

Green Dot Bystander Intervention Training Evaluation

Division of Student Affairs

2015-2016

Background

According to its website (<https://greendot.tamu.edu/>), Green Dot is an international movement built on the premise that individuals can systematically and measurably reduce the levels of power-based personal violence found in their community. Based on the social diffusion theory and social psychological research, Green Dot reinforces the belief that each person has the power to incite change in their social environment.

Through the Division of Student Affairs, Green Dot provides two ways to educate the Aggie family. Students, faculty, staff and interested community members can either participate in an overview, which is an introduction to Green Dot concepts, or participate in the more in-depth intervention training. Those who participated in the Green Dot Bystander Intervention training classes this year were given a survey to assess the program and how it affected their understanding of related concepts. Green Dot has previously assessed their program, and this is the fourth year that Student Life Studies has worked with Green Dot.

Method and Sample

Two surveys were developed; one intended for students, and the other for staff, faculty and community members who attended the programs. Surveys were produced using Teleform[®], survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. Of the 20 questions on both surveys, 12 were quantitative, five were qualitative, and three were demographic. The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS[®], a statistical software package, and the qualitative data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel[®]. Surveys were distributed after the training classes were completed; surveys from 10 classes were returned to Student Life Studies for analysis. It is unknown how many Green Dot Bystander Intervention training participants received surveys so response rates cannot be determined, but 128 faculty, staff and community members and 31 students took at least part of the survey.

Results

Results include frequency percentages, means, and standard deviations (sd) for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. In addition, summary themes are contained within this report, while the full qualitative responses can be found in a separate document. This report is divided into two sections: Staff and Faculty Survey and Student Survey. Results will be compared to previous years' results where appropriate.

Staff and Faculty Survey

Table 1 provides the demographics for the faculty, staff and community members participating in the Green Dot/Bystander Training Program. Ethnicity was asked in a check-all-that-apply format. Similar to previous years, a majority of participants were staff members, female, and Caucasian. However, compared to 2014-2015, the percentage of faculty attending more than doubled, the percentage of attendees identifying as male double, and the percentage of those identifying as African American/Black doubled.

Demographic Statements	Frequency Percentage 2015-2016	Frequency Percentage 2014-2015
Classification	n=127	n=77
Staff	80%	83%
Faculty	15%	7%
Community Members	5%	10%
Gender	n=128	n=77
Female	73%	86%
Male	26%	13%
Prefer not to answer	2%	--
No answer given	--	1%
Transgender	--	--
Ethnicity	n=127	n=77
Caucasian/White	72%	78%
Hispanic/Latino	17%	17%
African American/Black	10%	5%
Native American/American Indian	2%	1%
Asian American, Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	1%
Prefer not to answer	2%	--
Not listed	1%	--

Table 1: Demographics

Participants were asked why they attended the program. Of the 123 respondents, 61% indicated personal interest, 26% were referred by faculty/staff and 13% chose the “other” response selection. No one selected the option referred by a friend. The referred by faculty/staff, friends and the “other” response selections provided space for respondents to write in the faculty/staff name/department, friend’s name and to specify “other”. There were a variety of department names and faculty staff names written in which included the Office of Sustainability, Admissions customer service, Diane Kraft, Kelly Wellman and Offices of the Dean of Student Life. Those who selected referred by “other” most frequently wrote in email as a response. As no one selected the option referred by a friend, no responses were written in after that selection.

The staff, faculty and community members were asked a series of questions to evaluate their understanding of power-based personal violence before and after the training and their willingness to take actions in situations involving it. Table 2, on the next page, in descending 2015-2016 “after” mean order, shows that after training staff members had a better understanding of what power-based personal violence means and strategies used to intervene when an incident is occurring. Similar to previous years, respondents’ understanding and willingness to take action increased in all aspects due to Green Dot training.

Statement	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Neither Good nor Poor (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	2015=2016 Mean (sd) [n]	2014-2015 Mean (sd) [n]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (before)	8%	28%	30%	28%	6%	3.05 (1.05) [127]	3.05 (1.00) [77]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (after)	76%	23%	2%	--	--	4.74 (.48) [110]	4.62 (.52) [68]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	2%	10%	34%	45%	8%	2.54 (.87) [126]	2.43 (.95) [77]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	66%	32%	3%	--	--	4.63 (.54) [110]	4.66 (.54) [68]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (before)	9%	39%	34%	16%	2%	3.39 (.92) [127]	3.35 (.93) [77]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (after)	57%	39%	4%	--	--	4.54 (.57) [110]	4.57 (.61) [68]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	9%	38%	31%	17%	6%	3.27 (1.03) [127]	3.16 (.95) [77]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	56%	41%	3%	--	--	4.53 (.55) [109]	4.50 (.59) [68]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	4%	25%	46%	23%	2%	3.06 (.86) [127]	3.18 (.94) [77]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	48%	47%	5%	--	--	4.44 (.58) [110]	4.47 (.56) [68]

Table 2: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked what their barriers/obstacles to intervening were. Many answered that fear for their own personal safety or for others who were with them prevented them from intervening. Shyness and tendency to avoid conflict, possible embarrassment and feeling it was none of their business was also mentioned. Quite a few indicated that they were afraid intervening would cause the situation to escalate, or that they were afraid of misinterpreting the situation, some due to cultural or language differences. Some indicated lack of time to get involved, especially if involvement caused an investigation.

Next, participants were asked what strategies they could use to intervene given their barriers. The most popular responses were delegate, distract, and both delegate and distract. Many indicated delegating to authorities or others who could help. Some mentioned all three D's of distract, delegate and direct. Those who indicated direct added qualifiers like using "I" statements and showing empathy in the situation.

Feedback regarding the facilitators of Green Dot training was requested of the participants through a series of statements in which participants rated their level of agreement. As shown in Table 3 the majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging, knowledgeable and well prepared.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2015-2016 Mean (sd) [125]
The facilitators were engaging.	82%	15%	1%	--	2%	4.74 (.71)
The facilitators were knowledgeable.	78%	19%	2%	--	--	4.71 (.71)
The facilitators were well prepared.	66%	25%	4%	3%	2%	4.48 (.90)

Table 3: Facilitator Evaluation

Participants were requested to provide any further feedback regarding the workshop facilitators. Feedback was primarily complimentary of the facilitators as many found them engaging, informative, and found the personal stories shared by the facilitators compelling. Some commented about the facilities not being large enough for the group, and that the technical difficulties were challenging for the presenters.

When asked if they felt all topics were given adequate time in the program 93% of the 124 respondents said yes, 7% said maybe and 1% said no. Respondents were then able to write in the topics they thought needed adjustment. The majority of written responses that were identified as needing less time were n/a, but a few identified barriers to intervention, examples, types of barriers, signs of violence and red dot. Topics which were identified as needing more time were the definitions, more role playing and practice using interventions and coming up with intervention strategies.

A majority of participants (94%) said they would recommend this program to a friend, 6% indicated that they might, and no respondents said they would not recommend the program to a friend (n=120). Eighty-six percent of 108 respondents answered yes when asked if they would be interested in attending other events hosted by Green Dot, and 14% answered no. Contact information for individuals or organizations who attendees thought would benefit from this training and those who would be interested in other events hosted by Green Dot can be found separately.

Student Survey

Table 4 provides the demographics for the students participating in the Green Dot/Bystander Training Program. Ethnicity was asked in a check all that apply format. A majority of participants were seniors, female, and Caucasian.

Demographic Statements	Frequency Percentage 2015-2016	Frequency Percentage 2014-2015
Classification	n=31	n=155
Senior	36%	16%
Sophomore	19%	43%
Graduate Student	19%	10%
Freshman	16%	7%
Junior	10%	25%
Gender	n=31	n=167
Female	81%	68%
Male	19%	30%
Prefer not to answer	--	2%
Transgender	--	--
Ethnicity	n=31	n=165
Caucasian/White	58%	67%
Hispanic/Latino	23%	26%
Asian American, Asian/Pacific Islander	16%	9%
Prefer not to answer	3%	2%
Native American/American Indian	3%	1%
African American/Black	--	5%
Other	--	--

Table 4: Demographics

Participants were asked why they attended the program. Of the 28 respondents, 61% indicated personal interest, 25% were referred by faculty/staff, 7% chose the “other” response selection and 7% were referred by a friend. The referred by faculty/staff, friend and the “other” response selections provided space for respondents to write in the faculty/staff name/department, friend’s name and to specify “other.” Eight respondents listed organization names and faculty/staff names, which included Maroon and White Leadership Fellows, Marcia Montague, Emily Gregori, Cameron Morrison and Lauren Dorsett. Two respondents who chose referred by a friend wrote in Abby Sticker and Tyler Hoyt. Those who selected referred by “other” wrote in email, Fish Camp, sorority sisters, and Maroon and White Leadership Fellows.

Students were asked a series of questions to evaluate their understanding of power-based personal violence before and after the training and their willingness to take actions in situations involving it. Table 5, on the next page, shows that after training students had a better understanding of what power-based personal violence means, and responses were slightly higher than last year’s responses. Respondents’ understanding and willingness to take action increased in all aspects due to Green Dot training.

Statement	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Neither Good nor Poor (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	2015-2016 Mean (sd) [n]	2014-2015 Mean (sd) [n]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (before)	--	36%	29%	32%	3%	2.97 (.91) [31]	2.89 (.95) [165]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (after)	87%	13%	--	--	--	4.87 (.34) [23]	4.78 (.42) [146]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	--	32%	36%	32%	--	3.00 (.82) [31]	3.07 (.89) [166]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	83%	17%	--	--	--	4.83 (.39) [23]	4.48 (.54) [145]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	--	7%	39%	42%	13%	2.39 (.80) [31]	2.47 (.82) [166]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	82%	18%	--	--	--	4.82 (.40) [22]	4.67 (.51) [145]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (before)	7%	48%	29%	16%	--	3.45 (.85) [31]	3.48 (.87) [166]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (after)	74%	26%	--	--	--	4.74 (.45) [23]	4.57 (.56) [145]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	3%	36%	45%	16%	--	3.26 (.77) [31]	3.33 (.98) [166]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	74%	26%	--	--	--	4.74 (.45) [23]	4.52 (.55) [145]

Table 5: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked what their barriers/obstacles to intervening were. The most frequent type of answer was in regards to fear for their own personal safety which prevented them from intervening. Shyness and tendency to avoid conflict, and possible embarrassment was also mentioned. A few indicated that they were afraid intervening would cause the situation to escalate, or that they were afraid of misinterpreting the situation.

Next, participants were asked what strategies they could use to intervene given their barriers. The most popular responses were both delegate and distract, then distract, delegate and least frequently mentioned was direct. A few indicated delegating to authorities or others who could help and a few mention all three D's (delegate, distract, direct).

Feedback regarding the facilitators of Green Dot training was then requested of the participants through a series of statements in which participants rated their level of agreement. As noted in Table 6, on the next page, all of the student participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging, knowledgeable and well prepared.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2015-2016 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators were knowledgeable.	87%	13%	--	--	--	4.87 (.35) [30]
The facilitators were engaging.	86%	14%	--	--	--	4.86 (.35) [29]
The facilitators were well prepared.	67%	33%	--	--	--	4.67 (.48) [30]

Table 6: Facilitator Evaluation - Students

Participants were requested to provide any further feedback regarding the workshop facilitators. Feedback was primarily complimentary of the facilitators, as most found them engaging, passionate about the subject and informative. A few participants commented about technical challenges, lack of planning for multiple presenters and provided a suggestion to incorporate peer educators.

When asked if they felt all topics were given adequate time in the program 97% of the 29 respondents said yes, 3% said maybe and no one selected no. Respondents were then able to write in the topics they thought needed adjustment. Two responses indicated the video, polling and strategies to intervene could be given less time in the presentations, although most shared that no topics needed to be given less time. Topics which were identified as needing more time were reactive/proactive, and how to deal with strangers (and not just friends). And, similar to the faculty and staff suggestions, the students also felt more time could be dedicated to more real life examples, and practice using interventions.

All of the 28 student respondents said they would recommend this program to a friend. Eighty-nine percent of 26 respondents answered yes when asked if they would be interested in attending other events hosted by Green Dot, and 12% answered no. Contact information for individuals or organizations who attendees thought would benefit from this training, and those who would be interested in other events hosted by Green Dot can be found separately.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Green Dot Bystander Intervention training was successful as faculty, staff, community members and students indicated learning more about power-based personal violence. They also identified their own barriers to intervening, but as a result of the training, felt more comfortable taking action in power-based personal violence situations. Because of this training, individuals could identify ways that they could make a difference and spread the Green Dot movement.

Overall participants found the training facilitators knowledgeable and engaging. However, some of the faculty/staff/community member participants, as well as the student participants, noted that the facilitators experienced some technical challenges with their presentations. If Green Dot organizers offer facilitators a refresher Green Dot facilitation training, it should also include more training on any presentation technology the facilitators are expected to use during the programs. Also, per additional recommendations from the participants, more time for role play and intervention practice would be useful in further building participants' confidence in using the distract, direct and delegate interventions.

Although participants indicated learning about power-based personal violence and interventions through the Green Dot Bystander Intervention training, staff may also consider assessing the effectiveness of the trainings. They could contact previous attendees, ask whether they have needed to intervene on another's behalf and inquire whether or what training resulting from attending the Green Dot Bystander Intervention training was most useful. The assessment could be done via various means, such as a survey followed-up by interviews or focus groups.

Demographic data provided by participants continues to indicate that female participation in the program was much higher than male participation, although the percentage of males increased over previous years. Also, significantly fewer

assessments were received from student participants in Green Dot trainings. Green Dot organizers may want to evaluate marketing techniques for future programs to attract more male participants to the program, as well as focus efforts on increasing the participation of students.

The Green Dot staff and facilitators are encouraged to read all qualitative comments to gain a better understanding of the themes seen in this report. Changes made based on the assessment results could be shared with participants, as well as other stakeholders on campus and within the community.

Report prepared for: Ryan Jackson, CLEAR, Offices of the Dean of Student Life
Report Prepared by: Susan Fox-Forrester, Student Life Studies
Report Prepared on: October 4, 2016
Analysis Prepared by: Dan Yin, Student Life Studies
Surveys Created by: Rachael Hovey and Tyler Harkrider, Student Life Studies

*Services provided by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by Texas A&M University Advancement Fee.
Find Student Life Studies on Facebook.*