movement actors who align themselves with powerholders are often described as coopted. I outline the flaws with cooptation narratives, focusing instead on the relationship between university administrators, staff, and students as cooperative strategies that allow social movement actors to pursue their goals. Third, I discuss the risk associated with cooperation. I highlight SFV members' concerns about associating too closely with administrators and how these activists work to maintain focus on organizational goals.

Beyond situating these results within ongoing debates around cooptation in social movements, this study adds to our understandings of the campus anti-violence movement more broadly. Men's rights advocates have heavily critiqued the campus anti-violence movement as creating moral panics around sexual violence and relying on disciplinary university adjudication procedures to abdicate personal responsibility (Gotell and Dutton 2016). Critical commentators such as Laura Kipnis have extended this narrative claiming that following the HIV/AIDS pandemic, millennials were taught about the dangers of sex and encouraged to rely on university administrators to fix their problems (Kipnis 2017). This backlash against the campus anti-violence movement oversimplifies the goals and strategies of this movement. The findings presented in this chapter work to challenge these claims, extend our understanding of the campus anti-violence movement, and contribute to debates regarding cooptation and cooperation between activists and powerholders.

Building Relationships and Finding Partners

Cavaliers Against Violence (CAV), a registered student group at Big South University (BSU), aimed to prevent sexual assault on campus and support survivors. In Chapter 2, I defined CAV as

a secondary formal organization and outlined their strategies and goals. Secondary formal organizations "are viewed as legitimate but not at the forefront of current movement activities" (Robnett 2000:25). This organization was hierarchically-structured and governed by a small executive student team. This team was made up of student leaders on campus and was affiliated with other campus offices and organizations such as Greek Life, Student Residential Living, and the campus newspaper. Students often pulled from these networks to recruit new members, especially to the peer educator program. CAV general bi-weekly meetings were rarely attended by students outside of the CAV executive team despite being advertised on a list-serv of over 1,000 individuals. Most of the students who regularly participated in these meetings joined the executive team the following year. While many of the executive team members shared in interviews that they joined CAV because they knew someone who had been assaulted, only one out of the eight Spring 2019-Fall 2019 executive team members identified as a survivor during interviews. Instead, most executive team members joined due to a general concern with violence on campus or because a friend had experienced violence during their freshman year or high school.

Like other student organizations at Big South University, Cavaliers Against Violence (CAV) was required to partner with a faculty advisor. When I began my fieldwork in the Fall of 2018, CAV's faculty advisor, Denise, was the head of the Survivor Advocacy Office (SAO). The Survivor Advocacy Office provided resources and a host of services to students who experienced violence on Big South University's campus, including but not limited to: meeting with students in emergency rooms, helping students to secure new housing, overseeing academic accommodations, and informing students about resources on and off-campus. The SAO was housed under the Counseling Center, which created a close working relationship between CAV,

SAO, and the Counseling Center. The first director of the Survivor Advocacy Office was essential in forming CAV, and the SAO office continued to be heavily involved with the organization throughout the beginning of this study.

Denise regularly attended meetings and helped to plan the peer education training days. Amy, a graduate student worker, funded by the Counseling Center and assigned to the Survivor Advocacy Office, helped the CAV executive team manage the organization's day-to-day operations. Other university departments and offices such as Greek Life, Residential Living, and Health and Wellness interacted with Cavaliers Against Violence; however, these offices primarily contributed to CAV's mission through financial support or promoting CAV events on campus. Denise and the SAO were a core part of enacting and shaping the goals of Cavaliers Against Violence. This was made clear to me following a CAV meeting when I walked out to the parking lot with Denise. We discussed my experience as a lecturer. She commented on how exceptional and creative students are but noted that they often need help focusing and enacting some of their plans. She saw guiding the CAV executive team as one of her main responsibilities as the director of SAO.

One of CAV's primary strategies for raising awareness and preventing gender-based violence on campus was the peer educator program. As described in Chapter 2, this program recruited students to educate others on campus about the prevalence of sexual misconduct, resources on campus for survivors, and bystander intervention strategies. Students submitted applications for the peer educator program to the CAV executive team each semester. Members of the CAV executive team interviewed these candidates to ensure there were no "red flags." Examples of red flags include statements that promote rape culture, such as "a girl who gets drunk is partially responsible for being assaulted." Those accepted to the program were required

to participate in a day-long training session. They were also encouraged to attend all CAV general meetings and monthly peer educator meetings. I participated in a total of three of these training sessions between Fall 2018 and Fall 2019. Students were educated about gender-based violence, resources on campus, bystander intervention, and how to give a 30-minute presentation on these topics to peer groups during training days. Representatives from the University Police Department, Title IX Office, Counseling Center, Student Health Services, Student Conduct, and Family Violence Center (an off-campus victim service center) were invited to attend and present to students at each of these trainings. As survivors of sexual violence may interact with many of these offices, the CAV executive team and SAO director felt it was important that peer educators were familiar with each offices' purpose and were prepared to answer questions about the services these offices provide.

In these presentations, each of the speakers was treated as an expert on gender-based violence. For example, Dr. Styles, a member of the Counseling Center for the previous two years, was one of the guest speakers.

> Dr. Styles stood at the front of the large auditorium style classroom. She pulled up her PowerPoint, the title page read, "Violence Intervention: Designing and Implementing Programs." Dr. Styles introduced herself and described some of her research on intimate partner violence, as well as her role as lead counselor for the survivor support group on campus. She acknowledged the importance of this issue and commended the students for helping to educate others on campus. Dr. Styles started by explaining the role of rape culture in perpetuating sexual assault. She outlined the history of rape culture, described how rape culture contributes to "misunderstandings" around sexual consent and what constitutes sexual misconduct. The majority of her presentation centered on advising students about how to present on this topic, warning them about the possibility of burnout, and emphasizing the importance of self-care for those working to end sexual violence.
>
> (Fieldnotes Fall 2018)

As I watched several other presentations on this day and additional training sessions over the next two semesters, I was struck by how similar these rooms felt to classrooms. Some peer

educators attentively took notes on the notebook provided by CAV at the beginning of the training session. Others doodled, played on their cellphones, and one man even fell asleep for almost the entirety of a training session. Every speaker allowed for questions or discussion either during or after their presentations. Some students' questions and comments indicated they had direct experiences with or knowledge of gender-based violence, but others were unfamiliar with terms and trends related to gender-based violence on campus.

These interactions between new peer educators and staff from various student services offices also mimicked the power dynamics between professors and students in the classroom. Staff and administrators were positioned as the authority and were invited to educate students on these issues. However, students were also recognized as playing a pivotal role in preventing violence and educating the general student body about resources for survivors. There were opportunities for students to share their experiences and opinions. This created a collaborative learning environment, albeit within a hierarchically structured training session.

Dr. Styles sought to help students deliver informational presentations and prepare them for the front-line of violence prevention. She acknowledged that this work often leads to burnout. She said that peer educators need to "watch out for their own emotional well-being" and prepare themselves because students often disclose experiences of sexual assault to peer educators at the end of these presentations. Like Dr. Styles, almost every presenter at these training events praised Cavaliers Against Violence and recognized peer educators as a vital part of the university's strategy to prevent sexual violence on campus.

Just as peer educators viewed university employees and service providers as authorities in the trainings, other students viewed peer educators as the authority during the peer educator presentations. The peer educator program demonstrates how partnerships between service

providers on campus and student advocates allow critical information about survivor resources and prevalence of sexual violence to be disseminated through various social networks on campus to which service providers may not have access. This information originated from university or community affiliated service providers, those invested within the institution's response to gender-based violence on campus.

Most notably, the Title IX Coordinator at each of these training sessions stressed to peer educators that their presentations should clearly define consent. She said that many of the cases that go through the office involve a man who adamantly denies violating the sexual misconduct policy and then proceeds to describe a violation of consent and this policy. Peer educators did not question or challenge the presenters in any of the training sessions that I observed. In fact, their perspectives on the causes of sexual violence often aligned with those of these presenters. When asked about the most significant factors contributing to gender-based violence on campus, almost all CAV members interviewed cited a lack of education or a need to better understand sexual consent as the primary cause of gender-based violence. Relationships between service provider offices and CAV influenced how these student advocates perceived and responded to social problems on campus.

Understanding the relationship between student advocates and these service providers provides insight into how gender-based violence is addressed on college campuses. These partnerships worked to support CAV in their intervention efforts, but service providers also influenced how CAV members understood the origins of gender-based violence. Researchers have evaluated the effectiveness of campus sexual assault prevention programs (Kettrey and Marx 2019; Rothman and Silverman 2007), students' awareness and use of victim services (Sabina and Ho 2014), and responses to sexual assault on campus by victim advocates, law

enforcement, and health providers (Buchholz 2015; Carmody, Ekhomu, and Payne 2009; Smith, Wilkes, and Bouffard 2014). Programs such as bystander intervention have received mixed-results but are often touted as the "most effective" method of addressing gender-based violence (Kettrey and Marx 2019; Yule and Grych 2017). Student advocates who look to service providers as the authority on these topics may miss opportunities to engage in more effective strategies that are not currently promoted by the staff at these offices.

Carolyn Garcia and colleagues (2012) found that students generally viewed sexual assault prevention programs and survivor resources favorably. Similarly, CAV members also expressed favorable opinions about the offices mentioned above in interviews. However, many of these members had not personally attempted to utilize these services. The relationships between service providers and student advocates might have looked different if the organization was led primarily by survivors. By examining a student organization and service providers' actions at a single university, this study demonstrates the complexity of these relationships and diversity within the campus anti-violence movement. The organizational and social dynamics on Big South University's campus shaped CAV's response to gender-based violence. Social and organizational contexts in which activists operate are specific to each campus community. In the following section, I argue scholars interested in how students seek to address gender-based violence on campus must pay attention to how students' strategies vary depending on the contexts in which student advocates operate.

Cooperation as Strategy

Navigating the complex relationships on a university campus is a weighty task, and these relationships influence the tactics and goals of student organizers. As described in Chapter 2, Survivors Fighting Violence (SFV) is a national social movement organization made up of

student survivors working to prevent violence in educational settings. Members of SFV's campus organizer team visited universities throughout the country. They educated students about their rights under Title IX and hosted training programs on organizing strategies students can adopt. Alissa, a member of this team, explained that they teach students about two organizing tactics, "inside" and "outside" organizing:

> Alissa: "Yeah, so, we talk about two methods of organizing tactics: inside and outside organizing. Me personally, I am more of an inside organizer. I am the person going and talking to administration and all that kind of fun stuff. When it comes to inside organizing what I would always say is the people who are going and speaking with the power holders, and speaking with the stakeholders, are going to be just as important as the people hosting rallies. As an inside organizer, I would plan a meeting with my administration. If we were petitioning, I would be the one delivering a petition to my administration. As an outside organizer, you're going to be the one creating events that the public can participate in and causing disruptions. Creating physical scenes that your administration can see that show that you want to see change. So this would be your rallies, your disruptions, sit-ins, teach-ins, banner drops, anything like that—that the public can physically partake in and that the administration can see, on campus with multiple students, alumni, faculty, whoever."
>
> A.C.: "What are some of the benefits of both of those tactics, inside and outside organizing?"
>
> Alissa: "The benefits of inside organizing are always going to be that you're in the room. Because we see a lot of times that if you only have outside organizing, your outside organizers aren't aware of what your administration is saying. So you can have your administration come in and say, 'Yeah, we're gonna fix Title IX and make a great policy.' But then they get in that room, and they make twenty terrible policies, and you have no one in the room, and no one can speak up for students. So as an inside organizer, I always, it's always important to have a student in the room to say no this isn't what we want. Because, again, you need to have someone speaking up for the people you're advocating for. A great benefit of outside organizing is you're not constricted by the politics and, I don't want to say respectability because even as an inside organizer respectability isn't always like what I am going for, it's more just having someone there to call out the wrongs that are being done in that private space. But I will say that, as an outside organizer who is a student, you have a lot more freedom. Because when you're an inside organizer, you're gonna want them to listen to you, and if you are constantly pushing against them and pushing their buttons they're never really gonna want to listen. But as an outside organizer, you're not limited by that. You can say what you want to say and not have to worry about, 'well, are they gonna

> invite me in [the room] next time?' Because that's not your goal. Your goal is to engage people on the outside who aren't in that room."

As demonstrated in the statement above by Alissa, inside organizing requires students to cooperate with university administrators and other offices on campus to achieve their goals. Outside organizing focuses on bringing points of contention into the public sphere and visibility to an issue. Student organizers must decide which tactic they wish to adopt in response to policies or situations that arise on campus. Both strategies play an essential role in combating gender-based violence; however, students' use of internal tactics, especially when students are viewed as closely tied to university administrators, are sometimes met with critiques of cooptation and institutionalization.

The term cooptation has been used to describe the practice whereby social movements are absorbed by elites or erased in efforts to work with those in power (Ferree and Hess 2000; Gamson 1975; Piven and Cloward 1977). Sidney Tarrow (1998) discussed the process of institutionalization. He argued that protests cycle toward decline as organizations within movements split – some moving into the realm of formal politics and others engaging in radical protest. Notably, the term cooptation has also been used to describe discursive struggles and shifts in meanings of concepts (Burke and Bernstein 2014; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996), as well as the adoption of movement strategies by countermovements. For the purpose of this research, I refer only to cooptation as the absorption or erasure of social movements by powerholders.

Pablo Lapegna (2014) argues that discussions of cooptation often present activists as incompetent or naive, fail to recognize the agency of activists, and ignore how actors may compromise with powerholders in the face of unfavorable conditions in order to sustain the movement. Feminist scholars, particularly those engaged in debates regarding the cooptation of

feminism under neoliberalism, have argued that research on the cooptation of feminist movements often relies on false assumptions of pure or innocent origins of movements (Calkin 2015; Prügl and True 2014). Critiques of cooptation and attempts to reconceptualize this term have been widely applied to interactions between social movements, states, and non-government organizations. I argue it is necessary to extend these discussions to movements with non-state targets.

Given these critiques, I adopt the term cooperation to describe situations in which activists work with university administration or staff to achieve social change. Cooperation does not necessitate the complete absorption of organizers into the university infrastructure or compliance with the administration's will. I will demonstrate in this section how social movement actors can benefit from cooperation with powerholders. As shown in the previous section, relationships between student organizers and service providers on campus may provide support to students. Still, the benefits of cooperation may extend to administrators as well.

Legitimacy of Administration

Markus Holdo (2019) argues that cooptation is seldom a logical strategy for elites, who are better served through cooperation, given that social movements rarely operate under winner-take-all scenarios. Instead, elites often engage in an approach of "mutually assured autonomy." Mutually assured autonomy occurs when the interests of those in power and movement actors overlap or when a partnership between the movement and state is necessary to build legitimacy. Holdo (2019) is clear that these parties must remain independent of one another to be successful and maintain legitimacy in the public's eyes. In other words, cooperation is unlikely to lead to cooptation. Social movement actors are not so naive as to forgo their goals and align with those in power. Nor are elites prone to absorb movements when they can benefit far more from

collaborating with activists. Holdo (2019) applies the concept of mutually assured autonomy to explore the relationship between the state and social movements. The following analysis demonstrates how non-state elites may benefit from cooperation with social movement actors. In applying this perspective, I hold with Holdo's (2019) notion of mutually assured autonomy in that both non-state institutions and movement actors must maintain some separation to remain legitimate representatives of their organizations. Although, it is essential to note that cooperation between non-state institutions and social movements may not always result in mutual benefits, or the relationship may benefit one party more than the other.

Furthermore, cooperation does not necessitate alignment of powerholders' and activists' goals. Parks and Richards (2007) highlight the actions of Mapuche workers in the Chilean state to show how actors operating within the state use their discretion to promote counter-hegemonic goals that benefit the movement. CAV members are embedded within BSU and included in some decision-making processes, but they do not hold formal positions within the university administration. Student activism provides an example of how social movement actors targeting non-state institutions may use proximity to power as a means of achieving movement goals that do not align with those of campus administrators.

The presence of various administrators from Big South University, such as the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs, at events like Take Back the Night adds legitimacy to the administration's claims that sexual violence is an issue they take seriously and are working to address. As described above, Cavaliers Against Violence are promoted as leaders on campus by many staff and administrators. The peer educator program is supported by several offices on campus and by faculty who allow peer educators to present in their classrooms. For example, when Residential Living received several reports of dating violence within student

housing, they asked CAV to prepare a peer educator program for RAs and residents focusing on this issue. Partnering with CAV allowed staff and administrators within Residential Living to address a threat to the students' security in their charge. Through cooperation, CAV was able to access the dormitories, university controlled spaces, and address dating violence using their own discourse and strategies. Failure to respond to the problem of dating violence in dormitories would threaten these administrators' legitimacy and authority. At Big South University, Cavaliers Against Violence was often the “go-to” organization when problems related to gender-based violence arose on campus. University administrators, campus service offices, and other student organizations treated CAV members as part of the violence prevention at BSU, even though they were not formal university employees.

The relationships between university administrators, service providers, and students illustrate how mutually assured autonomy also occurs in social movements engaged with non-state-based targets. Student organizers maintained their independence, engaged with the university as a target, and were perceived as legitimate anti-violence advocates by the student body. BSU’s campus newspaper reveals how university administers and offices on campus also received credit for addressing sexual violence when partnering with CAV or attending CAV events:

> An article published in the fall of 2018 outlined Chancellor Stock’s first three years at BSU. One of the ten photos that captured his time leading the university showed the Chancellor posing with a student at Take Back the Night. The Chancellor is pointing to the students’ sign that reads, “Sexual Assault Is Never the Survivors Fault! #BSUTBTN #ConsentAskForIt”
>
> In another article published the following spring, the headline notes an increase in reports of sexual violence on BSU’s campus over the past few years. In explaining this increase the Paige, the Title IX coordinator, notes the concerted effort on campus to increase students’ awareness about Title IX and survivor resources. The article then refers to the work of CAV on campus and Kerry is quoted saying, “I think the increase in reporting is good…the culture around

> reporting has improved." Later, the article mentions how BSU's police department has increased outreach efforts related to sexual violence on campus and partnered with CAV to achieve this goal.

Administrators benefited from publicly aligning with a student organization committed to ending violence on campus. However, whether or not this relationship between CAV and administrators is perceived by the student body as part of a genuine desire to address violence on campus also depends on the BSU administrator's investment in service for survivors and violence prevention. In moments where this commitment wavered, CAV members noted that BSU administrators desired to avoid lawsuits and failed to consider survivors in their decision-making processes. This was epitomized during discussions around merging the Survivor Advocacy Office with Student Conduct.

Administrators at BSU drew on CAV members as a resource when facing problems related to gender-based violence on campus, as exemplified when Residential Living called on CAV to address a growing problem of dating violence. BSU administration benefited from this cooperative relationship in two specific ways: (1) the university does not incur the expense of hiring additional staff for offices such as the Survivor Advocacy Office, and (2) they can access student networks and present critical information in a way that may be more amenable to students. Peer educators emphasized that students are more receptive to information on gender-based violence when it comes from peers. Delineating which of these factors motivated administrators' partnership with CAV is beyond the scope of this study, but it is an area that should be examined in future research.

Goals of Organizers

Cooperation with university administrators and service providers may provide support and legitimacy to organizations like Cavaliers Against Violence, but what happens when

administrators' actions threaten the goals of student organizers? Is cooperation still a viable strategy for student organizers under unfavorable conditions? Cavaliers Against Violence faced such a dilemma in the Spring of 2019. Between 2016 and 2019, Big South University was named in two lawsuits filed by respondents previously involved in Title IX investigation and disciplinary hearings at Big South University.[15] These respondents, both of whom were men, filed suit on the grounds that the university favored complainants over respondents, resulting in gender-bias. In these cases, the respondents specified numerous individuals, offices, and policies that they argued resulted in a violation of procedural due process and gender bias in outcomes in their respective disciplinary hearings. For example, one of the plaintiffs claimed that the complainant had not attended the live disciplinary hearing and that he was not able to directly cross-examine the witnesses. Another argued that the Title IX coordinator's report excluded exculpatory evidence and cited bias in the investigation process. Neither of these cases referred directly to the Survivor Advocacy Office, yet the loss of these suits prompted university administrators to pursue significant changes to this office.

The proposed changes to the Survivor Advocacy Office were not discussed in CAV general meetings or mentioned in the university's newspaper. This was a discussion happening among administrators and staff outside of the public view. I first learned about this change while interviewing Kerry, the President of Cavaliers Against Violence, in the Spring of 2019. Kerry, a white woman in her junior year, had been involved with CAV since her first year on campus. When I asked about her duties as President, she said:

> My role's changing this semester some. It's very interesting that you're doing research on us this semester because we just found out two weeks ago. Do you know this? You probably don't. [I shook my head to indicate no]. The University decided--they're calling it a merger. I think it's an elimination. They're limiting the Survivor Advocacy Office. Basically, that means a lot of things for CAV but, they

[15] I have listed a range of years to protect the anonymity of the school.

> are saying they're merging it with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Office. So, they're gonna have—right now, they have case managers [in the Student Affairs Office]. Two case managers for other student conduct process issues or mental health issues. Academic dishonesty, ya know? Any of the drugs or alcohol [offenses] that is their thing. They have all that. There's two case managers, they handle that. So basically, they're going to have a third case manager…They told me it can be the same thing that [the Survivor Affairs Office director] does right now, but it's just like we use those offices! But I don't think that's what is going on at all. Not at all…We have to find, decide where CAV is going to go from here. We're losing our advisor. And CAV is a registered student organization, but different in the fact that we are really kind of connected to a department [referring to SAO], and we are really connected to the Counseling Center. A lot of other organizations on campus they have an advisor role where the advisor is not that involved, but it's like [previous SAO director] and [current SAO director] are part of CAV. They help us a lot, so CAV is kind of different in that [way], and so I feel like we are…I feel like we're losing half of CAV.
>
> We're losing the Survivor Advocacy Office that means there's a lot of issues with that because the case manager is not going to be confidential. Which I think is a huge HUGE [capitalized for emphasis] issue. They [case manager] have to report on sexual assault. They have to tell Title IX. Where SAO right now, they don't have to. It's just, it's a confidential resource for students. So we're losing, I think we're losing a resource. They're [administration] calling it a merger, but I really don't think it's a merger at all. I think—yeah, I'm not very happy about it, but they told me it was because…I met with the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, and she told me that it's because the university was sued because the way they handle sexual assault cases on the respondent's side. They said they don't have equal resources. That's what they're saying, but my thing is don't take away. I'm all about equal resources for respondent and complainant and all. We should have that support at the university. But they're different-- the resources that survivors need and the perpetrators need. I don't think we should be taking away really important resources for survivors because respondents thought that [referring to respondents claiming the university favors survivors].

Kerry was deeply concerned about the proposed changes to the Survivor Advocacy Office. In the proceeding weeks, I spoke with other CAV executive team members about this issue, and they shared similar concerns. Like Kerry, many expressed frustration that, in the face of accusations of bias, the university administration chose to reduce the resources provided to survivors instead of increasing the resources provided to respondents. Although Cavaliers Against Violence did not discuss this issue in their general meetings, how to address the pending merger of the

Survivor Advocacy Office was heavily discussed among the executive team, both informally and at the team meetings. The team members consulted with multiple student organizations on campus, include the Black Student Union, which had opposed some previous university administrators' decisions, and asked how they had expressed their grievances. They also worked closely with Denise, the Survivor Advocacy Office director, to identify potential problems with the merger that could negatively impact survivors, such as designating the new case manager as a mandatory reporter. Ultimately, the CAV executive team decided to meet with university administrators and share their concerns.

Cavaliers Against Violence relied heavily on internal tactics, choosing to partner with the university more often than appealing to the public in times of contention. Their decision to cooperate with university administrators in this high-stakes situation for the organization and, more importantly, for survivors, may be criticized by some as defaulting into a coopted mindset. Similarly, some may argue that the university had duped these students into compliance and they failed to resist the will of powerholders in the university. However, these perspectives fail to account for the strategy and agency of these student organizers. The Cavaliers Against Violence executive team was fully aware that "outside" tactics, such as petitioning the administration, were available to them. They consulted with other student organizations who had used such tactics in similar situations but chose a strategy they thought would be most effective.

This decision was also made in consideration of the broader political contexts facing the campus anti-violence movement. In interviews with CAV members and at CAV meetings, I commonly heard students state that the pendulum for rights, which a few years ago was slightly towards survivors, had now swung in the direction of respondents. As indicated in Kerry's statement, CAV executive team members knew that this merger was in reaction to lawsuits the

university lost. As argued by Lapegna (2014), narratives of cooptation ignore how political contexts influence the choices social movement actors make to ensure the survival of the movement. Cavaliers Against Violence's response to the merger of the SAO office provides an example of how social movement actors' strategic choices are shaped by such contexts even when engaged with non-state targets, such as a university.

For Cavaliers Against Violence, the choice to utilize inside tactics and cooperate with university administration proved successful.

> I was attending the Fall 2019 peer educator training; this was the first chance I had to see Denise this semester since she was no longer serving as the CAV faculty advisor. In introducing herself to the audience, she said that she leads the Student Advocacy Center [SAC]. I was confused. It was my understanding that this office was merged into the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Office, and she would now be employed as a conduct case manager, specializing in conduct issues related to sexual misconduct. Denise proceeded to describe the work of the Student Advocacy Center. The services this office provides were identical to those provided under the former Survivor Advocacy Office. As the SAC director she was a confidential resource for survivors, was available for students seeking medical treatment or filing a complaint to the university police or Title IX, she would help secure housing and academic accommodations, and act as a general resource for students on campus who had experienced violence.
>
> After the group broke for lunch, I made my way over to Kerry, who was sitting by Lance, the leader of the peer educator program. I asked her what happened over the summer with the SAO office merger. She exclaimed that she had forgotten to update me about it. CAV's executive team was negotiating with the administration and had already made some positive changes, such as ensuring the new case manager would be a confidential resource [instead of a mandatory reporter]. In these discussions, one of the upper administrators who had been advocating for this change resigned. While this individual was being replaced, the CAV executive team learned that the lawsuits, which had supposedly led to the merger, had not directly cited the Survivor Advocacy Office. The university also received news that a survivor had sued a peer institution for failing to adequately provide resources that were currently being offered by the SAO. Kerry attended several meetings with the new administrator tasked with overseeing the SAO merger. Eventually, it was decided to rename this office and relocate it under a new department that would include the SAC and another newly formed office tasked with providing resources for students on campus such as mental health care [I later learned this office focuses heavily on suicide prevention]. Kerry referred to this change as "SAO by another name."

> I congratulated her on this success, knowing this had concerned her and the rest of the executive team. She said thank you, and she was happy with the result, but it had been an intense process. She said even after they decided to reconfigure the SAO as the new SAC, she had many discussions about the new office with administrators. She explained that the SAC was to be relocated into another building on campus. Initially, the administration wanted to put it in the administrative building. This is a building in which the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors' offices are located. Kerry explained that students rarely enter this building unless something serious is going on. She shared her concern with the administration that this might be an intimidating location. The administration then suggested relocating SAC into the student union. She told me, "All the offices in that building have glass walls. It's a fishbowl." Kerry had to explain to the administration why this was also a problem and how it could prevent students from seeking help. They agreed to move the office to a building that was further off of the main campus and housed other classrooms and offices, so students would not be intimidated or fear that it was obvious that they were going to the Student Advocacy Center.
>
> (Fieldnote Fall 2019)

The Cavaliers Against Violence executive team's successful leveraging of their relationships with key stakeholders on campus was one of several factors that ensured the preservation of a significant survivor resource at Big South University. Early in the process, they elected to privately express their concerns about this merger and list changes they viewed as necessary. This allowed them to be, as Alissa described, "in the room" as major decisions about survivors on campus were negotiated. Acting as a voice for students helped ensure the original case manager position would be a confidential employee and that the Student Advocacy Center also offered the other services once provided by the Survivor Advocacy Office.

Additionally, the resignation of an administrator working to dismantle the SAO and the success of a survivor's lawsuit at a peer institution contributed to the reformation of the SAO as the Student Advocacy Center (SAC). Still, the contributions of Cavaliers Against Violence should not be erased. The inclusion of student advocates throughout the process indicates the university recognized this group as a voice for survivors and stakeholders on campus.

Administrators also benefited from the inclusion of CAV members. For instance, Kerry provided valuable insight into the potential problems with the original location of the new SAC office and ensured that survivors would not feel uncomfortable visiting this new space. Cooperating with the administration and utilizing "inside" tactics allowed CAV to complete one of their primary organizational goals, acting as a support system for survivors on campus.

Cooperation as Mutually Beneficial

Cooptation literature often presents an all-or-nothing approach to social movements. Critiques of this perspective have demonstrated that social movements can work with representatives of the state while maintaining their agency and organizational autonomy (Della Porta 2006; Hodo 2019; Richards 2004). Similar patterns of cooperation can be observed between social movement organizations and non-state actors. In fact, these cooperative relationships may be even more critical for organizations such as Cavaliers Against Violence who partner with university service providers. Or organizations that operate in social spaces where connections control the information activists receive and whether these students are included in the decision-making process. Like states, non-state actors may be legitimized through association with social movements, but universities also benefit from student actors' expertise and experiences. Students understand the campus's social landscape, such as the visibility of an office in a student union, in ways university administrators do not. Still, cooperative negotiations sometimes fail and "inside" tactics are not always advisable given certain social contexts of the campus. In this case, faculty and staff who seek to prevent sexual violence on campus must support students as they navigate the relational politics of college campuses and support students "outside" organizing.

Cooperation as Risk

Many scholars have examined claims of cooptation and institutionalization within the broader anti-violence movement. Beth Richie (2012) noted that as the anti-violence movement evolved from grassroots community organizing into institutionalized, hierarchy-based national organizations, the movement sacrificed radical politics for reforms considered more palatable to powerholders. Others argue that feminist movements' cooperation with elites results from the situational dynamics in which movements operate (Whittier 2018). Furthermore, scholarship on the anti-rape movement that overemphasizes the role of legal reform and formal organizations, such as rape crisis centers, may ignore the radical and community-focused points of intervention (Baker and Bevacqua 2018). As I have argued above, cooptation is not a concept well-suited for evaluating the relationships between social movement actors and those in power; however, the risk of associating too closely with elites or compromising to the point that the overall success of a social movement is threatened cannot be ignored. I argue that social movement actors in the campus anti-violence movement are aware of this risk and seek to mitigate it by prioritizing their organizational goals in the midst of contention.

Many student organizers were wary of partnerships between student advocates and administrators. Lexi, the chair of Survivors Fighting Violence explained:

> "What I see now when I go to college campuses, and I ask, "how they organize?" They say we have a table. And I'm like your tabling is very exciting. I am happy to see you have a table. Now, how can we take that to the next level? And I think what's been interesting is how institutionalized organizing has become. Because they took what some of the young folks were doing and pushing for change and they said well how about we make that a cap course. Or we are going to give you a seat at the table. And what that has done now is people aren't organizing as much. They are going to these meetings and engaging with the tools these schools have given them, but don't do anything because it is [an] effective way for schools to just block you from doing anything. So I think over the past couple years, so many schools that were doing radical work are like, "Yeah. We have a caps course that's run through the university." That's great, but we're not done yet."

As described in Chapter 3, members of SFV often described negative experiences dealing with campus administration, Title IX offices, and other departments on their respective campuses. This institutional betrayal is not limited to colleges either, as member like Tanya recognized how her high school had failed her:

> Well, I think that like most activism, it rises out of personal experience, so for me, I didn't even realize the extent of intimate partner violence I had been facing until I was provided the language through an organization at my own university where we provide peer crisis training. It was when I had all this language and realized what partner violence looks like that I realized I had also experienced this. It was great outrage at seeing how my high school had mishandled so many things and how I could have received better support that I really started to be more involved in survivor advocacy training.

In op-eds and social media posts, SFV shared stories of survivors whose requests that their rapists be removed from campus were ignored, even after perpetrators admitted responsibility. Other survivors shared how universities failed to inform students about how to file Title IX reports. Still, others were subjected to questions from administrators that implied they were somehow responsible for being assaulted. These interactions made them personally aware of the risk of relying too heavily upon, or putting trust in, university administrators. As Lexi said when discussing students organizing on college campuses, "The university is not your friend!"

Contention Under Threat of Silencing

Survivors Fighting Violence encouraged students to act as watchdogs by monitoring universities, assessing policies, and holding institutions accountable for policies that harm survivors. Their strategic action plan warned students about working with administrators. They emphasized that, regardless of an administrator's personal belief, administrators are obligated to protect the university from financial loss, legal liability, and public embarrassment. Thus, administrators may seek to protect themselves and prioritize their careers by suppressing, ignoring, or silence

student activists. SFV pointed out that protecting students from violence is also the administrators' job and provided advice on how to work with administrators.

The SFV strategic action plan advised students that, although administrators may use various tactics to silence or dissuade student organizers, they should continue putting pressure on the school. The strategic action plan described six common moves universities may make to silence or ignore activists and suggest countermoves for student organizers. Survivors Fighting Violence also warned students against actions that could result in a loss of public support. The following scenarios represent suggested student responses to a series of administrative actions. I have altered the presentation and wording of these actions to protect the identity of SFV members. However, I have preserved the substantive content and intended messaging of the action plan:

> Scenario 1: Ignoring Demands or Delayed Response
> *Administrative action*: Administrators ignore demands of your student organization, refuse to meet with student leaders, or use delay tactics to postpone action.
> *Suggested response:* As a counter to this action, student organizations can escalate their tactics and call for public attention to the issue. Mobilizing allies on campus, including faculty, and in the community through direct action. Direct action includes tactics such as protest or petitions. Students can also discuss their request to meet with administrators in campus or local newspapers.
>
> Scenario 2: Form a Committee
> *Administrative action:* Administrators suggest forming a "committee" to address the issue and offer solutions.
> *Suggested response:* As a counter to this action, student organizations should consider what the university is proposing and what concessions are being made. Organizers should avoid committees that do not hold power to impact policy or real change. If the committee's formation is unlikely to aid in meeting student organizer's demands, students should engage in escalation tactics.
>
> Scenario 3: Dividing Students
> *Administrative action:* Administrators create division between students and groups by showing favoritism.
> *Suggested response:* As a counter to this action, work together to decide who will interact with administrators. If this is not possible, students who meet with

> administration should take detailed notes and share what has happened with the entire group. Work to include as many students as possible and increase representation.
>
> (Document Analysis 2020)

In the face of acts of contention or uncooperative university administrators, SFV provided students with practical advice on how to best pursue their organization's goals. Often this involved the use of escalation tactics and outside strategies. Survivors Fighting Violence advised students working within universities that when possible, it is beneficial to have a group of students who work as inside organizers and a separate group who work as outside organizers.[16] Inside organizers can communicate information from within university systems, and those on the outside can use this to mobilize necessary support for change. SFV noted that administrators might not be as willing to cooperate with those who are publicly criticizing the university. An inside team can promote organizers' goals to administrators and frame these concessions as a means of addressing mounting external pressure from students. Survivors Fighting Violence emphasized that for this strategy to work effectively, it is important that the inside and outside teams work together but behind the scenes.

Among SFV members, university administrators' actions were often understood as attempts to silence, ignore, and dismiss student survivors' concerns. These perceptions were informed by SFV members' own experiences as survivors of gender-based violence. Numerous studies have documented students' negative experiences seeking to file Title IX complaints and the traumatic consequences of institutional betrayal (Heldman et al. 2018; Linder and Myers 2018; Smith and Freyd 2013, 2014). The lived experiences of survivors working to address this social problem on college campuses have led many to be suspicious of working with university

[16] Although, as noted in Chapter 2, CAV did not have direct contact with SFV.

administrators and expect contention when operating within the university system. Survivors Fighting Violence educated local student organizers about using inside and outside tactics because they recognize that both are legitimate and useful strategies. This combination of approaches allows student advocates to navigate the complicated social landscapes of college campuses.

Contention Around Unsuitable Partnerships

Relationships between student advocates, campus offices, and administrators, like those between individuals, are not singularly positive or negative. CAV members often emphasized the need for the organization to cultivate relationships with service providers and administrators on campus. These students were not as suspicious of administration as SFV members. However, they still expressed concerns about how closely they should or should not align themselves with various offices on campus. In these discussions, members of the CAV executive team emphasized the importance of maintaining the organization's integrity. This is best exemplified in CAV's search for a new faculty advisor following the transition of the Survivor Advocacy Office to the Student Advocacy Center, which began in the Spring of 2019. Several offices/departments on campus sought to partner with Cavaliers Against Violence: the Women and Gender Studies Department, Health and Wellness Center, and Counseling Center. The CAV executive team was strongly considering Health and Wellness until they received news that required them to reconsider their decision:

> I had been at the What Were You Wearing: Clothesline Project for a little over half an hour and already walked the exhibit twice. I noticed Sabra and Taylor standing in a corner and walked over. We talked about their exams and plans for the summer. After a few minutes, I asked how the search was going for the new advisor. They exchanged what I perceived as a knowing look, and Taylor said they were probably going to go with the Women and Gender Studies department [the CAV executive team did select the vice-chair of this department to serve as the faculty advisor]. I was surprised because last I had heard they were likely

> going to go with Health and Wellness, which has significant resources and personnel to assist with day-to-day operations. Health and Wellness also host events regularly on campus, and members of the executive team felt it would be beneficial to have access to these resources and to promote their events through Health and Wellness. I inquired what motivated the change. Sabra said, "We met with the director, and we have some ideological differences." Taylor explained that the new Director of Health and Wellness researches and promotes abstinence as a health measure, and they did not feel she would be a good match with the values and approach of Cavaliers Against Violence. He added that Health and Wellness has its own peer educator program, and she wanted to merge their peer educators with this existing programming. The new peer educator program would include information on drinking, drugs, mental health, and sexual violence. "It is just too much to put into one training. We already have to limit our presentations." He said that he could not imagine the presentations being as effective if they cut out any more material or shortened the length of the presentation.
>
> (Fieldnote Spring 2019)

The selection of a faculty advisor was also discussed at the last CAV executive team meeting of the Spring 2019 semester. Kerry emphasized the importance of finding a good fit, someone who shared the vision and values of CAV, and the importance of avoiding ideological differences. In speaking with Kerry after this meeting, she also commented on the Health and Wellness director's research and emphasis an abstinence-only approach to sexual health. However, she added that they had to be careful because they still wanted to remain on "good terms" with the office. The conversations around selecting a faculty advisor demonstrate that Cavaliers Against Violence sought to partner with a department on campus to help the organization grow and thrive. Still, they were protective and worked to avoid affiliation with departments who might threaten or distract from their goals.

Contention Over Control

In addition to ensuring ideological alignment between Cavaliers Against Violence and campus partners, the CAV executive team worked to protect their organization's

autonomy. Frequently CAV would partner with other student organizations for events such as ROTC, the Black Student Union, or the LGBT Campus Pride organization. Cooperation between these groups allowed CAV to reach students from across campus and share information about survivor resources, gender-based violence, and bystander intervention. CAV executive team often sought to draw from these organizations' knowledge, for example, asking the Black Student Union to suggest a speaker who could address Black women's experiences of sexual violence and recent public accounts of abuse by Nelly. While these partnerships were an important part of CAV's mission to raise awareness on campus, members were careful to ensure that the organization received acknowledgment and maintained control over their events and programs.

This was exemplified at "Healthy Love" an event CAV organized near Valentine's day. They invited a speaker from the Counseling Center to discuss how to healthy and unhealthy relationships. As an incentive to attend, this talk was accompanied by a cookie decorating party. The following is an excerpt from my fieldnotes of this event:

> The "Healthy Love" event has concluded and about eight students are now moving to the cookie decorating station. Bags of pink and white decorating icing are spread across the table with two plastic containers full of sugar cookies sitting in the middle. One by one students begin to take a cookie and decorate—A few of the students made simple heart designs, one person made a heart with the word "kind" written in the middle, and another made a heart with the words "Love & BSU" written across the front. As they were decorating the hearts students discussed their plans for the weekend and course assignments. The President of CAV was being interviewed by the school's television campus new station. When she finished the interview she walked over to the decorating table and Lance, the chair of the bystander intervention program, tried to get her attention. She stood beside him and they began to quietly discuss a meeting that he had earlier that week. As two of the executive members standing beside them became interested in the conversation, he turned to the group and re-told the story he had been sharing with the President.

Lance explained that the new Director of Greek Life, Dr. Still, wanted to start a peer educator program within the Greek community. He explained that Dr. Still had arrived on campus in August and contacted him, so they could meet and discuss the possibility of starting a Greek Ambassador program in which the ambassadors would be trained as peer educators. Lance [who is heavily involved in Greek life] explained, "He wants to create leadership opportunities for students within the Greek system." These ambassadors would not only cover sexual assault, but alcohol, drugs, and mental health—specifically suicide. Lance noted that this had been a problem on campus. Lance says that Dr. Still was interested in what type of programming the CAV peer educators had undergone.

At this point, all the remaining executive board members are intensely listening to Lance's story. The President says that there are already peer educators [trained by CAV] in Greek life. Lance indicates that Dr. Still seemed more interested in what their presentations look like and the type of information that they share during the presentations. The President then asks if he [Dr. Still] is interested in having the ambassadors trained by CAV or did he want to take their program—she asks if he is looking to partner with CAV. Lance says that based on his understanding ambassadors would be separate from CAV.

Now, several of the executive board look uncomfortable. One man says that this would be a conflict of interest. Others comment, "Do they realize we have a program?" and "So we will lose the opportunity to present to the Greeks?" Lance explained that many national chapters require that these organization undergo some sort of training and Dr. Still is trying to get these chapters up to date, while also providing leadership opportunities for Greek students. Executive members responded asking, "Why can't they just continue to be trained as part of CAV?" and another said "We already try and send Greek peer educators to Greek presentations, so they are trained by someone in Greek life." However, other members said that they know many Greek houses that do not want to be trained by CAV. The CAV secretary says that she knows of one sorority that is trained by a church and her friend in that sorority said the training is "not very good." Another said that, "Many religious and conservative organizations on campus do not want to have presentations by CAV. They don't want to be involved with CAV because they view it as a political organization." The President responded, "Are we a political organization?" An executive member responded, "I don't think that this [sexual misconduct] should be political." Several members nodded in the affirmative.

At this point, several students started to pick up their bags and say their goodbyes. Kerry, CAV's President, got Lance's attention and said that it sounded like they needed to have another conversation [with Dr. Still]. She said that they could work together, but CAV needed to have recognition as well.

About a month later, I followed up with Lance after another CAV meeting. He had informed Dr. Still that many of the peer educators are also Greek life

> members and Dr.Still could send the ambassadors to the CAV training if he would like.
>
> (Fieldnote Spring 2019)

Like the Health and Wellness office, Greek Life's director sought to set up an educational training program of their own. CAV was unwilling to relinquish their bystander intervention training for a couple of reasons.

First, the members recognize their programming as comprehensive and inclusive of essential information regarding violence on campus. They worried that Health and Wellness would exclude critical information and that Greek Life's presentation would be less effective. One student's comment demonstrates that this would be a "conflict of interest." Greek Life was a point of contention within this organization. Some members felt that Greek Life was no more responsible for violence on campus than other organizations and that their culpability in contributing to this problem was exaggerated. Others viewed Greek Life and Greek party culture as a central cause of the problem. Despite this division within the membership, all of the CAV executive team members present at this event agreed that their bystander intervention training needed to remain solely focused on gender-based violence. It could not be collapsed within larger peer educator training efforts.

Second, CAV members were upset at the suggestion that they should forfeit their training materials without acknowledgment of their work. The Greek Life director's request was not viewed as an attempt to cooperate or partner with CAV but as an attempt to usurp their organizational autonomy without recognizing their work. Cavaliers Against Violence is known on campus as a leader in efforts to address gender-based violence, and

name recognition is key to their success in hosting widely attended events, such as Take Back the Night, and recruiting new members.

Cavaliers Against Violence have moderate support from administrators and various departments on campus, but they are engaged in contentious relationships and work to maintain their autonomy and preserve the ideological integrity of their organization. Survivors Fighting Violence recognize the importance of responding to social dynamics on campus by training students to utilize "inside" and "outside" tactics. Activists' decisions about when to go public, negotiate in private, or who to partner with on campus, as well as many other determinations, cannot be explained as a choice between radical independence and cooptation. I argue that the agency and strategy that goes into these decisions are best understood through examining the relationships involved in students' mobilization and the contexts in which they operate.

Conclusion

In 2006, the Office for Civil Rights saw an increase in Title IX complaints related to sexual harassment, and by 2014 the number of sexual harassment complaints nearly rivaled those pertaining to academic inclusion and athletics (Reynolds 2019). In a historical analysis of Title IX, Celene Reynolds (2019) found that complaints were more likely to be filed against private, competitive schools and schools within states with greater representation of women in legislation. She suggests that this may indicate certain schools may have greater transparency regarding Title IX or that the demographic makeup of these schools results in a concentration of privileged students better able to negotiate the legal system. Similarly, research has shown that institutional characteristics of universities, such as the presence of a women's center, a women or gender studies

program, female university presidents, and participation in campaigns to address violence against women, increased the likelihood of rape reporting and university compliance with the Clery Act (Boyle et al. 2017).

In this chapter I demonstrated that local social movement organizations, like Cavaliers Against Violence, are situated in specific social contexts that shape their tactics and goals. Monolithic representations of the campus anti-violence movement fail to explain how such contexts of individual campuses impacts students' activism. In attempts to find shared patterns and paint a broad picture of this movement, the choices of activists can be oversimplified as falling into cooptation or compromising to the point of erasure. I argue, instead, for greater recognition of the potential of cooperation as a strategic tactic within social movements. CAV has opted to focus on building partnerships and strong ties with departments on campus. Their choice to cooperate with university administrators allows them access to shaping new policies and the ability to represent students even within a contentious situation. However, this approach would not be appropriate for all local student organizers. As Lexi warns, "the university is not your friend."

Survivors Fighting Violence, in contrast, had a contentious approach to their interactions with administrators. This is a survivor led organization, and their experiences with universities, specifically their experiences of institutional betrayal, helped to shape their strategies. SFV views institutions of higher education as targets of the movement that require external motivation to protect survivors. Previous studies of student-movements have shown that universities may be more vulnerable to attacks to their legitimacy than nation states (Walker et al. 2008). SFV is aware of this vulnerability and

seeks to gain power through exploiting it. While a cooperative approach may be more effective for CAV, an organization embedded within the university, SFV's national presence allows them to take a contentious approach. In particular, they leverage relationships with media and student groups across the country to shame universities and prompt change.

Student advocates must choose the strategies that work best on their campuses. Research has shown that rates of reporting and Title IX complaints vary among schools based on the structures of these institutions and the political contexts in which they are situated. So, too, do social movements strategies. I argue that scholars examining social movements should shift focus away from cooptation narratives, instead emphasizing activists as moving along a continuum from cooperation to contention. As demonstrated in the new campus anti-violence movement, activists are aware of this continuum. They develop inside and outside organizing strategies and deploy these strategies depending on the specific context. Our practical and theoretical understandings of these movements can be improved by learning from student organizers' actions.

Activists' strategies were shaped by social relations on campuses. In the next chapter, I extend my analysis to explore how student activists' responded to cultural contexts and political shifts. I discuss Survivors Fighting Violence's adoption of an abolitionist framework and their recognition of the role of racism, heterosexism, and ableism in the continuation of gendered-based violence. I also show how Cavaliers Against Violence attempted to adopt an apolitical stance to gain wider support on campus, and explore the consequences of this decision. I also discuss how CAV's position within a predominantly white university influenced their organizational make-up

and goals. In comparing these organizations, I draw attention to internal contradictions within the anti-campus violence movement and students as embedded within multiple systems of power and oppression.

CHAPTER 5: POLITICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXTS OF THE CAMPUS ANTI-VIOLENCE MOVEMENT

This chapter describes how SFV and CAV's strategies, organizational logics, and targets were influenced by the political and cultural contexts in which these organizations were situated. In shifting to relational approaches in the study of social movements, McAdams and colleagues (2001) emphasized the importance of examining "official" politics and informal politics. Armstrong and Bernstein (2008) improved upon this with their multi-institutional politics approach that recognizes state and non-state institutions as central to political contention. They draw attention to how power operates within political and cultural contexts, thereby requiring social movements to respond to various institutions across different contexts (Armstrong and Bernstein 2008). Utilizing a multi-institutional politics approach, I demonstrate how student activists adapted to political and cultural shifts at the national and campus level.

In referencing political contexts, I refer to politicians, state governing bodies, laws, and regulations, among other events and organizations that made up the social environment in which activists operated. I utilize the terms culture and cultural context to refer to ideologies and organizational norms and logics, as well as repertoires that developed around campus gender-based violence within and outside of this movement. I also adopt Polletta's (1999) perspective of culture and social structure as intertwined and inseparable. In practice, the distinction between the political and cultural is sometimes blurred. This messiness reflects the importance of cultural politics (hooks 2015). Distinguishing between the political and cultural helps to provide conceptual clarity, but they should be understood as operating in tandem.

This chapter addresses the question: How did political and cultural contexts shape this movement? In the first section, I focus on SFV to describe the transition from the Obama to Trump administration. Next, I show carceral and anti-carceral feminist perspectives persist in anti-violence organizing. I then describe how CAV responded to political change. Finally, I argue CAV strategies reproduced the power dynamics of BSU's campus. Throughout this chapter, I return to the point that social movements remain multi-faceted sites of organizing that require attention to practices at national and local levels. Kenneth Andrews (2002: 107) has argued for a greater focus on organizations within social movements. Andrews (2002) looked at how responses to events (ex. boycotts) by organizations working within the civil rights movement produced different outcomes. I extend this approach by examining how organizations' outcomes are tied to political contexts and cultural contexts. I also utilize an intersectional perspective to reveal how interlocking systems of inequality, including racism, patriarchy, heterosexism, cissexism, ableism, and more, are resisted and reproduced in the practices of student activists. I argue that the degree to which reproduction or resistance occurs can only be understood through a thorough examination of the environments in which these organizers operate.

Political Shifts and Strategic Responses at the National Level

Whittier (2018) argues that the early success of the new campus anti-violence movement was due in part to political opportunities under the Obama administration created by feminist organizing around VAWA and grassroots efforts to address violence. Political representatives at the national level and major media outlets began to recognize the voices of student activists who had been working to address gender-based violence for years (Brodsky 2017). The inclusion of student and survivor activists as key stakeholders was apparent through their involvement in

campaigns such as It's On Us and the White House Task Force to Prevent Sexual Assault (Eilperin 2014). In response to the new campus anti-violence movement and guidance from the White House and the Department of Education (DOE), changes were made on campuses around the country, including employment of Title IX coordinators, clarification of procedures related to sexual misconduct on campus, and employment of "risk management strategies" to avoid public embarrassment and legal recourse (Heldman et al. 2018). The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) which, as previously noted in Chapter 2, had rarely investigated Title IX violations on campus prior to 2011, was targeted in 2013 by student activists who protested outside of the DOE and petitioned for greater transparency and timely action from OCR (Blustein 2017). Between 2013 and 2014, Title IX complaints filed with OCR increased from 32 to 104, and by 2016, 175 colleges and universities were under investigation (Smith 2017). However, in 2016 with the election of Donald Trump, this movement and its supporters saw dramatic political and cultural shifts (Heldman et al. 2018; Whittier 2018).

In 2017, the DOE rescinded the 2011 Dear Colleagues Letter and announced that the DOE would begin to create a new series of rules for Title IX (U.S. DOE 2017). This press release also included direct quotes from Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, who emphasized the importance of "fairness" and "due process." Men's rights advocates (MRA), aided by law professors from Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania, utilized narratives of due process to critique schools' adjudication processes and claim that Title IX investigations unfairly favor complainants (Anderson 2019). As Alexandra Brodsky (2017: 825), civil rights attorney and former student activist, explains:

> In this broader fight for fairer school discipline, efforts to address sexual harassment and efforts to protect accused students' time in class are understood to be part of the same project to increase educational access. Yet, in the narrower college rape context, many advocates and most popular accounts tell a tale of

> warring interests. Schools can either prevent and respond to gender violence or protect accused students' rights; these aims are imagined to be entirely mutually exclusive. Many Title IX opponents deploy a rhetoric of "overcorrection" and a pendulum swinging too far, as though a single axis of justice exists on which every gain for one side is a loss for the other.

Title IX opponents, men's rights advocates, and some legal scholars have suggested that schools' civil disciplinary procedures should be treated with the same standard as criminal legal proceedings (Anderson 2019). Many of these arguments hinge on prominent rape myths by overemphasizing rates of false reporting and severity of punishment respondents face in school disciplinary hearings, as well as beliefs that rape is a unique and ambiguous crime (Brodsky 2017; Eigenberg and Belknap 2017). For example, Betsy DeVos was quoted in an interview with *60 Minutes* stating she "did not know" if the number of false reports were equivalent to the number of rapes or sexual assaults (McNamara 2018). Such statements are ubiquitous among Title IX opponents, despite research that demonstrates sexual misconduct continues to be under-reported on college campuses. Further, research shows that less than half of investigated reports result in a finding of responsibility, and, of those, less than half result in suspension or expulsion (Richards 2019). False reports are also uncommon, with less than 2-8% of sexual assaults reported to police officers being unsubstantiated (Lonsway, Archambault, and Lisak 2009).

The DOE under DeVos' administration was heavily critiqued by survivor activists, including those within SFV, as misrepresenting the meaning of due process to protect abusers and shield schools from financial recourse at the expense of students' civil rights (Barthélemy 2020). Betsy DeVos met with members of these groups and students who had been accused of sexual misconduct early in her tenure as she prioritized changing Title IX rules (Anderson 2019). The DOE during the Trump administration also sought advice and support from men's rights groups, such as Families Advocating for Campus Equality (FACE) and Stop Abusive and

Violent Environments (SAVE), as they rescinded the 2011 DCL and crafted new Title IX rules (Barthélemy 2020). Below, I show how SFV responded to this shifting political context by applying existing organization strategies to a new target, the DOE and White House.

From Partner to Target

In Chapter 3, I described how members of this movement were personally impacted by the rising backlash against the movement. In addition to the personal cost associated with political backlash, these activists had to adjust their targets, goals, and strategies in response to this new political context. When I asked about challenges the movement has faced, Hailey described how SFV struggled to respond to an increasingly hostile relationship with the White House and DOE:

> That's a big one! This entire administration. I mean this is my third year with [SFV]. So my entire time at [SFV] has been under the Trump administration. I was involved in organizing on campus prior to the Trump administration, under the Obama administration**.** So I definitely saw that huge shift where all of the sudden our biggest enemy is the government. And so that has been really, really difficult. We've been saying at [SFV], we feel like we're being gaslit by the Department of Education because, literally for a year now, we've been hearing that the rule was gonna drop any day now. So, we've been in this constant panic mode every week. We keep hearing, "It's coming out this week. It's coming out this week. It's coming out this week." And then it never comes out! So we've been just like seriously stressed! And under a lot of pressure for a **long** time now [emphasis added by participant]. So that's been really hard. And then every time we think the department won't do this, they suck and Betsy DeVos is evil, but she would have to know it would be inhumane to do this. For example, she would have to know it would be inhumane to drop a new 2,000 page Title IX rule during an international pandemic, and then she did it. So it's like, we just keep, I feel like I shouldn't be surprised anymore. It shouldn't be shocking to me that she did this but it still is. I actually think of it a lot, as I was in an abusive relationship, and it feels very much similar to me how I was trying to respond to my abuser but it's impossible. In a domestic violence situation to figure out all the right steps to take when you're dealing with someone who's not rational, and I feel like that's what we're doing with the government now. It's hard to think about how to react and how to respond and think of what we should be doing when this administration is so inhumane. It's incredible! I think that has been really, really difficult for us as organizers.

As emphasized in Hailey's account, the federal government had formerly been responsive to the new campus ant-violence movement, which led to early successes, but under Trump it became one of SFV's primary targets. SFV, like other national organizations, had specialized in using Title IX to file complaints against universities that were failing to address violence on campus; however, the DOE under Betsy DeVos took steps that indicated to student advocates a shift in the DOE's willingness to hold schools accountable. Acts such as rescinding the 2011 DCL created opportunities for universities to abandon changes made in response to OCR investigations and revert to policies that early members of this movement fought to change.

SFV recognized that the federal government, specifically the DOE, no longer acted as a resource or partner in their efforts. Furthermore, the DOE and White House increasingly posed a threat to the movement. SFV regularly protested in front of the department. They were also one of several survivor activists organizations to sue the DOE over the new Title IX regulations that went into effect in August of 2020. These direct actions that had once been used to combat gender-based violence on campus were now being implemented increasingly in the nation's capital.

This contentious relationship is also represented in the social media campaign against DeVos proposed changes to Title IX. In November 2018, the proposed new Title IX rules were released and opened to a 60-day notice and comment period. In the months preceding the notice and comment period, SFV engaged in a campaign to highlight how the proposed rules undermined survivors' well-being and students' civil rights. For example, Tweets included:

> Tweet: @BetsyDeVosED survivors of violence are pushed out of schools Protect the rights of trans students to a violence free education

> Tweet: Universities and school districts will save millions if the proposed rule is implemented. Savings at the cost of survivors.[17]
>
> Tweet (a thread): In brief, the new rule would reduce reporting—allow for mediation in cases of rape—allow for religious exemptions to Title IX—require cross-examination—reduce economic protections—permit schools to not investigate assaults that happen off-campus
>
> Tweets from SFV released between September and November 2018

In the Tweets above and in similar Tweets throughout the notice and comment period, SFV sought to provide individuals with an overview of what changes were included in the new rules and the impact of these rules on survivors. This information was communicated using a variety of strategies including statistics, policy analysis, and storytelling of survivors' own experiences. SFV had experience in policy analysis and numerous connections to legal scholars, as many founding members went on to become attorneys. After the rules were approved in 2020, SFV's policy team spent days reading the new 2,000 page Title IX regulations. They also worked to clarify the meaning of the rules for the general public. Octavia, a member of the communications team, said: "[We] really focused on making information very accessible and digestible for people because we know with proposals and the Trump administration and different types of laws, the information and the language is very hard for a lot of people to digest." Policy analysis and public relation strategies that SFV members had long applied to help students file Title IX complaints were now utilized to highlight harms associated with new DOE policies.

In addition to applying former strategies of direct action and legal recourse to a new target, SFV shifted social media strategies to shame the DOE as they had once shamed schools into compliance. In the face of an unfavorable administration, SFV saw the potential to gain public support for survivors and warn the public about the consequences of policies, laws,

[17] The specific number was included in the original tweet. It has been excluded here to preserve anonymity of SFV.

regulations, and court appointments that threatened students' civil rights. One of SFV's early social media campaigns included a series of Tweets by survivors describing their hardships accessing educational resources following experiences of violence. DeVos was tagged in each of these Tweets. Again, SFV implemented the existing strategy of storytelling in order to confront new threats to the goals of this movement. In addition to describing the personal costs of violence and gaining public attention, social media also served as a way to call out Betsy DeVos specifically for her insistence on a policy that would exacerbate these hardships. In between September 2018 and May 2020, Devos was mentioned 528 times, and Trump was mentioned 88 times. The exaggerated mentions of DeVos are, in part, due to SFV's strategy of tagging her Twitter handle in campaigns related to new Title IX regulations, but I argue this also demonstrates the frustration and betrayal members felt at the head of DOE's disregard for the needs of survivors. In the interview above, Hailey referred to DeVos as "evil." Other SFV members also expressed strong dislike and frustration with Betsy DeVos in particular. These views show how this transition from open to closed political opportunities is personalized for activists, and the consequences are not only felt in terms of goals and shifting organizational strategies but emotional burdens that come with investment in a movement.

Trump and Devos were not SFV's only political targets. SFV members also grew concerned with and sought to draw attention to court rulings that threatened survivors' rights as well as the appointment of judges such as Neomi Rao. In a series of tweets about Rao's appointment to the US Court of Appeals, SFV included links to "victim blaming" articles that she had written in her 20s and rallied against "rape apologist judges." Furthermore, SFV continued during this time to use social media and news media to identify universities that were failing to support survivors on campus. These actions demonstrate that while SFV had a new

target in the form of DOE and White House, they remained committed to helping students hold universities accountable as well.

In the transition from the Obama to Trump administration, SFV witnessed a closing of political opportunities that had resulted in significant gains for their predecessors. In response to this new political environment, SFV repurposed strategies used to shame universities into compliance and applied these strategies to the DOE. While SFV had used direct action and petitions to sway the DOE under the Obama administration, the degree to which the federal government became the primary target of SFV demonstrates how political context determined this organization's target selection process. SFV's strategic approach to their new state target demonstrates how multi-institutional organizations re-apply tactics, such as social media campaigns, policy analysis, and direct action, as they shift between state and non-state targets in tumultuous political contexts.

New Strategies in the Trump Era

In addition to targeting the Trump administration through existing tactics, SFV sought to create new strategies to meet the needs of survivors. Lexi, the team leader of SFV, explained:

> I think the other biggest issue we are facing is that relying on enforcement mechanisms that change with every administration. We rely on the Department of Education to use enforcement mechanisms, but they constantly change. And that, it's not always most effective. I think that UNC [Chapel Hill] has been under investigation six years. It's not effective. It's not moving. It has been for some schools. It has moved them to take action, but across the field it's really not. And so, I think that we have to start looking at state and local governments to figure out how can we move accountability to be more localized. Where schools' budgets are very much influenced by state governments and they hold a lot over a school. Why are they not more involved, being looked at? And I think that's what we've really been trying to do at Survivors Fighting Violence with our state policy suggestions that we publish. We do stuff at the national level. It's great to do stuff at the national level, but we can't keep doing this. We have to find solutions.

SFV recognized that the federal government was an unreliable partner in the fight against gender-based violence on campus. Lexi referenced the stagnation in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill investigation. In 2013, students filed a Title IX complaint against the UNC-Chapel Hill, alleging the university had mishandled sexual assault cases. In June of 2020, the university entered into a settlement agreement with DOE agreeing to a $1.5 million settlement and to a review of their compliance over the next three years (Devarajan 2020). This lengthy investigation process and the instability of Title IX policy emphasized to student organizers the importance of seeking other pathways to social change.

State governments became a new target of SFV in response to shifts in the political climate. As Lexi explained above, these organizers recognized the power of state legislatures to influence schools' budgets and policies related to gender-based violence. SFV's policy team monitored state legislation that potentially harmed survivors. For example, they assisted local activists campaigning against Missouri House Bill 573. SFV promoted a letter writing campaign on their social media platforms that detailed how the bill would harm survivors by allowing, among other things, respondents to appeal to the state's "Administrative Hearing Commission." This social media campaign also publicized news articles that detailed how the bill had been crafted by state lobbyist, Richard McIntosh, after his son was expelled from Washington University for raping another student. McIntosh's wife, Audrey McIntosh, served on the Administrative Hearing Commission to which students would appeal.[18] This was one of several state laws that SFV worked to stop by collaborating with campus student organizers.

While Heldman and colleagues (2018) passingly mentioned that activists within this movement have started to focus on state legislation, much of the research on this movement has

[18] HB 573 was defeated by June 2019 (McKinley and Hancock 2019).

focused on survivors' Title IX and Clery complaints. I argue that, in response to the Trump administration and Betsy DeVos' leadership in the DOE, student activists' recognized state legislative bodies as potential new targets. As demonstrated by SFV, states may be effective targets when pressuring universities to implement positive changes and promote students' civil rights on campus. State legislatures can also propose legislation that undermines students' rights. So, state governments must be monitored and held accountable for legislation that impacts survivors' access to education. Furthermore, as this movement increasingly advocates against gender-based violence in high schools and middle schools, local governing bodies, including school boards, are likely to become vital sites for advocacy and policy reform. SFV's targeting of state legislatures shows how activists respond to multiple shifting political contexts, not just those at the federal level. National organizations in multi-institutional movements, like SFV, are well-positioned to select new state or non-state institutional targets as they observe openings at one institutional level and closing advocacy opportunities at another.

Carceral Feminism and Abolition

In addition to navigating multiple political climates, SFV had to address cultural shifts in responses to gender-based violence on campus within and outside of the movement. During the 2016 U.S. Presidential election, Donald Trump was publicly accused of sexual harassment and assault by several women. Access Hollywood tapes included statements in which Trump described assaulting women (Fahrenthold 2016). In 2017, women's marches were held around the country in part to protest the continued failure to support survivors and take gender-based violence as a serious matter (Hartocollis and Alcindor 2017). In the midst of new collective efforts to address gender-based violence, long-standing practices of exclusion and marginalization resurged within feminist organizing spaces. The #MeToo movement succeeded

in bringing national attention to sexual violence and harassment, but the popularization of this movement also privileged the experiences and voices of straight, cis-gender, white, wealthy women (Burke 2017; Onwuachi-Willig 2018). This is perhaps best exemplified by the erasure of #MeToo founder Tarana Burke, a Black woman, in many public accounts of the movement (Onwuachi-Willig 2018). In addition to practices of exclusion and erasure, the latest iteration of the anti-violence movement has once again highlighted contestations between carceral and anti-carceral feminists (Musto 2019; Richie et al. 2021).

Carceral feminism has been described as a feminist strategy to prevent violence through utilizing the criminal legal system as a means of punishing offenders; it, thereby, justifies expansions of policing (Bernstein 2007; 2012). Bernstein (2007) argued that carceral feminism focuses on how individuals perpetuate harm and, often, ignores how structures of domination reinforce and enable gender-based violence. Additionally, critics of carceral feminism have argued that this ideology is antithetical to an intersectional understanding of violence (Whittier 2016). In examining feminist activism related to the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), Whittier (2016) argued that feminist organizers had an intersectional understanding of how marginalized groups' experiences of sexual violence and intimate partner violence varied due to multiple systems of inequality. However, their ability to pursue legislative change was restricted by frames and coalitions within Congress that relied on carceral framings of this as a gendered-crime issue. Carceral feminists' support of the criminal legal system has also resulted in interpersonal and state violence against marginalized women, especially transgender, Black and Native women (Richie 2012; Kim 2020). It has been argued that the state's reliance on violence as a means of addressing violence makes carceral approaches an "ineffective anti-violence strategy" (Musto 2019). Furthermore, carceral-based solutions to violence incur harm to

survivors who seek assistance through the state and non-government organizations as they are subjected to monitoring and punitive forms of protection (Musto 2016).

In contrast, anti-carceral feminism, rooted in an intersectional approach, employs strategies that challenge carceral approaches to violence (Carlton 2018). Scholars have noted that anti-carceral feminist activists often overlap with prison and policing abolitionists and seek to address violence through community, accountability, and transformative practices (Carlton 2018; Musto 2019; Richie 2021). In response to highly publicized acts of state violence, calls for the abolition of the prison-industrial complex and policing have increased (Kim 2020; Richie 2017). Musto (2019: 49) argued that the overlap between abolition and anti-carceral feminism provides critical criminologists with an opportunity to further interrogate practices of criminalization:

> What is also needed, however, is a reformulated framework to talk about the activities of non-state actors—the powerful adjacent—whose work supports carceral agendas. I am referring, here, to celebrities, corporations, humanitarian and faith-based organizations, and non-profit and non-governmental actors, noted above, whose work may support, if not directly expand, criminalization, state-organized policing, surveillance, and confinement. Transing critical criminology[19] invites us to pay attention to evolving penal and non-state arrangements, to track the fluid overlap between state and non-state actors (Bernal and Grewal 2014: 6), and to widen the lens with which we document criminalization, punishment, and confinement, such that it makes visible the constellation of non-penal actors who knowingly and unintentionally collude with carceral actors and projects.

The campus anti-violence movement provides an ideal example of the ways carceral and anti-carceral feminist strategies are employed in relation to state and non-state institutions.

As discussed in the previous section, SFV sought to shape public discourse related to gender-based violence on campus by highlighting the harms associated with federal, state, and campus level policies. SFV took an abolitionist approach to responding to cultural investments in criminalization and abuses within the legal system. Members of SFV were well aware of the

[19] This refers to a practice of crossing boundaries in criminological study of carceral practices.

critiques of carceral feminist approaches to anti-violence. Upon joining the organization, team members were assigned an abolitionist reading list. The articles in this reading list included descriptions of prison abolition movement, abolition of policing, and histories of the 1970s feminist anti-violence movement with a focus on grassroots organizers who resisted carceral approaches to gender-based violence. SFV invested in expanding public discourse related to gender-based violence to recognize the potential of abolition in the present day, as well as the history of abolition in anti-violence feminist organizing.

For SFV members, abolition was a core part of the organization, and this distinguished them from other national organizations fighting against gender-based violence. Octavia explained what abolition means in the context of the anti-violence movement:

> I would say looking to fight against sexual violence beyond the prison industrial complex. It's something that I've been more interested in and researching about more within the last year or so, is looking at ending sexual violence through a restorative and transformative healing. That means being a prison abolitionist. Realizing that there is justice or there can be results beyond prison is something I've definitely come to understand more. Being an activist and being an organizer, knowing that if my goal is to end sexual violence, eradicate sexual violence, that also means my goal would be to abolish prisons as well because prisons perpetuate sexual violence. **Sexual violence happens inside of prisons** [emphasis added by participant]. So, if I want to eradicate sexual violence, then I have to also abolish prisons as well because it impacts survivors. Their stories do matter! And we have to be very mindful that the prison industrial complex is violent itself. So, if we want to eradicate violence, we have to eradicate that as well.

Octavia focuses on the violence that occurs within prisons. This was a key part of SFV's repertoire of support for abolition. In interviews, social media posts, and op-eds, members highlighted that putting individuals in jail or prisons does not reduce sexual violence, it just takes it out of the public eye. They also publicized the high rates of gender-based violence among those who have been incarcerated. This concern with prison abolition aligns with previous analysis of anti-carceral feminist organizations. SFV, like their anti-carceral feminist

predecessors, noted the overlap between violence prevention, prison abolition, police violence, reproductive freedom, immigrant rights, and social justice movements more broadly. SFV promoted other social movement organizations dedicated to these issues through their social media platforms by retweeting calls for action, relevant news stories related to legislation, or calls for an end to policing.

As I described in Chapter 2, SFV prioritized inclusion and centered the perspectives of marginalized individuals in their organization. They recognized that failure to center Black, trans, queer, and undocumented survivors within anti-violence movements, including recent iterations of #MeToo and #TimesUp, often led to the promotion of carceral approaches to violence prevention within these movements. Conversely, SFV members were aware of how inequalities that permitted gender-based violence in education also reinforced other forms of violence and oppression. This was emphasized in their organization description, which includes the statement, "violence is both a cause of inequity and a consequence of it." They consistently drew attention to the harms committed within the prison industrial complex. In an op-ed about reforming the movement, an SFV member, noted that incarcerated individuals are "subjected to deplorable conditions and violence." This op-ed called for a "reimagined" movement dedicated to solutions that address harm, promote healing but do not perpetuate further violence.

SFV showed that abolition is not an easy solution, but one that requires in-depth study and greater public recognition of how violence is reproduced in the criminal legal system. They advocated for an anti-violence movement centered on providing support for survivors rather than promoting punishments for perpetrators. SFV recommended sanctions that prioritized the survivors' will and safety on campus and argued that universal sanctions are ineffective as survivors' may seek different forms of "justice." As part of an anti-carceral approach to violence

prevention, SFV also focused on implementing violence prevention training and consent education well before college to address harm before they occur and institutional oversight to prevent universities from enacting harm against survivors. These proposed solutions demonstrate an approach to violence organizing that targets institutional change over individual "justice" or punishment, and as such, society rather than individuals become targets for social change.

While advocating for the abolition of prisons and policing, these survivor organizers also recognized the appeal of carceral approaches to sexual violence. Later in the interview, Octavia noted the difficulty of working with survivors who wanted to pursue criminal charges and see their rapists in prison, "And as an advocate and someone who supports survivors, who helps survivors, and works closely with them, **I can't tell them no** [emphasis added by participant]. I have to do what they think is best for them." Similarly, Lexi the team leader of SFV, shared that those working in the movement are often operating from a place of trauma. She noted that this presents challenges for the movement, "It's hard to find wins when we are all coming from such different places of views as well as pain and trauma." As survivors of violence, these members recognized the desire to engage with the criminal legal system. However, several survivors also noted that this is a desire they came to recognize as socially produced and one they worked to unlearn. These perspectives on abolitionist organizing within the context of a movement against gender-based violence reveal how trauma responses are connected to cultural norms and expectations about how individuals and societies should respond to crime. Furthermore, abolition practices required engagement with a continuum of learning regarding gender-based violence and harms associated with the carceral state. Conflicts emerged in the movement as activists fall within different points along this learning continuum and, as a result, adopt differing perspectives on the best ways to address this problem.

I argue that SFV's anti-carceral approach may be particularly effective given recent cultural pushback against survivors and the anti-violence movement. Lexi from SFV described the challenge of responding to this recent cultural shift:

> And so, I've been in so many debates with folks where they just throw the phrase due process at me but have no context for what that means. And when I try to explain it to them, they just assume that I'm trying to take away the rights of respondents. And what's been so frustrating is SFV constantly has folks, especially on Twitter, being like "what about the accused?" And we always respond and say, please see our recommendations for fair process protections. We do care about a fair process and have had folks whose education has been harmed by our schools aren't handling our cases correctly. We know what it's like to have our education taken away. We don't want to do that to anyone else unfairly. A fair process is really essential to us. But because we are women and because we are survivors, it's assumed that we don't care about respondents. Which is simply not true!
> …
>
> Anytime I talk to parents, like anytime I do an interview, I am constantly asked "what about my son?" My response is always, your son is more likely to be sexually assaulted than falsely accused. And, if you are not worried about your son being safe from sexual violence, you're doing it wrong. And I think that's been so hard this narrative of men are victims, and we lie, and we make things up. And we are just looking to kick a boy out of school because we regret the sex we've had. And I always appreciate when one of my team, when we were meeting with the Department of Ed, and they said to us what about these girls, how do they know the difference between regretful sex and assault, I think it just might be sex that they regret. And one of my team said, "Trust me. We've all had sex that we regret, but I know the difference between my rape and just a bad [sexual experience]." And I think that's the common narrative, it's just these girls making mistakes and being sad that they made a mistake. When we know that's not the actuality. That's not what the data shows. What's been so hard is just our cultural idea of disbelieving survivors is so deeply embedded that it's hard to fight that. We can show up and say that, so I use University of Michigan. Over 200 survivors report to their school, and only one person was expelled. If we are looking at that margin, we are clearly not holding people accountable. But the facts don't matter to folks. And I think that has been really hard to come up against and really hard to move on is that for some reason our culture cares more about folks accidentally being held accountable for something they didn't do, instead of a survivor being forced out of their education because they were raped.

In the face of widespread narratives of false reporting and in a society where, in Lexi's words "facts don't matter," SFV emphasized anti-carceral approaches to gender-based violence. SFV

did not recommend strategies that would limit a perpetrator's ability to access education. For example, they publicly opposed noting sexual misconduct on students' transcripts as this could reduce reporting and "mimic the criminal legal system." Additionally, they were one of only a few organizations to oppose a mandatory minimum sentencing bill inspired, in part, by the six-month sentence received by Brock Turner, a Stanford student who was convicted of raping a woman. In a press release opposing this legislation, SFV noted that chargers would unlikely fall on those "who look like Turner" but would have a disproportionate impact on Black, Latino, and low-income persons. These actions refute claims by men's rights organizers that survivors only seek to punish men or do not care about consequences that those accused of sexual violence face. SFV serves as an example of what fair process can look like outside of a criminal legal system.

The re-emergence of anti-carceral and carceral divides between student activists in this movement demonstrates the continuing contention over feminist values and subjugation of marginalized voices within this movement. In this climate, SFV abolitionist organizers found new allies in a growing anti-policing and prison abolitionist movement and a potential defense against claims from a surging men's rights counter-movement. As researchers, service providers, administrators, and other stakeholders in the fight to address gender-based violence on campus seek to negotiate increasing tension between survivors' and respondents' rights, anti-carceral solutions hold great potential.

Local Response to Political Change

The political and cultural shifts above were felt far more by members of SFV than CAV. This difference in the degree of impact illustrates how local context determines strategies and goals of student activists. The exception to this trend was Cavaliers Against Violence members' response to the proposed new Title IX rules; however, even in CAV's response, we see the influence of

the local campus environment. CAV desired to project themselves as a non-political group and to focus on their local campus, their engagement in the controversy over the proposed Title IX rules represented a new strategy and slight diversion from their standard actions. After Betsy DeVos opened the notice and comment period for the proposed new Title IX rules, CAV held a general meeting to address the proposed changes and discuss the notice and comment process. Denise, the director of the Survivor Advocacy Center, suggested that the CAV executive team host this event. While it was debated, the team agreed to hold the meeting, but they chose not to create a comment from CAV. Instead, individual members would be able to submit their own comments if they desired to do so. Below is an overview of the CAV notice and comment meeting, from my fieldnotes:

> I arrived on campus around 6pm. It was cold for January in the South. The temperature had recently dipped below freezing, and few students were walking around campus. The classroom had three rows of long tables arranged in a horseshoe to face the front of the room. One the whiteboard was written:
>
> > Comments submitted to: Regulations.gov
> >
> > Section 106.44(e)(1)(ii): The proposed Title IX regulation will change the definition of sexual harassment from "severe, pervasive, or objectively offensive" to "severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive." One word will limit what is legally considered sexual harassment and make it much more difficult for survivors of sexual violence to receive assistance specifically through Title IX.
> >
> > Section 106.45(b)(iii): The proposed Title IX regulation will affect the jurisdiction afforded to the university when supporting survivors of sexual violence. If an instance of sexual violence occurs off campus, for example, the Title IX Coordinator will not be able to support the survivor in the manner they are able to now.
> >
> > Section 106.45(b)(3)(vii): The proposed Title IX regulation will require the university to allow the advisors to the complainant and respondent to cross-examine each party and witnesses. Cross-examination under the advisor to the potential perpetrator will significantly affect the hearing process for the potential survivor.

By the time the meeting started there were around thirty to thirty-five people present. This was one of the most well attended meetings CAV had all year. The group included students, faculty, and staff. Almost all were women. The meeting has been organized around three guest speakers Denise, Paige--the Title IX coordinator, and the head of the Counseling Center.

Paige spoke for the majority of the meeting. She began by explaining the history of Title IX and changes that went into effect with the 2011 Dear Colleagues Letter as well as changes that followed after DeVos rescinded this letter. She then turned to the proposed rules. She highlighted the concern her office and university had with the specific parts of the new rules that were listed on the board. She walked through each of these issues and how the university planned to respond. She encouraged everyone to read the 140 pages of proposed rules for themselves and advised that they make short comments [She mentioned that this was advice she had also been given about the notice and comment process, but she did not say who had advised her office]. Once she had made her way through the proposed changes and possible outcomes, she began to take questions from audience members. Most of these questions came from faculty or staff. As Paige answered concerns regarding how the university would navigate these changes, she emphasized that the priority was maintaining resources for students, but these resources and accommodations may now come from Survivor Advocacy Center instead of through the Title IX office.

To close the meeting, Denise announced she had planned to show a video from SFV about how to write an effective comment but would "skip it for the sake of time." She wrote down the link for those who wanted to write a comment. "If you want to write a comment—you can do so now if you would like pull out your PC or cell phone. As students, you're also welcome to reach out to the administration. Express your opinions and concerns." She reiterated a few of Paige's main points, specifically drawing attention to the three rule changes written on the board. The first, the change in sexual harassment, would mean that schools wouldn't be able to stop these things till after they had happened. Schools also wouldn't be able to prevent escalation of harassment. Additionally, the second part of the rule. "How do you define what are university events? What is adjacent to campus?" She recalled an incident where a student was assaulted off campus but nearby a campus building. "Is this adjacent? Also, the issues already mentioned associated with use of live cross examination." She reiterated Paige's point about their concerns about SES differences between students. She reminded everyone that the notice and comment period will close on Jan. 30th. Denise said, "One thing that we have heard about writing effective comments that are more likely to be read and considered is using data and statistics as much as possible." She showed the handsoffix.org site that included links to helpful statistics and notes that individuals could use when writing their comments. She encouraged students to "be factual. Avoid blaming or putting the department on the defensive—we've been advised this will help people to avoid getting their comments kicked out." However, she also mentions that people are welcome to use personal stories or

> their experiences when writing comments. Denise's last piece of advice for comment writers in the room was to make an alternative suggestion if you are going to critique part of the rules."

In this lengthy meeting, it was clear that BSU's Title IX office and Survivor Advocacy center were advocating for best practices within the confines of the new rules, and it appeared that BSU administration were willing to follow these practices. In fact, in implementing the eventual Title IX rule changes, BSU's new policy met all but one of the criteria that SFV suggested for schools to "doing everything possible to protect survivors."[20] This included ensuring that off campus sexual assaults would still be adjudicated through campus' sexual misconduct process even if separate from Title IX and that students would have access to resources such as advisors without paying a fee.

Students at BSU may have been protected from some of the worst components of the new rules based on the university's approach. Given the university's willingness to protect survivors' rights in spite of these changes, CAV's passive approach may have been the best strategic action. However, the rules in and of themselves still represented a threat. In the face of this threat and under pressure from Denise, CAV hosted the notice and comment meeting, but members did not write a comment together or publicly appeal to the administration despite encouragement from Counseling and the Survivor Advocacy Center during the general meeting. This event emphasizes CAV's desire to appear politically unaligned. This apolitical approach was debated amongst the executive board, yet they continued to abstain from direct public actions. Patrick, who had been involved

[20] BSU did not include a specific timeline for completing investigations in the new Title IX and sexual misconduct policy. It is also possible a timeline existed that was not listed on the BSU Title IX website.

with CAV for two years explained what he felt was at the root of this inaction, despite some members' expressed desire to take a more "public stance":

> I think it's the sort of, leadership, I don't mean we are incapable of leading but up until this point we haven't taken any definitive steps to determine. We're still doing the same things over and over again. We talk about it all the time. What can we do? But I don't think there is a lot of effort outside those one-hour meetings, different programming strategies, different marketing strategies, different activism. I think a large part of that is due to the fact that we are full-time students. We get really used to compartmentalizing academic work and social interactions, then work-work. At least for me it's a lot of times out of sight, out of mind, not just for CAV but for everything…And the fact that most of our, at exec level, we are all in rigorous academic programs and we're involved in something else that's not CAV. We're spreading ourselves thin.

Patrick's explanation highlights the power of existing organizational logics. Walker and colleagues (2008) noted that organizers' familiarity with tactics often shape future actions. This was certainly apparent in CAV's approach to proposed Title IX rules. Students also had a practical incentive to default to these former strategies as implementing new events, campaigns, or programming required time, a limited resource among CAV's small and ever-changing team.

CAV's apolitical organizing strategy was also bread out of a concern from CAV members who believed that direct action would alienate them from certain campus groups, namely Greek organizations and conservatives. Furthermore, the organization was receiving some level of support from BSU administration. This desire to avoid conflict combined with a perception of campus administrators as receptive to students concerns and organizational logics that promoted a continuation or former organizing strategies that called for the appearance of political neutrality led CAV to address publicly address the potential threat of the proposed Title IX rules, but rely on individual

rather than collective opposition to these rules. In the next section, I describe the consequences of this apolitical organizing strategy.

Power Dynamics on Campus

CAV's organizing practices show the importance of considering context and differences between organizations within the same movement. Scholars have warned against social movement theorizing that defaults to whiteness and the need to examine racialized dimensions of all social movements, not just those that seek to address racial justice (Bracey 2016; Oliver 2017). Additionally, those who have used an intersectional lens to examine social movements have highlighted how intersecting inequalities determine whose concerns are addressed by movements and which individuals are recognized as social movement leaders (Naples 2002; Robnett 1997).[21] In this section, I attempt to answer Glen Bracey's (2016: 11) "call to simultaneously theorize collective action and the system of inequality with which a movement is engaged" by examining how CAV's goals and strategies were shaped by power dynamics on campus.

In Chapter Three, I described SFV as centering the needs of racially marginalized survivors, as well as LGBTQ+, undocumented, and disabled students. For SFV, the structure of the organization and makeup of leadership both represented intentional attempts to ensure that survivors from marginalized communities were involved in determining the organization's goals and strategies. SFV's actions support assertions that the new campus anti-violence movement is an intersectional movement (Milkman 2017). However, as I have argued throughout this dissertation, this is not a monolithic movement. CAV struggled to adopt this intersectional approach in their responses to gender-based violence on campus. CAV's strategies and goals

[21] It is worth noting that there has been significant debate about how best to utilize intersectional analysis (see Roth 2017 for overview).

were shaped by the local culture of BSU's campus. In this section, I show that CAV's practices and strategies to address gender-based violence often centered whiteness, even as they actively sought to bring awareness to Black women's experiences of sexual violence. I argue that CAV was situated in a "white institutional space" (Moore 2008), and the organization absorbed many of the characteristics of this space. Given that racism does not operate in isolation, the white institutional space of BSU cannot be discussed without also examining how these practices of racism were intertwined with patriarchal and heteronormative values.

BSU as a white institutional space

Wendy Moore's (2008) examination of elite law schools as white institutional spaces highlighted how social institutions and organizations are formed by and reproduce the racialized social structure of the United States. In her recent article revisiting contemporary white institutional spaces, Moore (2020: 1957-8) asserts:

> Moreover, contemporary dynamics of White space must include examination of the racial dynamics of advantage and disadvantage, control and exploitation, and action and emotion within organizations; including the interacting mechanisms of hidden White organizing logics or curricula, racialized demographics of power, color-blind racist discourses and ideologies, racialized everyday cultures, practices and microaggressions, and how these mechanisms function in coordination to reproduce White power and privilege within organizational and institutional spaces.

I argue that Big South University exists as a white institutional space, similar to other institutions of higher education. BSU did not enroll Black students prior to the early 1960s. Norms of whiteness were embedded into the structure and culture of the university. For example, BSU's mascot has long been criticized as racist and glorifying historical violence. The university responded by rebranding the mascot in an attempt to disconnect the image from its history but kept the name. This is why I selected "Cavaliers" as a pseudonym for this dissertation—to

capture, at least in part, the significance of this symbolic representation of white supremacy on campus.

In addition to contestation over the mascot, BSU is one of many schools in the southern region of the U.S. that has been criticized for maintaining confederate monuments on campus. A student social justice group on campus organized a protest for the removal of a monument during my observations of CAV. Later, a "pro-Confederate" group organized a counter-protest in support of the monument. This counter-protest is symbolic of the role of BSU within the state. The campus often served as a site for state-wide debates regarding racialized injustice and white supremacy, drawing in students as well as white supremacist groups from the surrounding areas and across the state. Students also organized to address racial microaggressions on campus, and BSU administrators were called on to respond to racist comments by key figures associated with the university. These instances demonstrate the racialized culture and practices on campus, signifying that BSU was a white institutional space.

CAV was situated within this white institutional space. Scholars have explored the impact of teaching and attending predominantly white institutions that privilege whiteness. (Cabrera 2019; Feagin, Vera, and Imani 2014; Gusa 2010). I extend this literature by emphasizing how this college campus culture shaped the strategies and practices of student advocates within CAV. Furthermore, as Moore (2008) argued for the importance of understanding the relationship between racialized social organizations, institutions, and the racialized social structure of the US, I seek to include smaller campus organizations and student groups within discussions of universities as white institutional spaces.

Centering Privilege

CAV members felt it was critical to their mission to include groups and students who held power on campus in the organization. In cultivating relationships with these groups, CAV was better able to implement peer education training and promote awareness of affirmative consent on campus. Over a third of the undergraduate student body at BSU were involved in Greek life on campus. Athletic groups were also highly celebrated on campus. These organizations have been shown to contribute to rape culture on college campuses (Armstrong et al. 2006; Griffin et al. 2017). While CAV executive team members all acknowledged the role of rape culture in perpetuating sexual assault and harm to survivors, there was extensive disagreement between members about whether organizations such as fraternities contributed to rape culture at BSU. In interviews, some members noted that these organizations maintained too much power on campus, but others felt that Greek life was often scapegoated for problems that were actually tied to party culture on campus. Many of the members who expressed this belief were themselves members of Greek organizations.

In practice, CAV members were careful to avoid placing blame on these groups during events and peer educator programming. They emphasized the need to maintain good relationships with Greek life and remain "apolitical" in the eyes of the student body. As feminist scholars have long argued, "the personal is political." While CAV saw inaction as a means to avoid conflict for those oppressed by the political and cultural environment of the campus, inaction is political action. In their attempts to present themselves as student advocates dedicated to fighting what they saw as a universal problem, one that can be experienced by all people and perpetrated by anyone, CAV members effectively privileged those who have been perceived as

"targets" of the larger campus anti-violence movement. This is demonstrated in the fieldnote excerpt below describing a meeting of the CAV executive team:

> The general meeting had wrapped-up and the non-executive team members had left. Only Jayda [Treasurer], Lance [Head Peer Educator], Patrick [Community Outreach Chair], Kerry [President], Sarah Ann [Secretary], and I were left in the small 30-person classroom. Sabra [Social Media] joined later after a Student Government event concluded. Lance, Patrick and Jayda moved two tables on the right side of the room. The table and chairs were positioned so that students faced one another with the two tables in the middle. I sat at a third table that ran perpendicular to where these members of the exec team were now sitting. Kerry started off this exec team meeting by discussing plans for an upcoming bystander intervention panel that they had organized in partnership with other student groups on campus. They would be discussing a range of different types of violence and how students could intervene. Most of the conversation revolved around recruiting different student groups to attend, which groups should be invited to participate, a minor debate about inviting the Republican student group to attend but not to participate as panelists, and so on. Kerry continued to move through the meeting agenda, eventually getting to the final discussion—elections.
>
> CAV would vote on a new executive team for Spring-Fall 2020 in a month. Sabra had posted several reminders about the elections on social media over the past few weeks, and there were several email reminders to submit your name if you planned on running for a position. Kerry said she was "so stressed" and "trying not to panic." Her major concern was that several key executive positions remained unfilled, and no one had expressed interest in running so far. She noted that two people had signed-up to run for President which was important because, "President is the biggest concern. All other positions you can throw anyone into." Kerry said she thought it was also important for there to be at least one man on the executive team. Most of the room nodded in agreement with her statement. Sabra asked Lance if a new peer educator, Chad, would consider running [Chad had not attended many meetings or events that semester. However, he had been trained and presented as a peer educator. He was also the student who had fallen asleep several times in the peer educator training at the beginning of this semester]. Lance didn't think he would have the time as he was heavily involved in their Greek organization. He suggested Chad's friend and another member of his fraternity, Johnathan, who had also recently completed the peer educator training program. Lance said he had other people he could "nudge" to consider running [likely other members of his fraternity]. Kerry asked the group to focus back on President. "It has to be Sarah Ann or Ashley." She noted the awkwardness as Sarah Ann was still in the room for this conversation, but Sarah Ann nodded and said it was fine. "It's just you're a sophomore," Kerry said with an apologetic look on her face. She thought that Ashley should be President as she had seniority. Jayda interjected, "We've had sophomores before." Sabra suggested they act as co-Presidents. As the room looked to Sarah Ann, she said

> she would be fine with that. Kerry said she wanted to talk with Ashley [the other student running] but thought it was a good idea as well. Everyone seemed to approve of this solution. Kerry concluded the discussion about elections by reminding everyone that they would need to meet with the person who took over their position several times before the end of the semester, so they [the new executive team] would be prepared for sexual assault awareness month. The rest of the meeting focused on how to improve student participation in CAV and concerns about the long-term stability of CAV.
>
> Fieldnotes, Executive Team Meeting, Fall 2019

This short conversation about the upcoming elections and future executive team of CAV points to the leadership priorities of members. In 2019, three out of the eight members on the executive team were men. The previous year, a man served as CAV President. During both of these years, there had only been one person on the executive board who was not white, Jayda, a Black woman, and a few of the peer educators were Black, Latino, and Asian students during the time I observed the organization. However, when it was time to select a new leadership team for CAV, the priority was including a man. Race was never mentioned. CAV leaders did not make purposeful efforts to recruit Black or LGBTQ+ students even after hosting programs that emphasized the urgency of considering the needs of these populations when addressing violence on campus.

The whiteness of the group went unnoticed by most white members because whiteness was viewed as normative. When CAV held their elections, the position of Head Peer Educator was sought after by two students who had undergone peer educator training early that semester. One of the candidates, Caitlin, was a Black woman and the other, Frances, was a white woman. Although both had equal levels of experience within the organization [they had completed peer education training in the same semester and had completed the same number of presentations] and shared similar rationales for seeking the position, Frances won the position. Caitlin was then asked if she would like to serve as Treasurer, which was one of two unfilled positions at the time

and the same position that Jayda had occupied. I recall sitting in the room and being struck by the fact that not only did the execs, who represented most of the voters in the room, not consider the need to include Black students on the team, but they voted against a woman who would have been the only Black student on the team that year. The fact that Caitlin ultimately accepted the same position that Jayda had previously occupied seemed to symbolically represent the marginalization of Black students' experiences not only on BSU campus but in CAV.

CAV's apolitical strategy prompted them to treat organizing as a race-neutral act, but this remains ineffective in a racist campus culture. This apolitical approach to addressing power dynamics on campus extended to gender and patriarchy as well, although to a lesser extent. Student leaders in this organization recognized that sexual violence and dating violence were gendered problems largely because they disproportionately impact women. Further, although they attempted to use gender-neutral language in presentations to emphasize that both men and women can experience gender-based violence, they also recognized men are more likely to be perpetrators of gender-based violence than women. However, they often failed to publicly recognize that gender shapes causes and consequences of sexual and dating violence on campus, not just rates of violence. For instance, they did not discuss in peer education presentations how patriarchal norms and practices on campus, such as men controlling party spaces (Armstrong et al. 2006), contribute to gender-based violence, but they dispelled several rape myths. At the same time, CAV members noted the role of rape culture and sexualization of women's bodies as causes of gender-based violence in interviews. The peer education training session also included a brief discussion of patriarchy by Dr. Black, a psychologist, who worked in the counseling office and specialized in healthy relationship education. This contrasting approach shows gender inequality was on the periphery of discussions about gender-based violence within CAV and,

largely, omitted entirely from their public programming. This prevented CAV members from grappling with unique factors that contribute to violence especially against minoritized students.

As noted in Chapter 2, CAV members primarily viewed gender-based violence as caused by a lack of knowledge about consent. They sought to include men and members of Greek life in the organization to have better access to these groups and ensure their education program remained effective. Also, as we see here, CAV was committed to maintaining an apolitical public image. They wanted gender-based violence to be seen as a student issue, not a woman's issue. However, this practice also promoted members of dominant gender and racialized groups into the leadership of CAV. Lance's entrance into CAV exemplified this process:

> I'm from a small southern town, and, growing up, I never experienced any type of violence, sexual assault, or [violence] for my sexual orientation. I always thought of rape as the only type of sexual assault or gender-based violence, in those terms. When I came to BSU, I joined a fraternity. My freshman year, three or four months in, and the fraternity that I joined [name of fraternity]. I love it. I'm glad that I joined it. I joined it because of the people in there, and I thought that they were good people, but it had a bad reputation from a previous event [this event took place the year before Lance enrolled at BSU]. … And [name of event] is an amazing event. We're doing it again this year. We've reorganized it some, but it's a big philanthropic event for my fraternity…We had a competition for each sorority. We put a girl up to be the [Queen/Sweetheart]. And it was a cool honor to get. You know they'd ask you some questions and it was kind of like a little pageant. Well, him on the mic, he was too drunk, we shouldn't have let him have the mic. He said some very uncomfortable questions and was sexually harassing girls.
>
> …
>
> I never thought of [name of fraternity] like that till I heard about that one event. That gentleman was kicked out of the fraternity, and we've done a lot since then to change our image and to change hopefully the way a lot of guys think. One of them being pushing participation in CAV. Freshman year they said, "Hey guys. There is this great organization on campus. We really want to become—want y'all to become a member of it. Want you to get more involved in stuff like this." So I found out about CAV through my fraternity. I was pushed to join it. They didn't say you should join it. They said we need some people to join it. And some older guys that were already in the fraternity, [name of fraternity member and one of first members of CAV], encouraged me to join. So, I applied. I went to some of the regular meetings, and then I applied and got into their peer ed program. And at first, I just thought it was something that my fraternity really wanted me to do and

> that I needed to do, but then I realized this is such an important organization. And we start off with six guys from my fraternity in the group, I'm the only one that actively participates any more. Cause I realize it's something I care about outside of my fraternity. That's how I got involved in stuff like this.

Lance joined CAV initially because his fraternity used pledges, new and temporary members who are seeking access to an elite social group, to repair their reputation on campus. While Lance stayed in CAV due to his personal commitment to addressing gender-based violence, he also took steps to shield his fraternity and the former member who had sexually harassed women at this event. Twice he noted that this man was "too drunk" when he sexually harassed women in public. Lance used this explanation despite being the Head Peer Educator of a bystander intervention training program that emphasizes alcohol is not an excuse to assault someone.

Mason, former President of CAV and also a member of a social fraternity, was on the executive board of CAV when this incident occurred. He noted CAV "had to help them a lot [referring to Lance's fraternity]." Mason described that the members of the fraternity were frustrated with CAV and felt like they had been targeted, but Mason maintained that CAV had acted as a resource and worked with the organization to help them understand the significance of the issue. There was significant disagreement between CAV members about the role Greek life played in perpetuating sexual violence on campus; however, the organization continued to act as a service to these organizations. Peer education training allowed them to meet requirements set by their national chapters. CAV viewed the inclusion of Greek life as a necessary and important part of their strategy for addressing lack of knowledge about consent. However, the organization not only educated Greek life members, but they consistently placed them in leadership positions within CAV. This practice helped Greek life organizations to legitimatize their concern with gender-based violence on campus without addressing structures that perpetuate violence. Once again, CAV's decisions regarding their organizational make-up while appearing apolitical and

promoting neutrality have personal and political consequences as these decisions reproduced gendered, social, and racialized power dynamics of BSU.

Whiteness as the Default

> What are issues we haven't talked about? So, the **huge** thing that we did [emphasis added by participant]. I can't believe I haven't talked about it before this! But I am so happy that we did have an event about sexual violence and the Black experience. I am the only Black person on our executive team. And it also feels like very few of us in the organization. So, it's always really making sure that I speak up for my community, as well as…so making sure that we are heard because we have never done that before. So that was very impactful for me having something where I feel like I am heard and, the people, the community that I come from are seen and heard. Because we don't even talk about it. I don't think we even. I know these things, but that's not even in our PowerPoint [peer educator PowerPoint] is how much more Black women experience sexual violence than any other group of people. So, I am sure that relates to students on this campus as well. It's very important that we are also heard and that we get to speak out against things as well.
>
> Jayda, Cavaliers Against Violence

Like BSU, CAV often treated whiteness as the default, relied on white logics, and relied on color-blind racist ideologies. Bonilla-Silva (2006) describes color-blind racist ideologies as frames that white individuals use to dismiss the impact of institutionalized racism that operates, often covertly, to reinforce white supremacy. Mueller (2017:234) argued for greater focus on the role of culture in reinforcing colorblindness:

> Examining colorblindness as an everyday, recursive accomplishment brings these nuances into relief. White students' creative and often strident efforts to avoid, repair, or otherwise metabolize a breach in colorblindness betray an epistemology of ignorance that I believe better grounds models of racial ideology. This socio-psychological focus on process more clearly marks everyday whites' role in maintaining the cultural tools of colorblindness and, further, reveals means by which whites refashion new tools when necessary, to mystify domination and make racial reproduction manageable; this focus also elevates the psychic, specifically moral investments that accompany whites' racial reproduction.

CAV events and members of the executive team, as well as some of the few general members active in the organization, consistently ignored how gender-based violence and racism were

intertwined within or outside of campus. Jayda, drew attention to the absence of discussions related to racism or any recognition of race within CAV. Given CAV's embeddedness within a campus culture where racialized power dynamics were actively being contested, this erasure arguably represents a strategic choice to align with colorblindness and whiteness. CAV's main advocacy initiative, the peer educator program, is emblematic of this choice.

At several points in this portion of the interview, Jayda came back to the omission of statistics about rates of sexual violence among Black women, as well as the fact CAV had not "pushed" for peer educator presentations at Black sororities and fraternities. In presenting general statistics on gender-based violence among college students and targeting predominantly white fraternities, CAV made choices to prioritize white students and their organizations. Their choices did not appear to members as racialized because these actions resemble those of other student organizations, BSU administrators, course curricula, and many other aspects of campus life – in other words, an entire campus culture that privileged whiteness. Like students in Mueller's (2017) study, when colorblindness and white logics were challenged, members of the CAV executive team responded in ways that implied ignorance about the prevalence of racialized inequality. Jayda explained how some CAV exec members were initially unsure about what to include in the "Black Experiences of Sexual Violence" presentation:

> So, when we did that event, I'm sure most of the people on our exec never heard about it, never talked about it, never needed to talk about it. So, they came away from that hearing Dr. Frazier speak [the speaker for the Black Experiences of Sexual Violence event]. And even before that when they were like 'What do we talk about? What are we doing?'. And me telling them, and me being able to talk about that identity of myself, because I've never talked about as a Black woman on this campus. We've needed to, but we've never done it. So, I've always just been the identity of being a female, student advocate, ally on this campus. Not a Black female, you know what I mean?

The CAV executive team repeatedly discussed the importance of educating themselves and the general student body about gender-based violence, and they were tasked with providing information and resources to students on campus. However, when asked by the Black Student Union to organize an event to address sexual violence in the Black community, specifically sexual violence committed by R. Kelly, they were uncertain how to respond. This ignorance was not only a result of CAV's own practices of whiteness as a default but the training they received from offices on campus that also ignored intersections of racism and gender-based violence and treated white survivors' experiences as universal. In three peer education trainings over three semesters, the specific experiences of racially marginalized, queer, undocumented, or disabled students were not addressed by the BSU police, the Counseling Center, Survivor Advocacy Office/Student Advocacy Center, Title IX, or any of the other guest speakers from service-providers on campus. These student activists relied on these campus service providers and offices to educate them about gender-based violence. CAV's organizing practices reinforced whiteness and universal messages of gender-based violence that they learned in this training.

CAV members' failure to think about how whiteness impacted experiences of sexual violence left a gap in their programming that needed to be filled. These advocates were aware of the need to consider which peer educators spoke to fraternities and sororities and try to match them with Greek peer educators, but they gave little consideration to how legacies of false reporting against Black men by white women and current practices of racialized violence within the legal system and medical community may impact Black students' experiences of gender-based violence on campus. CAV's embeddedness within the white institutional space of BSU (and the US more generally) resulted in the reproduction of white logics and practices within their own advocacy work.

As a consequence of reproducing whiteness within their organization and privileging dominant groups, CAV members, including the executive board, struggled to understand connections between gender-based violence and other systems of inequality. As exemplified by Jayda's statement, this placed an additional burden on her as the sole representative for all marginalized people on campus within the organization.

> So that was very satisfying to be able to talk about that and experience that. It really is telling because after, knowing that we've never talked about it, knowing that we've never advocated for that community, and afterwards 'Okay. Dang! We've never done this.' And this has been going on almost four years. **That's yeah!** [emphasized and drawn out by participant]. And I know they felt that! This is a major thing that we're doing this, and we should have been doing this, and we need to continue doing this. So, it's cool getting to share that side of who I am with them. I'm sure when they look at me, they know, but you don't necessarily have to address it. So, I love that I got to address who I am. So that is a huge difference for me. I know that there are things that they never think about or necessarily have to think about that catch my eye. Like the fact that we don't talk about how much more Black women are victims of sexual violence, and that's not in our PowerPoint. I'm sure most of them haven't thought about that.

For Jayda, the centering of whiteness within this organization meant that her experiences as a Black woman on campus often went unaddressed.

These practices of invisibility and dominance extended to cissexism and heterosexism as well. In my interviews with the 2019 executive board, Jayda and Lance both commented that they did not believe there were any LGBTQ+ people on the exec team. However, Taylor was a gay man who had served on the exec team for the past two years. Just as Jayda did not discuss her racial identity in CAV general or exec meetings, Taylor did not discuss his sexuality. When a speaker from the Office of Cultural Inclusion who identified publicly as non-binary and shared that they use them/they pronouns came to speak, Lance misgendered them and used she/her pronouns, much to the chagrin of Kerry, who pulled me aside, to say she had reminded him several times of their pronouns. During my time observing CAV, I was open about my identity

as a queer woman, which I believe motivated Kerry to discuss this with me. When CAV members asked about my family or personal life, I disclosed that I was married to a woman. My own sexuality and status as a gender scholar placed me in a unique position during my observations. In taking a participatory observer role, I was regularly volunteering and assisting CAV with events; however, I would occasionally be consulted about questions related to gender or LGBTQ+ issues. I was also asked to be one of the panelists for CAV's LGBTQ+ Discussion Panel.[22] Through these interactions, I built further rapport with CAV members, but these interactions also showed the limitations of the groups' understanding of power dynamics related to gender, sexuality, and race.

Cultures of dominance on campus were reconstructed within CAV, ultimately creating a white, patriarchal, heteronormative, and cisnormative space. Most CAV members were unaware of how these systems of oppression shape survivors' experiences of violence or contribute to gender-based violence. Candace, the Black woman who ran for Head Peer Educator, discussed racialized violence on campus during her interview, but when I asked, "Do you think that sexual violence or sexual harassment is related to race on this campus?" She said, "no." I recount this example to illustrate that CAV members' personal experiences of oppression were not the sole cause of their ignorance. Their apolitical, "race-neutral," and universal understandings of gender-based violence were also a result of their embeddedness within a campus culture that reified dominance and ignored systemic oppression. However, campus culture is not universal or singular. In the next section, I describe how CAV's strategies and practices were shaped by non-hegemonic campus culture as well.

[22] I discuss the methodological implications of this decision in the Appendix.

Practices of Inclusion

While CAV was embedded within and reproduced aspects of BSU as a white institutional space and often privileged those in positions of power on campus, CAV members were taking steps to be more inclusive during this study. The executive team organized several events in 2019 to address gender-based violence faced by members of marginalized communities, including the "Black Experiences of Sexual Violence" event that Jayda referred to, an LGBTQ+ panel, and a student panel on bystander intervention that promoted interpersonal intervention in response to sexual violence, homophobia, sexism, xenophobia, and ableism. The "Black Experiences of Sexual Violence" event was the only event addressing Black individuals in the four years since CAV's inception, and it warrants additional attention.

> I arrived at the lecture hall a few minutes early and saw about 20 students standing in front of the door. I was surprised as most CAV events were sparsely attended. As it turned out, this was a different student organization that had ended their meeting and were leaving the room in large groups. I entered the room and found Kerry and Jayda standing next to Dr. Frazier, a Black woman in her late 30s or early 40s. Kerry introduced me to Dr. Frazier, who was the guest speaker for this event and an Associate Professor of Social Work. The classroom was divided into two sections with stadium style seats on either side of a wide stairway that led to a sound booth in the back of the room. I walked up about ten steps or so and sat on the right side of the room. By the start of the event, there were around 21 people total which is around the same number of participants as some of CAV's other events such as the Roll, Red, Roll film screening the previous semester or the Love Is Healthy Relationships event the week before. Three white men who I did not recognize from previous events were sitting at the very back of the classroom near the sound booth. These men sat quietly and did not comment during the presentation. Six Black women were sitting together with Jayda in the front two rows on the right talking amongst themselves, several other members of the executive team were present, including Sarah Ann, Sabra, Patrick, and Taylor, and two women that had been part of CAV executive team last year but left the organization due to time commitments in their senior year. Denise from the Student Advocacy Center, a woman from the Counseling Center, and the director of a community family violence center were also in attendance and sitting together a couple rows in front of me.
>
> Dr. Frazier asked that before we begin—we take a moment to help her in honoring the ancestors. She poured a clear liquid, most likely water, on a potted

> plant that was on the table in front of the projector screen and said "libation." She asked the audience to show their presence and participation by saying "ashay." She said this is a Swahili word that means "to be with us." She said that we ask our ancestors to be with us in this discussion and support and guide us. "First, we honor those who were stolen from their homelands in Africa." She poured liquid onto the plant and said "libation." The audience responded—ashay. Many of the audience members quietly said these words, except for the women at the front and Denise, who repeated the word clearly. Second, "we remember those who were brought across the water on ships of death and in the face of these horrors jumped overboard rather than suffer what awaited them." She poured, called libation, and the audience said ashay, this time louder. Third, she called for the remembrance and to pay respect to the freedom fighters during and after slavery. She asked if the audience could name any. People responded after a few minutes silence with Martin Luther King Jr., Malcom X, Medgar Evers, Harriet Tubman, Rosa Parks, and Ella Baker. She added Trayvon Martin. She poured the liquid, said libation, and the audience said ashay. She then asked that the group honor personal ancestors – people who had moved on but were responsible for us being here and contributed to our success. She mentioned a few people from her own family. Two Black women from the front each mentioned a family member. None of the other students or audience members mentioned anyone. She poured the liquid, said libation, and called ashay. Finally, she asked that people remember the future – people who would come after them and who they themselves would support and were hoping to build a better world for them. She poured, called libation, and the group responded with ashay. She then thanked everyone for their participation. As I watched and participated in this opening exercise, I was struck by how rare it was to see practices that honor ancestral knowledge and highlight Blackness in spaces like this on campuses, BSU and other historically white universities.
>
> Fieldnotes Spring 2019

This is what it means to decenter whiteness. In this one event, CAV highlighted the experiences of Black survivors of gender-based violence. In partnering with the Black Student Union, they sought input and perspective from Black students on campus. However, as Jayda mentioned in her interview, CAV members did not seek to create such an event on their own accord. The President of the Black Student Union asked CAV to facilitate a discussion of R Kelly's sexual abuse of teen girls, and Jayda felt it was important to extend this conversation beyond R Kelly.

The contrast between this event and CAV's regular programs and events shows what is missing in their standard organizing practices and the consequences of defaulting to whiteness.

The benefits of centering marginalized students can be seen from the conversation portion of the Black Experience of Sexual Violence event.

> Dr. Frazier finished her PowerPoint presentation and began a discussion with the audience. She asked the audience, "What do we do? How do we begin to heal when R Kelly's bond was set at a million dollars?" She continued, "How do we reconcile the fact that African American women posted his bail for him? How, why do Black women continue to support Black men and not feel supported in return?" She asked the audience to consider how these things can be reconciled and that some of his most avid supporters have been women, not just recently, but over the years. One of the Black women at the front of the room responded that it feels like "double betrayal." Another emphasized that this practice is something Black women are taught. "We're students in a way—trained to care for Black men from the jump. That we need to look out for Black men no matter what." The other Black women sitting near her at the front nodded in agreement. Another student emphasized the oppression and violence Black men face in society and that Black women are encouraged to praise Black men even in the face of violence or when they lack equality or advocacy in other areas [referencing mistreatment and violence towards Black women]. The speaker asked, "How do we learn to heal and protect?"
>
> Fieldnotes Spring 2019

This had been one of the main focuses of the talk. Dr. Frazier discussed Post-Slavery Syndrome and intergenerational trauma faced by racially and ethnically minoritized groups. One her main points was that violence is often a response to experiences of trauma. "Hurt people hurt." I reflected on this argument a great deal as I took fieldnotes on the way home. It would be easy to reduce this argument to a "justification" of R. Kelly's behavior, but this perspective fails to account for the nuances and attempts of Dr. Frazier to place gender-based violence in relation to histories of racialized violence in the U.S. Furthermore, failure to recognize the interworking of systems of violence is produced through white logics that characterized many of CAV's presentations on gender-based violence. Following up on her question about ways to learn healing and protection, Dr. Frazier offered advice on how to address sexual violence.

> "We need to take steps to end the transmission of violence. To recognize patterns of abuse, place behavior in context of historical oppression, understand trauma as something that is transmitted throughout generations, and reconcile these histories

> and traumas within our own families." She noted that we should point out abuses when we see them and when we are in a safe place to do so we should intervene. "Protect others and reclaim that mammy figure" [this built off one of the points in her presentation about Patricia Hill Collin's (2004) discussion of controlling images]. "One of strength for good. Speak out against violence."
>
> She noted that this isn't about R Kelly—that he is just an archetype and example so that these discussions can occur. At this, several people nodded their heads in agreement. She said that in addition to intervention, "we should focus on therapeutic methods that connect the past and the present." Ambassadors, who she considers the people in the room to be, have a responsibility to learn more. "More than me and what has been said here today. Study, read, and share this message with others. Remember the past and honor the trauma that previous generations and current have experienced. From this place we can begin to interpret trauma, move forward, and move on." She noted the outcomes of healing are strength, well-being, safety, spiritual and religious, and strength as well. Dr. Frazier continued, "This has to be done in the community, but allies can help as well." She gestured to a Bob Marley quote that she wrote on the whiteboard before her presentation, "Emancipate yourselves from mental slavery. None but ourselves can free our minds."
>
> She said that the goal of this event should be opening a dialogue, but she also recognized this can be hard to talk about especially given the history of false reporting against men of color. "There is mistrust of authority that results from years of institutional oppression." A student added that it is also hard because people who never get justice in these institutions are now being pointed to these as solutions. The speaker agreed. She finished her talk by saying that 20 years ago, she stopped listening to R Kelly, that a lot of people got mad at her. She said that her husband would question her about it and play it to annoy her, and she would tell him to stop and that she would not have that music in her house. She said, "you have to be persistent and brave to stand up to injustice—Might be standing alone but standing in truth."
>
> Spring 2019

Following this event, CAV did begin to shift to some more inclusive practices in their programming and training. However, the advice of Dr. Frazier to continue to read and learn was not taken as a goal within the organization. Inclusion within CAV meant creating events and informative meetings where concerns of particular marginalized groups on campus were discussed. However, as demonstrated above, these groups and their needs were not centered in this organizations' standard praxis. Amidst calls on campus for social justice, CAV began to

organize events that spoke to the experiences of Black and LGBTQ+ survivors. These events hold potential for a more inclusive and intersectional approach to organizing. However, I suggest that if CAV members fail to use these events as opportunities to interrogate current organizational practices and to invest in knowledge production among members about how systems of inequality intersect with gender-based violence, these events risk serving as one-off annual symbols of inclusion and diversity. Such events may provide needed space on campus for marginalized students to discuss violence, but they may also "other" students by limiting knowledge and advocacy for these groups to single events, thereby reproducing, once again, the power of dominant social groups in their regular programming.

I argue that a focus on campus cultures reveals how student organizations are situated within and work to reproduce power dynamics of their particular campus. Numerous scholars have classified the campus anti-violence movement as an intersectional movement, but these accounts rely on national organizations and miss how local campus cultures shape student activists' goals, strategies, and understandings of violence on campus (Heldman et al. 2018; Milkman 2017; Whittier 2018). CAV shows how the political climate of a state and campus culture that reifies whiteness, patriarchy, and other forms of dominance may spillover into the organizational structure of local student advocacy groups.

Conclusion

The political and cultural contexts in which SFV and CAV were situated help to explain differences in their strategic approaches to gender-based violence on campus. I emphasize how shifts in state and non-state institutional support for the gender-based violence movement required national organizers to adjust their strategies and targets. Furthermore, I emphasize the importance of local campus cultures as determining strategies and outcomes of student activism.

During the Trump administration, the Department of Education and specifically Office for Civil Rights, which had been utilized by campus anti-violence organizers as a resource for holding schools accountable, became one of the movement's biggest targets. Using social media sites such as Twitter, news media, and op-eds, SFV members drew attention to the harmful policies and regulations promoted by the DOE. They emphasized that these actions were in direct conflict with the department's mandate to protect students' civil right to education. In addition to targeting the DOE, SFV implemented new strategies, shifting attention to state legislatures to advocate for campus policies that would better serve survivors. Finally, in the midst of renewed attention to gender-based violence as a social problem brought about through #MeToo and #TimesUp, campus anti-violence organizers fell along old divides between carceral and anti-carceral feminist approaches to violence. SFV's abolitionist approach served to undermine claims from men's rights activists that survivors seek only punishment and expanded the goals of the campus anti-violence movement by linking this movement's goals with those of prison and policing abolitionists, reproductive justice advocates, and immigrant rights organizations.

For CAV, political shifts at the national level rarely influenced the day-to-day operations of their organizations. CAV members recognized these changes, but their primary goals centered around BSU and the local community. Research has shown that structures of college campuses influence levels of reporting and likelihood of compliance with Clery Act and Title IX (Armstrong et al. 2006; Boyle et al. 2017). I argue that, as researchers begin to center student activists as key stakeholders in the fight to address gender-based violence, we must account for how campus culture and structure influence organizing strategies and outcomes. CAV operated in the white institutional space that characterized BSU, and they often unintentionally reinforced

existing power dynamics and relationships of domination on campus. White men and Greek life were prioritized for inclusion in CAV's efforts as the perception was that these were populations for whom consent education would be most effectively implemented. As a result, members were hesitant to alienate these groups and sought to present CAV as an apolitical organization despite evidence that fraternities play a large role in contributing to rape on campus (Armstrong et al. 2006) Further, the pervasive organizational logic, in many ways a holdover from CAV's founding, often ignored how gender-based violence was linked to racism, sexism, cissexism, heterosexism, and ableism, among other forms of inequality on campus. CAV trainings and events usually treated white, cisgender, straight survivors as the default. The emergence of new events that spoke to experiences of Black and LGBTQ+ students provided an opportunity for CAV to adopt a more inclusive and intersectional approach to organizing, but without investigating their current training programs, organizational logics, and power structure, these events will likely serve as occasional signals of "diversity" within a white, heteronormative space. In concert with scholarship on multi-institutional political approaches, these findings show how multi-institutional social movements may be better positioned to adapt to shifts in political contexts and recognize potential receptive state and non-state institutional targets for change. Furthermore, representations of movements must avoid defaulting to the experiences of national organizers and recognize activists as situated within different cultural contexts. These cultural contexts may result in organizational practices that challenge dominance, as exemplified by SFV's anti-carceral stance, or reproduce it, as demonstrated by CAV.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

At the start of this dissertation, I quoted Princess Harmony, a survivor, who emphasized that those involved in the new campus anti-violence movement experiences of violence are far from universal or limited to sexual assault. This is a theme I have returned to throughout this dissertation. Using Survivors Fighting Violence and Cavaliers Against Violence as examples of national and local social movement organizations involved in this movement, I have drawn attention to divergence in students' motivations for joining the movement; differences in targets, goals, and strategies of these organizations; and discordant viewpoints on political and cultural responses to violence. In this final chapter, I discuss the implications of these findings for social movements that, like the new campus anti-violence movement, target state and non-state institutions. Additionally, I echo scholars who have called for an interdisciplinary and intersectional approach to the study of gender-based violence (Armstrong et al. 2018; Edelman, Leachman, and McAdams 2010; Gronert 2019; Hirsch et al. 2018; Powell and Henry 2014). Specifically, I argue that feminist epistemology should be used to build bridges among gender-based violence researchers, service providers, survivors, institutional powerholders, and activists.

Several major themes that emerged from this study have important implications for understanding social movements and gender-based violence more broadly. First, the new campus anti-violence movement demonstrates variability among social movement actors and organizations. This variability highlights the importance of accounting for social, cultural, and political context in the study of social movements. Second, universal accounts of movements may undermine activists' goals and shape state and institutional responses, often in ways that

reproduce dominant power structures and inequalities. Third, efforts to address gender-based violence require interdisciplinary scholarship and collaboration between multiple stakeholders, including, and arguably most importantly, survivors and student activists. I argue that adopting a feminist epistemology can facilitate the types of partnerships and scholarship necessary for violence prevention social movements to succeed. Finally, I discuss future research directions and practical implications of these findings by highlighting what we can learn from student activists, and how those who are no longer students can support their efforts to eradicate violence in education.

Multi-Institutional Targets Require Multi-Institutional Strategies

The new campus anti-violence movement had multiple state and non-state institutional targets. This movement started with survivor activists targeting universities for failing to protect students on campus or provide survivors with resources necessary to continue their education. Under the Trump administration, the Department of Education, which had once acted as a tool that survivor activists could utilize to hold schools accountable, became a target seeking to strip rights and protections from survivors. Universities were required to adopt the 2020 Title IX rules amidst continued calls to recognize the impact of gender-based violence and a growing counter-movement. This counter-movement, led by men's rights activists, claims concern with "due process" as a strategy to rollback protections for survivors and impede the campus adjudication process. Social movement actors and organizations engage with state and non-state institutions as they navigate these shifts, transitioning between targets and responding when former partners become new adversaries. SFV and CAV also demonstrate how social movement organizations deploy different strategies depending on the social, political, and cultural context in which they operate.

The election of Donald Trump signaled a political shift in federal responses to campus violence. In the face of an increasingly hostile federal government and growing counter-movement, SFV implemented old mobilizing tactics in new ways. They engaged in direct advocacy by protesting outside the Department of Education. They created educational campaigns to inform individuals about the consequences of the propose Title IX rules and trainings for student activists regarding how to combat the rules through notice and comments. Following the release of the final rules in May of 2020, SFV refocused social media campaigns to target universities and influence how rules were implemented on each campus. In response to the rapid transition within the DOE, SFV also developed new organizing tactics to better target state and non-state institutions involved in securing protections for survivors on campus. SFV put greater emphasis on advocating for changes in state legislatures, which influence universities funding and policies. This strategy demonstrates the connections between state and non-state institutions and how student organizers sought to utilize this connection to achieve their organizational goals.

The ability of multi-institutional movements to shift between targets in the face of opening or closing political opportunities should be further investigated by social movement scholars. Scholars have noted how organizations may select tactics based on characteristics of targeted institutions (Bartley and Curtis 2014; Walker et al. 2008). SFV engaged in some of these practices such as shaming universities that are susceptible to threats to their reputation and legitimacy. However, this research shows how in the face of political transition these strategies developed for non-state institutions can be re-deployed against new state targets. Furthermore, social movement organizations positioned at the national level that maintain contact with and provide support for local organizers, are well-positioned to observe opportunity openings and

closings within various state and non-state institutions. Organizers, like those in SFV, consider these opportunities when engaged in the process of target selection and implement strategies they feel with be most effective not only based on characteristics of institutions but the context in which that institution is situated.

Non-state institutions also differ from one another. Universities exemplify how organizations that comprise the same non-state institution (i.e., education) differ in policy, practice, and culture. In addition to crafting different strategies to navigate state and non-state institutions, social movement actors must recognize that not every actor within the same institution responds to the same strategies and must, therefore, implement tactics that are specific to specific social institutions and organizations. SFV advised local activists to utilize "inside" and "outside" organizing tactics. Student advocates working "inside" universities represent the interest of survivors and work to prevent gender-based violence through influencing the formal decision-making process within universities. They also act as watchdogs who are able to notify campus and outside organizers of potentially harmful policies or practices. In receptive institutional or organizational environments, inside organizing may be effective at ensuring universities or colleges implements best practices in addressing gender-based violence as was often the case with CAV. However, when an organization seeks to implement harmful policies or is failing to sufficiently protect students and support survivors, outside organizers can engage in direct advocacy, social media campaigns, or other awareness raising strategies that put pressure on universities to change and shame them into compliance. These strategies typified SFV's typical approach to addressing violence on campus and allowed organizers to shift tactics in response to change on local campuses.

In implementing this inside/outside advocacy strategy, these organizers benefit from both formal and grassroots organizing that characterized early anti-violence movements. Scholars should seek to better understand how social movement actors enact these divide-and-conquer approaches within other multi-institutional movements. While a degree of mutual autonomy may be necessary to ensure that both representatives of institutions and social movements maintain legitimacy and independence in the public eye (Holdo 2019). Inside organizers recognize the gains that can be made within non-state institutions and the limits to such relationships. These organizers' strategies demonstrate the limits of binary representations of movements as coopted or contentious (Lapegna 2014). In highlighting cooperation within the campus anti-violence movement, I seek to add to existing research that has shown how organizers working within systems of power achieve change while resisting cooptation and present activists as engaged in efforts to achieve change within and outside institutions (Calkin 2015; Park and Richards 2007; Prügl and True 2014).

While much of this research has focused on the actions of SFV and CAV as social movement organizations, these findings also have implications for our understandings of violence prevention. Attention to context requires scholars to address how local political, social, and cultural environments shape the manifestation of violence on campus as well as responses to violence. BSU is situated within a highly conservative state. Progressive policy initiatives are unlikely to find support in such states especially given the rising cultural backlash against survivor movements. Therefore, CAV members focused on social change within BSU and the local community. Within the BSU campus, CAV found service providers that were willing to not only partner but guide and direct the organization in how best to advocate for survivors on campus. University administration also included CAV members within decision-making

processes on campus. As a result, even in instances where the university was inclined to limit services for survivors, CAV, along with service provider allies, were able to influence the administration and maintain valuable resources for survivors on campus. Additionally, CAV sought to address gender-based violence on campus outside of the administration and policy. They targeted rape culture on campus through bystander intervention programming and consent education. CAV members viewed interpersonal conversations among peers and challenging sexist or heterosexist jokes in their social interactions as a key part of their advocacy on campus.

These interpersonal strategies may be more effective in localized environments than at the national level. CAV's use of this strategy also reveals how students' personal networks influence which groups on campus are exposed to violence intervention. In the case of CAV, students involved in Greek life and athletics were prioritized in violence prevention efforts. CAV leaders also opted for a cooperative and apolitical approach in their campus advocacy work. They built partnerships with service providers, administrators, and student groups on campus in order to support their events and programming. Members avoided taking public stances in conflicts on campus for fear of being perceived as divisive and thereby alienating groups they targeted for peer educator training, namely Greek life. These strategies were largely effective as CAV provide bystander intervention training each year to many, primarily white, Greek organizations, introductory one-credit hour freshman courses, and residential halls. They also kept the campus updated on changes to Title IX policy and informed individuals about how to participate in the notice and comment period.

CAV's approach to violence prevention highlights how those working to address violence on campus in conservative states, may look to allies at the university level. Positive relationships with administrators on campus allowed students to maintain control of how gender-

based violence programming was implemented on campus. However, these strategies unintentionally contributed to reproducing the power of dominant groups and normalizing the white institutional space of campus. This will be discussed in more detail below.

Moving Beyond "the Same Faces and the Same Stories"

Some scholars and activists have critiqued mainstream representations of the new campus anti-violence movement as centering white, middle-class, and wealthy straight women (Blustein 2017; Cantalupo 2019). This was often the case with CAV. SFV member Octavia, a Black woman, described depictions of the movement as representing, "the same faces and the same stories." However, SFV organizers moved for policies and services that recognized the needs of Black, Latino/a, Asian, and Native and Indigenous students, queer and trans students, disabled students, low-income students, and undocumented students. SFV also sought to include and center marginalized students in their organization. They maintain that these students already face disadvantage on college campuses that prioritize dominant groups, and these inequalities are exacerbated when acts of violence are committed against these students. Furthermore, SFV emphasizes violence is a consequence of inequality. Students from marginalized groups are at higher risk for experiencing gender-based violence (Cantalupo 2019). Not only are these students' needs unmet on college campuses, their experiences are rarely centered in media representations of this movement or in federal, state, or campus policies.

As a way to counteract this and to center marginalized students, organizations like SFV take an intersectional approach to mobilization. SFV built partnerships with other movements such as prison abolition, reproductive justice, disability rights, and immigrant rights organizations, among others. These partnerships allowed SFV to utilize new strategies in seeking protection for students on campus. For example, disability rights laws provided a new pathway

for advocacy outside of Title IX. This intersectional practice also prompted SFV to adopt an abolitionist stance in their approach to violence prevention on campus. Abolitionist anti-violence strategies center repairing harm over punishing perpetrators. Therefore, student activists prioritize resources for survivors. In addressing harm on campus, these activists promoted adjudication outcomes that prioritize the needs of survivors and require perpetrators to take accountability for their actions but also protect educational opportunities for all students involved. They often relied on Title IX, which secures civil rights to educate rather than promoting a criminal legal response as the only means to address violence on campus. Abolition is not easily achieved as it requires transformation of the criminal legal system and, in the interim, SFV recognized survivors may wish to address harm through the courts. This creates tension between supporting survivors and promoting anti-carceral practices. Survivor activists negotiate this tension by educating local campus organizers about the violence within the criminal legal system, and advocate against federal, state, and campus policies that promote policing and prisons as responses to gender-based violence.

Conversely, CAV framed gender-based violence as an issue that can impact anyone and that everyone should work to prevent. These organizers, who were primarily white and straight, believed that the root cause of gender-based violence is a lack of knowledge about consent and the harm associated with violence. Therefore, they relied on strategies with broad appeal and "universal" application, rather than centering those students at the margins of campus power relations. As a consequence of this political and universal discourse, CAV treated whiteness as the default in the vast majority of events and peer educator programming. At the time of this work, CAV members had begun to develop more inclusive programming such as hosting an LGBTQ+ panel and a Black Experiences of Sexual Violence event; however, hosting singular

events designed around the experiences of marginalized students did not result in efforts to include marginalized students in leadership or decenter whiteness in other CAV programming. Campus organizers who reproduce whiteness in leadership and day-to-day programming signal that the organization like campus is a white, heteronormative space and the needs of marginalized survivors and concerns of these students will be secondary to those of dominant groups on campus.

Historically, dominant women's movements, including the anti-violence movement in the 1970s, have struggled to practice inclusion and have often privileged the needs of white, middle-class, wealthy, cisgender, and straight women. In anti-violence organizing this has often resulted in the implementation of policies and practices rooted in the carceral state. The new campus anti-violence movement brought a resurgence of these same tensions. Attention to these renewed debates illustrates how the context in which activists are situated can inform where they fall within these debates and how perspectives and strategies evolve over time. Local cultures may result in the reproduction of dominance as actors who are embedded within these power structures. Furthermore, social movement actors rely on a process of learning to inform their perspectives on social problems they seek to address. If actors only engage with representatives of dominant groups in this learning process, they risk reproducing dominance. Relatedly, social movement organizations reliance on previous practices and familiar strategies risk perpetuating existing problems of exclusion and erasure of those who are marginalized within movements (Walker et al. 2008).

Rooting Gender-Based Violence in Feminist Epistemology

In addition to the findings outlined above, an implication of this research is the potential that adopting a feminist epistemology lens has for bridging gaps between gender-based violence

researcher across disciplines, as well as connecting researchers to service providers, survivors, and activists. “Feminist standpoint epistemology goes beyond feminist empiricism in its accounts of knowledge creation. It seeks to give due weight not only to experience but also to the epistemic roles played by both social location and political commitment (Jaggar 2014: 303).” Gender-based violence has been studied within legal studies, health, education, criminology, psychology, gender studies, queer studies, disability studies, and social movement studies. Given that this problem reaches into so many fields, scholars must take an interdisciplinary approach in the study of gender-based violence (Edelman et al. 2010; Gronert 2019; Hirsch et al. 2018; Powell and Henry 2014). In examining violence within education from a legal and social movements perspective, Nancy Cantalupo (2019) highlights how women of color are often omitted in discussions of gender-based violence on campus and draws attention to the lengthy history of intersectional and feminist critical race theorizing from Black and Chicana women that served as basis for Social Justice Feminism. Furthermore, she characterizes the Title IX, #MeToo, and Time’s Up movements as adhering to the theory and practice of Social Justice Feminism[23] as these movements acknowledge and respond to: (1) structures and hierarchies that reproduce inequality, (2) interlocking system of oppression, and (3) bottom-up strategies. Cantalupo calls for new laws and practices that center women of color and adhere to Social Justice Feminist practice. I build on these calls for a more interdisciplinary and intersectional practice in the study of gender-based violence by suggesting that feminist epistemology helps

[23] Cantalupo (2019: 55) describes Social Justice Feminism as “rooted in theory and practice, both of which are fairly described as activist in nature. These influences combine to create a unique approach to legal design and policymaking that focuses on structural solutions that put a central focus on addressing the multiple oppressive forces facing women of color and other intersectional populations.”

researchers to incorporate these approaches, as well as connect with service providers and student advocates in responding to gender-based violence.

Adopting feminist epistemic values would prompt gender-based violence researchers across these disciplines to consider three things:

1. How context influences survivors' experiences of violence and support.
2. The role of power in shaping various perspectives on the causes, consequences, and solutions to violence.
3. Arguably the most important, starting with the situated knowledge of survivors' and activists' experiences shows how to best address violence on campus.

Accounts of gender-based violence must extend beyond perceptions of students as survivors or perpetrators and look at their position as stakeholders who shape how this issue is addressed on campus and beyond through their activism, social relations, and public discourse. Feminist epistemology provides the tools for us to recognize the situated knowledge of student activists and how this knowledge is formed by their positions within systems of domination and oppression. Survivor and student activists, working at the local and national level, should be consulted not only in policy decisions but the formation of research agendas. Furthermore, in recognizing students' experiential knowledge of political and cultural shifts on and off campus, we can better account for how dominance may be reified in federal, state, and campus policies. This is exemplified by SFV's accounts of how federal and state laws have been used to roll back the rights of survivors, rather than adding additional support for respondents. These policies do not seek to promote equity, but rather ensure continued use of violence to maintain power and control.

Students are the linchpin in the vast array of disciplines and stakeholders working to address this issue. Student activists have continually called for universities and the DOE to recognize their experiences and knowledge when creating policies and services related to gender-based violence in education. Researchers must do the same. In centering the experiences of student activists, researchers can design studies that contribute to the needs of these organizations. For example, survivors and student activists may benefit from additional research on violence against marginalized students that can be shared with anti-violence student organizations working in white institutional spaces. As I argued in Chapter 3, activism can facilitate a learning process and motivate organizers to consider new solutions to social problems. Researchers invested in public scholarship should consider how they can contribute to that learning process and involved activists within research on gender-based violence (Krause et al. 2017). Additionally, student activists on the ground may recognize new forms of violence and interventions emerging on campus that require additional inquiry. Finally, research that focuses on internal contradictions and differences among student organizations' goals and strategies may identify new factors that influence how violence manifests and is best addressed in unique campus environments.

Final Thoughts

The pervasiveness of gender-based violence on college campuses has receive considerable attention especially within the last ten years. Like most research on social problems, scholarly inquiries largely have sought to answer the questions: What are the causes of gender-based violence on campus? And, what can be done to address this problem? Survivor and student activists within the campus anti-violence movement are key stakeholders whose perspective must be considered in order to address each of these questions. Further, there are several

questions that need to be addressed in order to fully grasp how these individuals understand and work to address gender-based violence in education. This is a movement largely led by women, queer, and transgender students; however, men, including white, cis-gender, straight, and fraternity men are also participating and taking leadership roles in advocating against gender-based violence on campus. What factors mobilize men to join this movement? How might their participation in this movement differ based on their own gender identity and understandings of masculinity? Scholars have noted that social movements as well as movement strategies and outcomes are often gendered. However, women's participation in movements has often been at the center of this scholarship. Examining the experiences and contributions of men, especially socially privileged men, within the campus anti-violence movement has potential to add to our analysis of the ways in which social movements are gendered, not only in goals but in processes of mobilization.

The findings from this research could be significantly expanded by examining another national social movement organization and student activist organizations working within different educational settings. SFV is unique in their commitment to abolition and the ways in which they centered marginalized survivors. Interviews with SFV members suggested that other national social movement organizations often reproduce privilege and carceral solutions in their advocacy approaches. This is a theme that requires additional exploration through interviews and observations of another primary social movement organization. Furthermore, I have argued that local campus cultures shape student activists' goals and strategic approaches to addressing gender-based violence. Campus administrations also vary significantly in their willingness to address this issue. CAV's cooperative response was, in part, due to a favorable administration as

well as a Title IX coordinator and Student Advocacy Center that sought to protect all students' rights to education, including survivors.

As discussed in the methods section, I was forced to adapt my plans and omit an HBCU that I had received IRB approval to study and had planned to begin data collection in spring 2020. The inclusion of a third site would have allowed me to draw comparisons between students working at the local level and expand on the arguments I have made regarding the importance of social and cultural context on student activism. Without this point of comparison, questions remain regarding the degree to which activists' strategic choices, such as the use of cooperative or contentious tactics, are shaped by local context, activists' own experiences and perceptions of gender-based violence, or other factors such as the influence of service providers on campus. While the inclusion of an additional site would certainly have allowed for a richer exploration of these questions, I maintain that activists' personal experiences and understandings of gender-based violence combined with the climate of individual campuses shape students' responses to gender-based violence on individual campuses. Future research should examine goals and strategies of local student activists situated in prestigious religious universities, community colleges with limited funding, and historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs).[24] The experiences of activists in a range of different campus climates may reveal new factors that shape students' responses to violence on campus and strategic approaches to advocacy around this issue. I plan to continue this research and include the experiences of student activists in these other local settings. Student advocates also recognize that Title IX not only applies to

[24] HBCUs have been under-studied in research related to gender-based violence on campus (Fedina et al. 2018). This research project originally included a public HBCU located in the South; however, I was unable to collect data from students on campus due to the switch to online learning during the Covid-19 health crisis.

universities, but also to all publicly funded schools. High school and middle school student activists and survivors must be included in future research if we truly hope to eliminate violence.

These finding not only add to understandings of the new campus anti-violence movement as a social movement but have practical applications for those working to address gender-based violence on campus. Allies, scholars, and service providers who seek to prioritize the needs of survivors should look to the practices survivors themselves have advocated for. As explained by SFV, campus climate surveys can act as a tool to alert those working in campus violence prevention of the rates of sexual violence on campus and survivors' experiences with service providers. These surveys also center survivors' concerns and may help to reduce the emotional labor placed upon survivor activists who are often called upon to share their stories due to a lack of transparency regarding how violence is handled on university campuses.

Lastly, individuals working within universities who care about survivors should utilize their access to decision-making spaces on campus to ensure that students, not just campus leaders but survivors, are represented in these spaces. The degree to which employees are able to leverage universities is, of course, dependent upon one's position in the university; however, violence prevention should be a campus-wide concern and requires a community response. In my observations of student activists, I noted several ways that I could work to support students in my role as a lecturer at Mississippi State University. Student activists at the campus and national levels have spent considerable time developing strategies to reduce risk of burnout and practice trauma-informed care. Instructors should learn from these practices and apply them to the classroom. I developed and will continue to refine a trauma-informed approach to teaching training that I have implemented at Mississippi State University. These trauma-informed strategies should also be used to guide methodological practices, especially when researching

gender-based violence. Survivor activists' calls for consent can also be utilized by researchers to reform methodological practices. How do we practice welcomeness as a standard of research and prioritize consent in relationships with participants? At what point do researcher-survivor interactions become exploitative or coercive? How can feminist epistemology and practices be used to avoid this? Survivor activists have experiential knowledge and have tirelessly worked to ensure violence does not prevent students from accessing education. As educators we should take note of their recommendations and be willing to listen and learn. We must prioritize students' knowledge if we ever hope to eradicate gender-based violence on campus.

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan, Kate Berry, and Joke Esseveld. 1983. "Objectivity and Truth: Problems in Doing Feminist Research." *Women's Studies International Forum* 6(4):423-435.

Adams, Alison, and Thomas Shriver. 2016. "Challenging Extractive Industries: How Political Context and Targets Influence Tactical Choice." *Sociological Perspectives* 59(4):892–909.

Alexander, Jeffrey. 2012. *Trauma: A Social Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Ali, Russlyn. 2011. "Dear Colleagues Letter." *Department of Education Office for Civil Rights*. Retrieved March 10, 2016. (https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.pdf).

Alimahomed, Sabrina. 2010. "Thinking Outside the Rainbow: Women of Color Redefining Queer Politics and Identity." *Social Identities* 16(2):151–68.

Amar, Anglea, Tania Strout, Somatra Simpson, Maria Cardiello, and Sania Beckford. 2014. "Administrators' Perceptions of College Campus Protocols, Response, and Student Prevention Efforts for Sexual Assault." *Violence and Victims* 29(4):579–93.

Anderson, Michelle. 2019. "Do the Proposed Title IX Regulations Protect or Undermine Due Process." *Fordham Law Review Online* 88:3–17.

Andrews, Kenneth. 2002. "Creating Social Change: Lessons from the Civil Rights Movement." Pp. 105–17 in *Social movements: Identity, culture, and the state*, edited by D. Meyer, N. Whittier, and B. Robnett. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Alteristic. 2021. "Green Dot Institute." *Alteristic.Org*. Retrieved March 12, 2021. (https://alteristic.org/green-dot-institute/).

Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar. 2018. "Introduction: The Cultural and the Political in Latin American Social Movements." Pp. 1-30 in *Cultures of Politics Politics of Culture: Re-Visioning Latin American Social Movements*, edited by S. Alvarez, E. Dagnino, and A. Escobar. New York, NY: Routledge.

Atkinson, Kym, and Kay Standing. 2019. "Changing the Culture? A Feminist Academic Activist Critique." *Violence Against Women* 25(11):1331-1351.

Armstrong, Elizabeth, and Mary Bernstein. 2008. "Culture, Power, and Institutions: A Multi-Institutional Politics Approach to Social Movements." *Sociological Theory* 26(1):74–99.

Armstrong, Elizabeth, Miriam Gleckman-Krut, and Lanora Johnson. 2018. "Silence, Power, and Inequality: An Intersectional Approach to Sexual Violence." *Annual Review of Sociology* 44:99–122.

Armstrong, Elizabeth, Laura Hamilton, and Brian Sweeney. 2006. "Sexual Assault on Campus: A Multi-Level, Integrative Approach to Party Rape." *Social Problems* 53:483–99.

Baird, Stephanie, and Sharon Rae Jenkins. 2003. "Vicarious Traumatization, Secondary Traumatic Stress, and Burnout in Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Agency Staff." *Violence and Victims* 18(1):71–86.

Baker, Carrie N., and Maria R. Bevaqua. 2018. "Challenging Narratives of the Anti-Rape Movement's Decline." *Violence Against Women* 24(3):350–76.

Barthélemy, Hélène. 2020. "How Men's Rights Groups Helped Rewrite Regulations on Campus Rape." *The Nation*, August 14.

Bartley, Tim, and Curtis Child. 2014. "Shaming the Corporation: The Social Production of Targets and the Anti-Sweatshop Movement." *American Sociological Review* 79(4):653–79.

Baum, Katrina, Shannan Catalano, Michael Rand, and Kristina Rose. 2009. *Stalking Victimization in the United States*. *National Crime Victimization Survey*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Becker, Sarah, and Justine Tinkler. n.d. "'Me Getting Plastered and Her Provoking My Eyes': Young People's Attribution of Blame for Sexual Aggression in Public Drinking Spaces." *Feminist Criminology* 10(3):235–58.

Bedera, Nicole, and Kristjane Nordmeyer. 2015. "'Never Go Out Alone': An Analysis of College Rape Prevention Tips." *Sexuality & Culture* 19:533–42. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-015-9274-5.

Benford, Robert. 1997. "An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective." *Sociological Inquiry* 67(4):409–30.

Bernstein, Mary. 2007. "The Sexual Politics of the 'New Abolitionism.'" *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 18(3):128–51. doi: https://doi.org/10.1215/10407391-2007-013.

Bernstein, Mary. 2012. "Carceral Politics as Gender Justice: Neoliberal Circuits of Crime, Sex, and Rights." *Theory and Society* 41(1):233–59.

Blustein, Ava. 2017. "Student Activism." Pp. 255–70 in *Addressing Violence Against Women on College Campuses*, edited by C. Kaukinen, M. H. Miller, and R. Powers. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2006. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*. Oxford, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Boyle, Kaitlin, Ashley Barr, and Jody Clay-Warner. 2017. "The Effects of Feminist Mobilization and Women's Status on Universities' Reporting of Rape." *Journal of School Violence* 16(3):317–30.

Bracey II, Glenn E. 2016. "Black Movements Need Black Theorizing: Exposing Implicit Whiteness in Political Process Theory." *Sociological Focus* 49(1):11–27.

Brodsky, Alexandra. 2017. "A Rising Tide: Learning About Fair Disciplinary Process from Title IX." *Journal of Legal Education* 66(4):822–49.

Buchholz, Laura. 2015. "The Role of University Health Centers in Intervention and Prevention of Campus Sexual Assault." *Medical News & Perspectives* 314(5):438–40.

Burke, Mary, and Mary Bernstein. 2014. "How the Right Usurped the Queer Agenda: Frame Co-optation in Political Discourse." *Sociological Forum* 29(4):830-850.

Burke, Tarana. 2017. "MeToo Was Started for Black and Brown Women and Girls. They're Still Being Ignored." *The Washington Post*.

Cabrera, Nolan. 2019. *White Guys on Campus: Racism, White Immunity, and the Myth of "Post-Racial" Higher Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Calkin, Sydney. 2015. "Feminism, Interrupted? Gender and Development in the Era of 'Smart Economics'." *Progress in Development Studies* 15(4):295-307.

Cantalupo, Nancy Chi. 2019. "Nd Even More of Us Are Brave: Intersectionality & Sexual Harassment of Women Students of Color." *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender* 42(1):1–81.

Carlton, Bree. 2018. "Penal Reform, Anti-Carceral Feminist Campaigns and the Politics of Change in Women's Prisons, Victoria, Australia." *Punishment & Society* 20(3):283–307.

Carmody, Dianne, Jessica Ekhomu, and Brian K. Payne. 2009. "Needs of Sexual Assault Advocates in Campus-Based Sexual Assault Centers." *College Student Journal* 43(2).

Carr, Joetta. 2013. "The SlutWalk Movement: A Study in Transnational Feminist Activism." *Journal of Feminist Scholarship* 4(4):24–38.

Chen, Cher Weixia, and Paul Gorski. 2015. "Burnout in Social Justice and Human Rights Activists: Symptoms, Causes and Implications." *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 0(0):1–25. doi: 10.1093/jhuman/huv011.

Coker, Ann, Bonnie Fisher, Heather Bush, Suzanne Swan, Corrine Williams, Emily Clear, and Sarah DeGue. 2015. "Evaluation of the Green Dot Bystander Intervention to Reduce

Interpersonal Violence among College Students across Three Campuses." *Violence Against Women* 21(12):1507–27.

Coles, Jan, Jill Astbury, Elizabeth Dartnall, and Shazneen Limjerwala. 2014. "A Qualitative Exploration of Researcher Trauma and Researchers' Responses to Investigating Sexual Violence." *Violence Against Women* 20(1):95–117.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2004. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cox, Laurence. 2009. "'Hearts with One Purpose Alone'? Thinking Personal Sustainability in Social Movements." *Emotion, Space and Society* 2(1):52–61.

Cox, Laurence. 2011. *How Do We Keep Going? Activist Burnout and Personal Sustainability in Social Movements*. Into-ebooks. Retrieved March 20, 2021 (http://mural.maynoothuniversity.ie/2815/).

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 2003. "Traffic as the Crossroads: Multiple Oppressions." Pp. 43–57 in *Sisterhood is forever: The women's anthology for a new millennium*. New York, NY: Washington Square Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 2006. "Framing Affirmative Action." *Michigan Law Review First Impressions* 105:123–33.

Cress, Daniel, and David Snow. 2000. "The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization: The Influence of Organization, Political Mediation, and Framing." *American Journal of Sociology* 105(4):1063–1104.

Crouch, Mira, and Heather McKenzie. 2006. "The Logic of Small Samples in Interview-Based Qualitative Research." *Social Science Information* 45(4):483–99.

Davidson, Shannon. 2017. *Trauma Informed Practices for Postsecondary Education: A Guide*. Education Northwest: Creating Strong Schools & Communities.

Della Porta, Donatella. 2006. *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State: A Comparative Analysis of Italy and Germany*. Cambridge University Press.

Devarajan, Maydha. 2020. "UNC Enters into $1.5 Million Settlement over Clery Act Violations, Chancellor Announces." *The Daily Tar Heel*, June 30.

Edelman, Lauren, Gwendolyn Leachman, and Doug McAdam. 2010. "On Law, Organizations, and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 6:653–85.

Eigenberg, Helen, and Joanne Belknap. 2017. "Title IX and Mandatory Reporting: A Help or a Hindrance?" Pp. 186–201 in *Addressing Violence Against Women on College Campuses*,

edited by C. Kaukinen, M. H. Miller, and R. Powers. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Eilperin, Juliet. 2014. "Seeking to End Rape on Campus, White House Launches 'It's On Us.'" *The Washington Post*.

End Rape On Campus. "The Clery Act." Retrieved March 1st, 2016 (http://endrapeoncampus.org/the-clery-act/).

Fahrenthold, David. 2016. "Trump Recorded Having Extremely Lewd Conversation about Women in 2005." *The Washington Post*.

Feagin, Joe, Hernan Vera, and Nikitah Imani. 2014. *The Agony of Education: Black Students at a White University*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fedina, Lisa, Jennifer Holmes, and Bethany Backes. 2018. "Campus Sexual Assault: A Systematic Review of Prevalence Research From 2000 to 2015." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 19(1):76–93.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and Beth Hess. 2000. *Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement Across Three Decades of Change.* London: Routledge.

Ferree, Myra Marx, and David Merrill. 2004. "Hot Movements, Cold Cognition: Thinking about Social Movements in Gendered Frames." Pp. 247–61 in *Rethinking Social Movements*, edited by J. Goodwin and J. Jasper. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Fisher, Bonnie, Francis Cullen, and Michael Turner. 2000. *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice.

Fitzgerald, Kathleen, and Diane Rodgers. 2000. "Radical Social Movement Organizations: A Theoretical Model." *Sociological Quarterly* 41(4):573–92.

Friedland, Roger, and Robert Alford. 1991. "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions." Pp. 232–66 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by W. Powell and P. DiMaggio. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood: Dorsey Press.

Garcia, Carolyn M., Kate E. Lechner, Ellen A. Frerich, Katherine A. Lust, and Marla E. Eisenberg. 2012. "Preventing Sexual Violence Instead of Just Responding to It: Students' Perceptions of Sexual Violence Resources on Campus." *Journal of Forensic Nursing* 8(2):61–71.

Gold, Jodi, and Susan Villari. 2000. *Just Sex: Students Rewrite the Rules on Sex, Violence, Activism, and Equality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Goodwin, Jeff, James Jasper, and Francesca Polletta. 2001. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gorski, Paul. 2019. "Fighting Racism, Battling Burnout: Causes of Activist Burnout in US Racial Justice Activists." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42(5):667–87.

Gorski, Paul, Stacy Lopresti-Goodman, and Dallas Rising. 2019. "'Nobody's Paying Me to Cry': The Causes of Activist Burnout in United States Animal Rights Activists." *Social Movement Studies* 18(3):364–480.

Gotell, Lise, and Emily Dutton. 2016. "Sexual Violence in the 'Manosphere': Antifeminist Men's Rights Discourses on Rape." *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy* 5(2):65-80.

Gould, Deborah. 2004. "Passionate Political Processes: Bringing Emotions Back into the Study of Social Movements." Pp. 155–75 in *Rethinking Social Movements*, edited by J. Goodwin and J. Jasper. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Gould, Deborah. 2009. *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Greenberg, Max, and Michael Messner. 2014. "Before Prevention: The Trajectory and Tensions of Feminist Antiviolence." Pp. 225–49 in *Gendered perspectives on conflict and violence: Part B*. Vol. 18B. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Griffin, Vanessa, Dylan Pelletier, O. Hayden Griffin II, and John Sloan III. 2017. "Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act: SaVing Lives or SaVing Face?" *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 42:401–25. doi: DOI 10.1007/s12103-016-9356-4.

Gronert, Nona. 2019. "Law, Campus Policy, Social Movements, and Sexual Violence: Where Do We Stand in the #MeToo Movement?" *Sociology Compass* 13(6).

Gusa, Diane Lynn. 2010. "White Institutional Presence: The Impact of Whiteness on Campus Climate." *Harvard Educational Review* 80(4):464–90.

Haraway, Donna. 1998. "Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14(3):575-599.

Harmony, Princess. 2016. "The Dangerous Myth of the 'Ideal' Survivor." Pp. 138–41 in *We Believe You: Survivors of Campus Sexual Assault Speak Out*, edited by A. Clark and A. Pino. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.

Harris, Kate Lockwood. 2018. "Yes Means Yes and No Means No, but Both These Mantras Need to Go: Communication Myths in Consent Education and Anti-Rape Activism." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 46(2):155–78.

Hartocollis, Anemona, and Yamiche Alcindor. 2017. "Women's March Highlights as Huge Crowds Protest Trump:'We'Re Not Going Away.'" *The New York Times*.

Heldman, Caroline, Alissa R. Ackerman, and Ian Breckenridge-Jackson. 2018. *The New Campus Anti-Rape Movement: Internet Activism and Social Justice*. Lenham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Henry, Nicola, and Anastasia Powell. 2014. *Preventing Sexual Violence: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Overcoming a Rape Culture*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hirsch, Jennifer, Leigh Reardon, Shamus Khan, John Santelli, Patrick Wilson, Louisa Gilbert, Melanie Wall, and Claude Mellins. 2018. "Transforming the Campus Climate: Advancing Mixed-methods Research on the Social and Cultural Roots of Sexual Assault on a College Campus." *Voices* 13(1):23–54.

Hoch, Amy, Deborah Stewart, Kim Webb, and Mary Wyandt-Hiebert. 2015."Trauma-Informed Care on a College Campus." Presented at the 2015 Annual Meeting of the American College Health Association, Orlando, FL.

Holdo, Markus. 2019. "Cooptation and Non-Cooptation: Elite Strategies in Response to Social Protest." *Social Movement Studies* 18(4):444–62.

hooks, bell. 2015. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.

It's On Us. 2021. "Our Story." *It's On Us*. Retrieved February 4, 2021. (https://www.itsonus.org/about-us/our-story/).

Jaggar, Alison, ed. 2014. *Just Methods: An Interdisciplinary Feminist Reader*. London, UK: Paradigm Publishers.

Jasper, James. 1998. "The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions In and Around Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 13:397–424.

Jessup-Anger, Jody, Elise Lopez, and Mary Koss. 2018. "History of Sexual Violence in Higher Education." *New Directions for Student Services: Special Issue: Addressing Sexual Violence in Higher Education and Student Affairs* 2018(161):9–19.

Johnson, Michael Lee, Todd Matthew, and Sarah Napper. 2016. "Sexual Orientation and Sexual Assault Victimization Among U.S. College Students." *The Social Science Journal* 53(2):174–83.

Jones, Kristen. 2010. "Law Enforcement of Title IX In Sexual Assault Cases: Feeble Watchdog Leaves Students At Risk, Critics Say." Pp. 73–84 in *Sexual Assault on Campus: A Frustrating Search for Justice*, edited by G. Witkin and D. Donald. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Public Policy.

Kelly, Maura, Amy Lubitow, Matthew Town, and Amanda Mercier. 2020. "Collective Trauma in Queer Communities." *Sexuality & Culture* 24(1):1522–43.

Kettrey, Heather Hensman, and Robert A. Marx. 2019. "The Effects of Bystander Programs on the Prevention of Sexual Assault across the College Years: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 48(2):212–27.

Khan, Alia. 2011. *Gender-Based Violence and HIV: A Program Guide for Integrating Gender-Based Violence Prevention and Response in PEPFAR Programs*. Arlington, VA: USAID's AIDS Support and Technical Assistance Resources.

Kim, Mimi. 2019. "Anti-Carceral Feminism: The Contradictions of Progress and the Possibilities of Counter-Hegemonic Struggle." *Affilia* 35(3):309–26.

Kingkade, Tyler. 2014. "University of North Carolina Routinely Violates Sexual Assault Survivor Rights, Students Claim." *Huffington Post.*

Kingkade, Tyler. 2015. "Barnard College Joins List of 94 Colleges Under Title IX Investigations." *Huffington Post*.

Kipnis, Laura. 2017. *Unwanted Advances: Sexual Paranoia Comes to Campus.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Kirby, Dick. 2015. *The Hunting Ground*. DVD. Santa Monica, CA: Lionsgate Home Entertainment.

Klandermans, Bert, and Suzanne Staggenborg. 2002. *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Knight, Carolyn. 2015. "Trauma-Informed Social Work Practice: Practice Considerations and Challenges." *Clinical Social Work Journal* 43(1):25–37.

Krause, Kathleen, Stephanie Miedema, Rebecca Woofter, and Kathryn Yount. 2017, "Feminist Research with Student Activists: Enhancing Campus Sexual Assault Research." *Family Relations* 66:211-223.

Krebs, Christopher, Christine Lindquist, Tara Warner, Bonnie Fisher, and Sandra Martin. 2007. *The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice.

Krebs, Christopher, Christine Lindquist, Tara Warner, Bonnie Fisher, and Sandra Martin. 2009. "College Women's Experiences with Physically Forced, Alcohol-or Other Drug-Enabled, and Drug-Facilitated Sexual Assault Before and Since Entering College." *Journal of American College Health* 57(6):639–46.

Kretschmer, Kelsy, and Kristen Barber. 2016. "Men at the March: Feminist Movement Boundaries and Men's Participation in Take Back the Night and Slutwalk." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 21(3):283–300.

Kriesi, Hanspeter. 2004. “Political Context and Opportunity.” Pp. 67–90 in *Blackwell Companion to Social Movement*, edited by D. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Lapegna, Pablo. 2014. “The Problem with ‘Cooptation.’” *States, Power and Societies* 20(1):7–9.

Larson, Jeff. 2013. “Social Movements and Tactical Choice.” *Sociological Compass* 7:866–79.

Leon, Chrysanthi. 2016. “Law, Mansplainin’, and Myth Accommodation in Campus Sexual Assault Reform.” *Kansas Law Review* 64:987–1025.

Lewis, Ruth, and Susan Marine. 2019. “Guest Editors’ Introduction.” *Violence Against Women* 25(11):1283–89.

Linder, Chris, and Jess S. Myers. 2018. “Institutional Betrayal as a Motivator for Campus Sexual Assault Activism.” *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education* 11(1):1–16.

Lonsway, Kimberly, Joanne Archambault, and David Lisak. 2009. “False Reports: Moving beyond the Issue to Successfully Investigate and Prosecute Non-Stranger Sexual Assault.” *Prosecutor, Journal of the National District Attorneys Association* 43(1):10–22.

Lorber, Judith. 2005. *Gender Inequality: Feminist Theories and Politics*. 3rd revised. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publication Company.

Maloney, Carolyn. n.d. *Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act*.

Marshall, Catherine, and Gretchen Rossman. 2016. *Designing Qualitative Research*. 6th ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Martin, Patricia Yancey, and Robert Hummer. 1989. “Fraternities and Rape on Campus.” *Gender & Society* 2(4):457–73.

Martin, Patricia Yancey, and Frederika E. Schmitt. 1999. “Unobtrusive Mobilization by an Institutionalized Rape Crisis Center: ‘All We Do Comes from Victims.’” *Gender & Society* 13(3):364–84.

McAdam, Doug. 1996. “Political Opportunities: Conceptual Origins, Current Problems, Future Directions.” Pp. 23–40 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by D. McAdam, J. McCarthy, and M. Zald. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, Doug. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

McNamara, Brittney. 2018. “Betsy DeVos Said She Doesn’t Know Whether FalseRape Allegations Outnumber Real Ones.” *Teen Vogue*.

Meyer, David. 2004. “Protest and Political Opportunities.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:125–45. doi: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110545.

Milkman, Ruth. 2017. “A New Political Generation: Millennials and the Post-2008 Wave of Protest.” *American Sociological Review* 82(1):1–31.

Miller, Michelle Hughes. 2017. “From Sexual Harassment to Sexual Violence: The Evolution of Title IX’s Response to Sexual Victimization.” Pp. 97–112 in *Addressing Violence Against Women on College Campuses*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Moore, Wendy. 2008. *Reproducing Racism: White Space, Elite Law Schools, and Racial Inequality*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Moore, Wendy. 2020. “The Mechanisms of White Space(s).” *American Behavioral Scientist* 64(14):1946–60.

Mueller, Jennifer. 2017. “Producing Colorblindness: Everyday Mechanisms of White Ignorance.” *Social Problems* 64(2):219–38.

Musto, Jennifer. 2019. “Transing Critical Criminology: A Critical Unsettling and Transformative Anti-Carceral Feminist Reframing.” *Critical Criminology* 27(1):37–54.

Meyer, David, and Suzanne Staggenborg. 1996. “Movements, Countermovements, and the Structure of Political Opportunity.” *American Journal of Sociology* 101(6):1628-1660.

Naples, Nancy. 2002. “Materialist Feminist Discourse Analysis and Social Movement Research: Mapping the Changing Context for ‘Community Control.’” *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State* 226–46.

Office on Violence Against Women. 2017. *Addressing Gender-Based Violence on College Campuses: Guide to a Comprehensive Model*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Oliver, Pamela. 2017. “The Ethnic Dimensions in Social Movements.” *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 22(4):295–416.

Onwuachi-Willig, Angela. 2018. “What About #UsToo: The Invisibility of Race in the #MeToo Movement.” *The Yale Law Journal Forum* 128:105–20.

Page, Tiffany, Anna Bull, and Emma Chapman. 2019. “Making Power Visible: ‘Slow Activism’ to Address Staff Sexual Misconduct in Higher Education.” *Violence Against Women* 25(11):1309–30.

Park, Yun-Joo, and Patricia Richards. 2007. “Negotiating Neoliberal Multiculturalism: Mapuche Workers in the Chilean State.” *Social Forces* 85(3):1319–39.

Piven, Frances, and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail.* New York: Pantheon.

Polletta, Francesca. 1999. "Snarls, Quacks, and Quarrels: Culture and Structure in Political Process Theory." *Sociological Forum* 14(1):62–70.

Polletta, Francesca. 2004. "Culture Is Not Just in Your Head." Pp. 97–111 in *Rethinking Social Movements*, edited by J. Goodwin and J. Jasper. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Potter, Sharyn. 2016. "Reducing Sexual Assault on Campus: Lessons from the Movement to Prevent Drunk Driving." *American Journal of Public Health* 106(5):822–29.

Prügl, Elisabeth, and Jacqui True. 2014. "Equality Means Business? Governing Gender through Transnational Public-Private Partnerships." *Review of International Political Economy* 21(6):1137-1169.

Reger, Jo. 2015. "The Story of a Slut Walk: Sexuality, Race, and Generational Divisions in Contemporary Feminist Activism." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 44(1):84–112.

Reynolds, Celene. 2019. "The Mobilization of Title IX across U.S. Colleges and Universities, 1994-2014." *Social Problems* 66(2):245–73. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spy005.

Ricci, Sandrine, and Manon Bergeron. 2019. "Tackling Rape Culture in Québec Universities: A Network of Feminist Resistance." *Violence Against Women* 25(11):1290–1308.

Richards, Patricia. 2003. "Expanding Women's Citizenship? Mapuche Women and Chile's National Women's Service." *Latin American Perspectives* 30(129):249–73.

Richards, Patricia. 2004. *Pobladoras, Indígenas, and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile.* Rutgers University Press.

Richards, Patricia. 2005. "The Politics of Gender, Human Rights, and Being Indigenous in Chile." *Gender & Society* 19(2):199–220.

Richards, Tara. 2019. "No Evidence of 'Weaponized Title IX' Here: An Empirical Assessment of Sexual Misconduct Reporting, Case Processing, and Outcomes." *Law and Human Behavior* 43(2):180–92.

Richie, Beth. 2012. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Richie, Beth, Valli Kalei Kanuha, and Kayla Marie Martensen. 2021. "Colluding With and Resisting the State: Organizing Against Gender Violence in the US." *Feminist Criminology*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085120987607.

Robnett, Belinda. 1997. “Commentary and Debate: Formal Titles and Bridge Leaders: Reply to Keys.” *American Journal of Sociology* 102(6):1698–1701.

Robnett, Belinda. 2000. *How Long? How Long?: African-American Women in the Struggle for Civil Rights*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rothman, Emily, and Jay Silverman. 2007. “The Effect of a College Sexual Assault Prevention Program on First-Year Students’ Victimization Rates.” *Journal of American College Health* 55(5):283–90.

Rucht, Dieter. 1996. “The Impact of National Contexts on Social Movement Structures: A Cross-Movement and Cross-National Comparison.” Pp. 185–204 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by D. McAdam, J. McCarthy, and Zald, Mayer. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sabina, Chiara, and Lavina Y. Ho. 2014. “Campus and College Victim Responses to Sexual Assault and Dating Violence: Disclosure, Service Utilization, and Service Provision.” *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 15(3):201–26.

Smith, Carly Parnitzke, and Jennifer Freyd. 2013. “Dangerous Safe Havens: Institutional Betrayal Exacerbates Sexual Trauma.” *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 26(1):119–24.

Smith, Carly Parnitzke, and Jennifer Freyd. 2014. “Institutional Betrayal.” *American Psychologist* 69(6):575–87.

Smith, Meredith. 2017. “Title IX Investigations and ‘Rehabilitated Schools.’” Pp. 271–84 in *Addressing Violence Against Women on College Campuses*, edited by C. Kaukinen, M. H. Miller, and R. Powers. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Smith, Molly, Nicole Wilkes, and Leana A. Bouffard. 2014. “Sexual Assault on College Campuses: Perceptions and Approaches of Campus Law Enforcement Oficers.” *Age (Mean)* 45:26–70.

Steinmetz, George. 1999. “Introduction: Culture and the State.” Pp. 1-50 in *State/Culture: State-Formation After the Cultural Turn*, edited by George Steinmetz. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Summers-Effler, Erika. 2010. *Laughing Saints and Righteous Heroes: Emotional Rhythms in Social Movement Groups.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sutton, Tara, Leslie Gordon Simons, and Kimberly Tyler. 2019. “Hooking-up and Sexual Victimization on Campus: Examining Moderators of Risk.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 1–30. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260519842178.

Swanson, Charlotte Strauss, and Dawn Szymanski. 2020a. “Anti-Sexual Assault Activism and Positive Psychological Functioning among Survivors.” *Sex Roles* 1–14. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01202-5.

Swanson, Charlotte Strauss, and Dawn Szymanski. 2020b. "From Pain to Power: An Exploration of Activism, The# Metoo Movement, and Healing from Sexual Assault Trauma." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 67(6):653–68.

Sweet, Ellen. 2014. "Date Rape: Naming, Publicizing, and Fighting a Pandemic." Boston, MA: Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies Program at Boston University.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tesch, Renata. 1990. *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. New York, NY: Falmer Press.

Ullman, Sarah, and Stephanie Townsend. 2007. "Barriers to Working with Sexual Assault Survivors: A Qualitative Study of Rape Crisis Center Workers." *Violence Against Women* 13(4):412–43.

U.S. Department of Education. 1997. "Sexual Harassment Guidance 1997." Retrieved February 10, 2021. (https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/sexhar01.html).

U.S. Department of Education. 2001. "Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance: Harassment of Students By School Employees, Other Students, or Third Parties." Retrieved February 10, 2021. (https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/shguide.pdf).

U.S. Department of Education. 2014. "U.S. Department of Education Releases List of Higher Education Institutions with Open Title IX Sexual Violence Investigations." Retrieved March 1, 2016. (https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-releases-list-higher-education-institutions-open-title-i).

U.S. Department of Education. 2015. "Title IX and Sex Discrimination." Retrieved March 1, 2016 (http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix_dis.html).

U.S Department of Education. 2017. "Department of Education Issues New Interim Guidance on Campus Misconduct." Retrieved February 8, 2021. (https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/department-education-issues-new-interim-guidance-campus-sexual-misconduct).

VanDeusen, Karen, and Ineke Way. 2006. "Vicarious Trauma: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of Providing Sexual Abuse Treatment on Clinicians' Trust and Intimacy." *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse* 15(1):69–85.

Vemuri, Ayesha. 2018. "'Calling Out' Campus Sexual Violence: Student Activist Labors of Confrontation and Care." *Communication, Culture & Critique* 11(3):498–502.

VIP Center. 2021. "Green Dot." *University of Kentucky*. Retrieved March 12, 2021. (https://www.uky.edu/vipcenter/content/green-dot).

Wade, Lisa, Brian Sweeney, Amelia Seraphia Derr, Michael Messner, and Carol Burke. 2014. "Ruling Out Rape." *Contexts* 13(2):16.

Walker, Edward, Andrew Martin, and John McCarthy. 2008. “Confronting the State, the Corporation, and the Academy: The Influence of Institutional Targets on Social Movement Repertoires.” *American Journal of Sociology* 114(1):35–76.

Ward, Jane. 2008. *Respectably Queer: Diversity Culture in LGBT Activist Organizations*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Wasco, Sharon, Rebecca Campbell, and Marcia Clark. 2002. “A Multiple Case Study of Rape Victim Advocates’ Self-Care Routines: The Influence of Organizational Context.” *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30(5):731–60.

Way, Ineke, Karen VanDeusen, Gail Martin, Brooks Applegate, and Deborah Jandle. 2004. “Vicarious Trauma: A Comparison of Clinicians Who Treat Survivors of Sexual Abuse and Sexual Offenders.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19(1):49–71.

Whittier, Nancy. 2016. “Carceral and Intersectional Feminism in Congress: The Violence against Women Act, Discourse, and Policy.” *Gender & Society* 30(5):791–818.

Whittier, Nancy. 2018. “Activism against Sexual Assault on Campus: Origins, Opportunities and Outcomes.” Pp. 133–50 in *Nevertheless, They Persisted: Feminisms and Continued Resistance in the U.S. Women’s Movement*, edited by J. Reger. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wies, Jennifer, and Kathleen Coy. 2013. “Measuring Violence: Vicarious Trauma among Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners.” *Human Organization* 72(1):23–30.

Wood, Lesley. 2004. “Breaking the Bank and Taking to the Streets: How Protesters Target Neoliberalism.” *Journal of World-Systems Research* 10:69–89.

Yule, Kristen, and John Grych. 2017. “College Students’ Perceptions of Barriers to Bystander Intervention.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 35(15-16):2971-2992.

APPENDIX A: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWEES

Interviewees Demographic Information		
Name	**Organization**	**Demographic Characteristics**
Lexi	SFV	Gender Identity: Cisgender Woman Sexuality: Queer Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 24 Socio-economic status: Lower-middle class
Octavia	SFV	Gender Identity: Woman Sexuality: Queer Race/Ethnicity: Black Age: 24 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Tanya	SFV	Gender Identity: Woman Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: Mexican Age: 22 Socio-economic status: Lower-middle class
Hailey	SFV	Gender Identity: Woman Sexuality: Queer Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 25 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Brittany	SFV	Gender Identity: Woman Sexuality: Straight Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 18 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Jayda	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: African American Age: 22 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Mason	CAV	Gender Identity: Male Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 21 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Lance	CAV	Gender Identity: Male Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 20 Socio-economic status: Middle class

Taylor	CAV	Gender Identity: Male Sexuality: Gay Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 20 Socio-economic status: Middle-upper class
Sabra	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Straight Race/Ethnicity: White and Middle Eastern Age: 19 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Anita	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Straight Race/Ethnicity: Indian-Asian Age: 19 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Ashley	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Straight Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 20 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Patrick	CAV	Gender Identity: Male Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 20 Socio-economic status: Lower class
Candice	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: Black Age: 30 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Lisa	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Bi-sexual Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 23 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Kenna	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Straight Race/Ethnicity: African American Age: 20 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Sarah Ann	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Heterosexual Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 18 Socio-economic status: Middle class
Kerry	CAV	Gender Identity: Female Sexuality: Straight Race/Ethnicity: White Age: 21 Socio-economic status: Middle class

APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

During the period of this research, I made numerous decisions that required ethical and methodological considerations. As a researcher who asked participants to be open and honest with me, I sought to be honest and transparent in my interactions in the field. This meant disclosing my sexual identity as a queer woman and, at times when participants asked, my own experiences of gender-based violence. I also considered how to present myself during CAV meetings, and I was transparent about my research and the purpose of my presence at CAV meetings and events. However, I sought to "fit in" among students by discussing graduate school and wearing casual clothing. At first, I was concerned about appearing as aligned with CAV's executive board and alienating general members since the board was my point of entrée into the organization. It soon became apparent that the executive board members represented the majority of CAV membership, with only a few other students regularly attending CAV events or meetings. Nevertheless, I reflected upon my position as a researcher in the field to evaluate how this shaped my perspective and how my social position influenced this research.

One important ethical decision in this process was to ensure that I respected and was sensitive to disclosures of survivorship in private spaces. Students rarely discussed instances of gender-based violence at CAV meetings or events. However, the peer educator training sessions did include questions and discussions about students' exposure to violence. During these moments, I did not record details of individuals' experiences of violence as this was not the purpose of this dissertation, and I did not have explicit permission from each peer educator trainee to share their stories. However, I did disclose my status as a researcher and notified the

group of my presence. Instead of recording information about individuals' experiences of violence, I noted general trends such as what motivated peer educators to join CAV---their own experiences of violence, friends and family members' experiences of violence, or general concern with violence on campus. Survivor activists emphasize the importance of respecting survivors' rights to share their own stories. As such, I did not include any information in this dissertation about individuals' experiences of violence that were not shared directly with me during interviews.

In addition to ethical issues regarding potential disclosure of survivorhood, I encountered one interaction that required special consideration of the methodological implications of my actions. In the second semester of my observations with CAV, I was asked to participate in an LGBTQ panel with BSU faculty, staff, and students on experiences of LGBTQ people living in the South. Although I do not subscribe to positivists notions that researchers can exist in the field without impacting the environment, I hold with feminist methodologies that challenge assumptions of complete objectivity and recognize the researcher as part of the social environment (Acker, Barry, and Esseveld 1983; Haraway 1998). Still, I had to consider how my participation in the panel would shape the event and how my response would impact my relationship with CAV members. Ultimately, I relied on principles of feminist methods to make this decision. Feminist methodologies emphasize the importance of addressing power relations between the researcher and participants and, when possible, producing knowledge with and for participants (Jagger 2014). CAV members were consistently asked to contribute their knowledge to CAV meetings and events by directing conversations around different forms of violence. I was asked to contribute my own experiences to this organization and chose to adhere to the request of my participants.

In addition to ethical and methodological considerations, I must note the influence of Covid-19 in my research practice. I had initially made plans with CAV members to present my research findings to the organization in the Spring of 2020. These plans were interrupted as BSU shifted to online learning. Despite attempts to reschedule in the 2020-2021 school year, Covid-19 has continued to disrupt the organization's meetings and practices. While I have shared the results of this study with participants who expressed interest in follow-up communication, I still hope to share results with the CAV executive team.