

Offices of the Dean of Student Life – Health Promotions

Green Dot Bystander Intervention Overview and Training Evaluations

2020-2021

Purpose of Assessment

According to its website (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. Students, staff and faculty who participated in the Texas A&M Green Dot Bystander Intervention training classes and the Green Dot Overview virtual workshops were surveyed to assess the programs and how attending affected participants' understanding of concepts related to power-based personal violence.

Key Findings with Recommendations

Student Life Studies identified several key findings and developed actionable recommendations the department may take based on the results. However, Health Promotions staff may identify other findings using their knowledge and understanding of the community. Staff members are strongly encouraged to read all the results and qualitative comments to gain a fuller understanding of participants' experiences.

- The Green Dot Bystander Intervention training was successful as the students indicated learning more about power-based personal violence. They also identified their barriers to intervening, and because of the training, they felt more comfortable taking action in power-based personal violence situations. They also could identify ways that they could make a difference and spread the Green Dot movement.
- Those attending the Green Dot Overview also indicated they learned more about how they could intervene, and their barriers to doing so. Participants of both the Bystander Intervention training and the Overview found the facilitators knowledgeable and engaging. Those participating in the Bystander Intervention Training suggested more time for role-play scenarios, devising intervention strategies and less time on red dots would improve the program for them. Overview participants suggested that adding moderators to breakout discussions could improve the virtual format, lengthening the breakouts and recommending all participants turn their cameras on during discussion.
- Although participants indicated learning about power-based personal violence and interventions through the Green Dot Bystander Intervention training, staff may also consider assessing participants' application of the training.
- Previous attendees could be contacted, asked whether they have needed to intervene on another's behalf and inquire whether or what they learned from attending the Green Dot Bystander Intervention Training was most useful. The assessment could be done through various means, such as a survey followed-up by interviews or focus groups.

Method and Sample

Two paper surveys were developed for Green Dot Bystander Intervention training classes held in-person from February 2021 through June 2021. One survey was created for trainings that included only students, and one for trainings created for staff, faculty and community members. Surveys were produced using Teleform®, a survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. Of the 22 questions on the staff and faculty survey, 13 were quantitative, six were qualitative, and three were demographic. Of the 23 questions on the student survey, 13 were quantitative, eight were qualitative, and two were demographic. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and the qualitative data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel®. No in-person Green Dot Bystander Intervention trainings were held for staff, faculty or community members, so no surveys were returned to Student Life Studies to process. One hundred-thirteen students received the Green Dot Bystander Intervention training survey during four workshops, with a response rate of 100%. Total number of surveys is slightly less than last year, when 133 students participated in seven trainings and took the surveys.

Another survey was developed for the Green Dot Overview workshop using Qualtrics®, a software program for creating web-based surveys. The survey consisted of 12 questions: five quantitative, three qualitative questions, and four demographic; due to branching technology not all responders saw all questions. Quantitative and demographic data were analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package and qualitative data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel®. The survey was available to workshop participants via an open link/QR code provided near the end of the Green Dot Overview workshops, held in virtual form only from August 2020 through July 2021. It is unknown how many Green Dot Overview workshop participants were provided the survey link/QR code so a response rate cannot be determined; however, 672 responded to at least one question in 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: the Green Dot Overview workshop and Green Dot Bystander Intervention training (student survey only). Results will be compared to previous years' results where appropriate.

Green Dot Overview Workshop

The survey opened asking respondents to share their classification and select what describes their primary role on campus. Table 1 shows that one-quarter of participants attending the Green Dot Overview were staff, 4% were faculty and the remaining 71% were students.

	Percent Spring 2021
Staff	25%
Junior	21%
Freshman	18%
Senior	10%
Sophomore	13%
Graduate Student	8%
Faculty	4%

Table 1: Respondents Classification (n=672)

Those who indicated they were students were asked to provide their university identification number (UIN). Table 2 on the next page shows the demographics retrieved from the student database, using each student's UIN that they provided in the survey. A majority of the participants were seniors, female, and White.

Demographic Data	Percent 2020- 2021
Classification	n=415
Senior	28%
Junior	24%
Freshman	20%
Sophomore	18%
Masters	7%
Doctoral	3%
Sex	n=415
Female	77%
Male	23%
Ethnicity	n=415
White	50%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	27%
Asian	12%
Black or multi-racial with Black	6%
Multi-racial excluding Black	3%
International	1%
American Indian	1%
First Generation Status	
Not First Generation	71%
First Generation	24%
Unknown	5%

Table 2: Student Demographics

Respondents were provided with the scenario “You are at a party, and you notice that your friend, who is clearly intoxicated, is getting led outside with someone they don’t know.” Next, respondents were asked to select from an all that apply list the bystander intervention tactic they could use in that scenario. Of the 505 who responded, 62% chose the direct tactic, 62% chose the distract tactic and 53 % chose the delegate tactic. Those who selected the direct bystander intervention tactic were asked which direct tactic they would use from a list of three tactics.

Direct Tactic	Percent Spring 2021
Address both person being harmed and person doing the harm	51%
Address person doing the harm.	47%
Address person being harmed	45%

Table 3: Direct Intervention Tactics (n=312)

All respondents who selected a bystander intervention tactic were asked why they chose that bystander intervention tactic and 425 responded. Those who chose the distract tactic as their preferred tactic to use when confronted with the provided scenario said it was their choice because that tactic was less confrontational, would keep them and the potential victim safe and de-escalate the situation. Similar reasons were noted for those who indicated that delegation was their preferred tactic, though those who preferred delegation also noted they thought another with expertise in intervening could address the situation more safely. Those who chose direct as their preferred tactic thought it best as the scenario required a more immediate response than the distract and delegate tactics provided, and that they were comfortable directly intervening on behalf of a friend.

From a list of common barriers, respondents were asked to select what would be their greatest barrier preventing them from intervening in this situation (the scenario). As noted in Table 4, the uncertainty of interpreting the situation and it not being as concerning as it seems was selected by almost one-quarter of respondents. Those who selected other could write a response and seven wrote responses such as none, fear of making the situation worse for the victim, preference to approach with a group and not noticing what was happening in time to act.

Barriers:	Percent 2020- 2021
Uncertainty that the situation is not as concerning as you think	23%
Personality Traits (shy, introverted)	21%
Fear for your physical safety	18%
Discomfort in confronting someone you don't know	16%
Fear of retaliation	9%
Discomfort in confronting someone you know	6%
Concern of how others around you will react	6%
Other	2%

Table 4: Barriers to Intervening (n=503)

Next, respondents were asked how they were going to use Proactive Green Dots after attending the overview, and 397 responded. Many indicated they would spread the word by telling others about Green Dot in person, on social media and within their student organizations. Some also noted they would be more observant of what is happening around them, check in with friends and intervene as necessary.

When asked if the facilitator was prepared for the presentation, 99% of the 498 respondents selected yes, 1% selected somewhat and no one selected no. Next, respondents were asked if the facilitator provided relatable examples throughout the presentation, 98% of 498 respondents indicated yes, 2% indicated somewhat and no one indicated no. When asked how the presentation could be improved, a majority of the 281 respondents complemented the presentation, indicated no change was necessary or just noted "NA". Students who attended the Overview made some suggestions for improving the program, such as adding more video and other visuals, more time in the breakout sessions and scenarios with more varied environments. Students also suggested a trigger warning for the content and promoting the program to increase attendance of men. Faculty and staff suggestions for improvement were similar to that of the students, and they also suggested having moderators in the breakout rooms to promote discussions and take away handouts. Students, staff and faculty all suggested that turning cameras on be encouraged for all attendees, especially in the breakout rooms.

All respondents were requested to share their gender in an open response question. About 67% of the 308 who wrote responses wrote female, 25% wrote male, and about 1% wrote non-binary. The remaining 10% wrote in responses including Woman, Ciswoman, Cis-Gendered male, Cis-gendered female, Neutral, and Man.

Those respondents who indicated they were staff or faculty were asked to share their ethnicity. As indicated on Table 5, on the next page, a majority of staff and faculty who responded identified as White. Although one selected the response "I identify as" which then allowed for a text entry, no text entry was given.

Demographic Statements	2020-2021 Percent
Ethnicity	
White	57%
Hispanic/Latinx	27%
African American/Black	11%
Prefer not to answer	6%
Asian American/Asian/Pacific Islander	3%
Not listed	1%
Native American/American Indian	1%
I identify as [text response]	1%

Table 5: Staff and Faculty Ethnicity (n=167)

Green Dot Intervention Training (Student Survey)

The survey opened with questions requesting students write the workshop date and facilitators' names, which are listed in the quantitative output documents. Students were then asked to provide their UIN. Table 6 shows the demographics retrieved from the student database using each student's university identification number (UIN). A majority of participants were senior, female, and White. The 2018-2019 frequency percentages came from students' self-report on the survey.

Demographic Data	Percent Spring 2021	Percent 2019-2020	Percent 2018-2019
Classification	n=104	n=115	n=262
Senior	66%	30%	28%
Junior	23%	25%	29%
Masters	5%	6%	5%
Sophomore	4%	17%	23%
Doctoral	1%	8%	3%
Freshman	--	13%	12%
Sex	n=104	n=115	n=262
Female	55%	68%	60%
Male	45%	32%	41%
Ethnicity	n=104	n=115	n=262
White	71%	54%	52%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	19%	19%	25%
Asian	5%	13%	11%
Black or multi-racial with Black	3%	4%	5%
Multi-racial excluding Black	2%	4%	3%
International	--	5%	4%
Unknown or Not Reported	--	<1%	*

Table 6: Demographics of Students

*Not reported

On the survey, students were asked to identify their gender using a written response. Table 7, on the next page, provides the demographic write-in for the students participating in the Green Dot/Bystander training program. A slight majority of attendees identified as female.

Demographic Statement	Percent Spring 2021	Percent 2019-2020	Percent 2018-2019
Gender	n=113	n=127	n=262
Female	53%	67%	61%
Male	47%	32%	38%

Table 7: Self-Reported Gender

Participants were asked why they attended the program. Of the 113 respondents, 90% were referred by a student organization, 4% were referred by faculty/staff, 3% indicated personal interest, 2% chose the “other” response selection and 1% were referred by a friend. The referred by faculty/staff, friend and the “other” response selections provided space for respondents to write the faculty/staff name/department, friend’s name and to specify “other”. Five respondents listed Fish Camp as organization names and faculty/staff names, and three respondents who selected referred by “other” listed Fish Camp and Fish Camp Chair. The responses can be found in the separate attached document.

Students were asked a series of statements 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 8, on this page and the following page, shows that like in previous years, students reported a better understanding of what power-based personal violence means before and after the Green Dot Intervention training. Respondents’ reported understanding and willingness to take action increased in all aspects after the Green Dot training.

Statement	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Neither Good nor Poor (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	Spring 2021 Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (before)	4%	54%	33%	8%	1%	3.53 (.75) [113]	3.46 (.89) [130]	3.58 (1.00) [318]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (after)	89%	11%	--	--	--	4.89 (.31) [113]	4.73 (0.44) [124]	4.84 (.42) [286]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	9%	44%	31%	14%	2%	3.44 (.91) [113]	2.85 (.98) [130]	3.00 (1.04) [318]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	80%	20%	1%	--	--	4.79 (.43) [113]	4.64 (.56) [124]	4.77 (.52) [286]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	9%	43%	27%	20%	2%	3.36 (.96) [113]	3.37 (1.01) [130]	3.36 (1.02) [318]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	70%	29%	1%	--	--	4.69 (.48) [113]	4.71 (.46) [123]	4.65 (.57) [286]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (before)	13%	34%	36%	13%	5%	3.39 (1.02) [112]	3.29 (.89) [129]	3.41 (1.02) [218]

Statement	Very Good (5)	Good (4)	Neither Good nor Poor (3)	Poor (2)	Very Poor (1)	Spring 2021 Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (after)	68%	32%	--	--	-	4.68 (.47) [112]	4.50 (.55) [123]	4.62 (.59) [285]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	13%	35%	35%	13%	4%	3.42 (1.00) [113]	3.22 (.91) [129]	3.33 (.99) [318]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	61%	39%	--	--	--	4.61 (.49) [113]	4.48 (.50) [122]	4.57 (.59) [286]

Table 8: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked about their barriers/obstacles to intervening. The most frequent type of answer was in regard to feeling embarrassed if they intervene and misreading the situation (intervening when they should not). Many mentioned fear for their personal safety and retaliation for intervening, whether physically or socially. Fear of conflict or confrontation, afraid intervening would cause the situation to escalate, shyness, and feeling it was not their business were also mentioned as reasons to not intervene.

Next, participants were asked what strategies they could use to intervene given their barriers. The most popular response was to delegate to someone in authority or someone who knows what to do, or delegate to a group of people to help. Distracting was the second most popular responses, and a direct approach was least popular. A few mentioned all three D's (delegate, distract, direct), as well as mentioned they would address the victim after the situation resolved to check on their welfare.

Participants' feedback regarding the facilitators of Green Dot training was requested through a series of statements for which participants could rate their level of agreement or disagreement. As noted in Table 9, most student participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging within the learning environment and effectively answered questions.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Spring 2021 Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators effectively answered questions about the subject presented	91%	6%	--	--	4%	4.80 (.78) [110]	4.56 (.94) [126]	*
The facilitators were engaging within the learning environment	87%	8%	--	--	5%	4.74 (.86) [111]	*	*

Table 9: Facilitator Evaluation - Students

*Question not asked

Respondents were requested to write topics they thought needed adjustment, given more or less time during the presentation. Seventy-five responded, most writing N/A, or that everything was good as is. Some indicated that less time could be spent on recognizing barriers, lecture style information and icebreakers. Topics that were identified

as needing more time were strategies of intervention, proactive green dots, and practicing strategies to intervene. When asked how the training could be improved, 104 responded with primarily complimentary comments. Some suggested the training be more concise, less time on red dots and more on green dots. A few wanted more discussion and interaction, with more mock scenarios for practice. Others suggested an expansion of topics discussed, to include information on how personal violence looks different between different groups (racial, religious, gender-oriented groups), and how language perpetuates sexual violence.

Background

Through the Offices of the Dean of Student Life within the Division of Student Affairs, Green Dot provides two ways to educate interested people. 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. Both groups of participants are 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 fifth year that Student Life Studies has worked with Green Dot.

Project Details

Gathering restrictions due to COVID-19 caused the number of workshops conducted and surveys received to be less than last year numbers.

The Department of Student Life Studies provides quality assessment services, resources and assessment training for departments in the Texas A&M University Division of Student Affairs and student organizations. Services by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by the Texas A&M University Advancement Fee. Results of this project and other assessment projects done through Student Life Studies can be found at <https://studentlifestudies.tamu.edu/results/>. Additionally, division staff and student can follow Student Life Studies on Facebook.

To work with Student Life Studies for future assessment projects, please fill out the Assessment Questionnaire at <https://slsform.dsaapps.tamu.edu/>.

Report prepared for: Dr. Denise Cristafi, Health Promotion, Offices of the Dean of Student Life
Report Prepared by: Susan Fox-Forrester, Student Life Studies
Report Prepared on: October 22, 2021
Analysis Prepared by: Dr. Robert Tirso, Student Life Studies
Surveys Created by: Susan Fox- Forrester and Barbara Schumacher, Student Life Studies