

Student Life – Health Promotions

Green Dot Bystander Intervention Overview and Training Evaluations

2021-2022

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 Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research (SAPAR) 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, including telling others about Green Dot in-person, on social media, within their student organizations and organize Green Dot presentations within their organizations.
- 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 with practical techniques, and a few suggest it be shorter. Overview participants suggested that adding more videos, real-life examples and more polls to enhance interaction could improve that program's format.
- 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 or Overview was most useful. The assessment could be done through various means, such as a survey followed-up by interviews or focus groups. Please contact SAPAR if interested in a follow-up assessment.

Method and Sample

Two paper surveys were developed for Green Dot Bystander Intervention training classes held in-person from August 2021 through June 2022. 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 papersurvey.io[®], a survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. Of the 21 questions on the staff and faculty survey, 15 were quantitative, three were qualitative, and three were demographic. Of the 20 questions on the student survey, 15 were quantitative, three 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[®]. Five in-person Green Dot Bystander Intervention trainings were held for staff, faculty or community members, with 86 surveys distributed and returned to SAPAR resulting in a 100% response rate. Two hundred-eighteen (218) students received the Green Dot Bystander Intervention training survey during 11 workshops, with a response rate of 100%.

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 from August 2021 through July 2022. 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, 533 responded to at least one question in the survey, fewer than the 672 in 2020-2021.

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%. Tables are in descending order for 2021-2022 results unless otherwise stated. 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 three sections: the Green Dot Overview workshop and Green Dot Bystander Intervention training (student and faculty/staff). 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 83% were students and the remaining 18% staff or faculty.

	Percent Year 2021-2022 (n=533)	Percent Spring 2021 (n=?)
Freshman	31%	18%
Sophomore	17%	13%
Junior	17%	21%
Staff	16%	25%
Senior	12%	10%
Graduate Student	5%	8%
Faculty	2%	4%

Table 1: Respondents Classification

Those who indicated they were students were asked to provide their Universal Identification Number (UIN). Table 2, on the next page, shows the demographics retrieved from the student database, based on each student's UIN that they provided on the survey.

Demographic Data	Percent 2021-2022	Percent 2020- 2021
Classification	n=389	n=415

Demographic Data	Percent 2021-2022	Percent 2020- 2021
Senior	24%	28%
Junior	24%	24%
Sophomore	24%	18%
Freshman	19%	20%
Masters	2%	7%
Doctoral	1%	3%
Sex	n=389	n=415
Female	68%	77%
Male	32%	23%
Ethnicity	n=389	n=415
White	49%	50%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	29%	27%
Asian	15%	12%
Black or multi-racial with Black	3%	6%
Multi-racial excluding Black	2%	3%
International	1%	1%
American Indian	<1%	1%
First Generation Status	n=389	n=415
Not First Generation	69%	71%
First Generation	28%	24%
Unknown	3%	5%

Table 2: Student Demographics

Those who noted they were faculty and staff were asked to share the ethnic and racial demographic(s) for which they identify from a select-all-that-apply listing. Noted on Table 3, the Hispanic/Latinx demographic was the most frequently selected, making up nearly half of faculty and staff respondents. One responded to “I identify as” and wrote South Asian.

Ethnicity- Race	Percent 2021- 2022 n=62
Hispanic/Latinx	45%
White	39%
African American/Black	10%
I prefer not to respond	8%
Native American/American Indian	2%
Asian American, Asian /Pacific Islander	2%
I identify as (write in response)	2%

Table 3: Faculty/Staff Self-reported Ethnicity/Race

All 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 a check all that apply list the bystander intervention tactic they could use in that scenario. Of the 383 who responded, 66% chose the direct tactic, 51% chose the distract tactic and 44% 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. Shown in Table 4, addressing those being harmed and those doing the harm was the most frequently selected direct intervention tactic.

Direct Tactic	Percent 2021-2022 (n=251)	Percent Spring 2021 (n=?)
Address both person being harmed and person doing the harm	66%	51%
Address person being harmed	51%	45%
Address person doing the harm.	44%	47%

Table 4: Direct Intervention Tactics

All respondents who selected a bystander intervention tactic were asked why they chose that specific tactic and 314 responded. Those who chose the distract tactic as their preferred tactic to use 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, although 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 or delegate tactics provided. Some indicated the direct method was the most effective method and that they felt 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 shown in Table 5, the uncertainty of interpreting the situation and it not being as concerning as it seems were selected by more than one-quarter of respondents.

Barriers:	Percent 2021- 2022
Uncertainty that the situation is not as concerning as you think	29%
Personality Traits (shy, introverted)	19%
Discomfort in confronting someone you don't know	15%
Fear for your physical safety	13%
Concern of how others around you will react	10%
Fear of retaliation	6%
Discomfort in confronting someone you know	5%
Other	1%

Table 5: Barriers to Intervening (n=376)

Next, respondents were asked how they were going to use Proactive Green Dots after attending the overview, and 283 responded. They said they would spread awareness by telling others about Green Dot in-person, on social media, within their student organizations and organize Green Dot presentations within their organizations. Many noted they would be more aware of what is happening around them, check-in with friends and intervene as necessary, and stop being bystanders.

When asked if the facilitator was prepared for the presentation, nearly all (99.7%) of the 375 respondents selected yes, 0.3% selected somewhat and none selected no. Next, respondents were asked if the facilitator provided relatable examples throughout the presentation, 99% of 375 respondents indicated yes, 1% indicated somewhat and no one indicated no. When asked how the presentation could be improved, a majority of the 199 respondents complemented the presentation, indicated no change was necessary or just noted "NA." Some made suggestions for improving the program, such as adding more video and other visuals, more real-life stories or examples and more polls or interaction.

All respondents were requested to share their gender in an open response question. About 53% of the 174 who provided responses wrote female, 37% noted male, and about 1% wrote in non-binary. The remaining 9% of responses included Woman, Cis male, Cisgender male, Cisgender woman, F, M, NA and She.

Green Dot Intervention Training (Student Survey)

The survey opened with questions requesting students write the workshop date 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 Universal Identification Number (UIN). A majority of participants were seniors, female, and White.

Demographic Data	Percent 2021- 2022	Percent Spring 2021	Percent 2019-2020
Classification	n=190	n=104	n=115
Senior	57%	66%	30%
Junior	31%	23%	25%
Sophomore	6%	4%	17%
Freshman	4%	--	13%
Masters	2%	5%	6%
Doctoral	<1%	1%	8%
Sex	n=190	n=104	n=115
Female	55%	55%	68%
Male	45%	45%	32%
Ethnicity	n=190	n=104	n=115
White	52%	71%	54%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	22%	19%	19%
Asian	14%	5%	13%
Multi-racial excluding Black	6%	2%	4%
Black or multi-racial with Black	3%	3%	4%
International	2%	--	5%
Unknown or Not Reported	<1%	--	<1%

Table 6: Demographics of Students

On the survey, students were asked to self-report their gender. Table 7 provides the demographic selected by the students participating in the Green Dot/Bystander training program. A slight majority of attendees identified as female

Demographic Statement	Percent 2021- 2022	Percent Spring 2021	Percent 2019-2020
Gender	n=213	n=113	n=127
Female	55%	53%	67%
Male	44%	47%	32%
Gender-fluid/Non-binary/Gender queer	1%	--	--
I identify as...<text entry response>	--	--	<1%
Intersex	--	--	--
Two-Spirit	--	--	--
Intersex	--	--	--

Table 7: Self-Reported Gender

Participants were asked why they attended the program. Of the 210 respondents, 83% indicated attending as a student organization, 12% were referred by faculty/staff, 14% indicated personal interest, and 1% were referred by a friend. Respondents were provided space to write the name and department of faculty/staff referral; 134 wrote responses. Most listed a student organization, such as Fish Camp, Aggie Fish Club, Beta Tau Omega, and Paradigm. Hullabaloo U was also frequently mentioned. All responses can be found in the separate 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 shows that like in previous years, reported understanding and willingness to act 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)	2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]	Spring 2021 Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (before)	13%	42%	35%	7%	2%	3.58 (.88) [217]	3.53 (.75) [113]	3.46 (.89) [130]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (after)	89%	10%	--	--	1%	4.86 (.48) [215]	4.89 (.31) [113]	4.73 (0.44) [124]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	10%	34%	39%	15%	2%	3.36 (.92) [213]	3.44 (.91) [113]	2.85 (.98) [130]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	84%	14%	1%	--	1%	4.80 (.55) [212]	4.79 (.43) [113]	4.64 (.56) [124]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	12%	30%	35%	20%	3%	3.27 (1.02) [216]	3.36 (.96) [113]	3.37 (1.01) [130]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	74%	25%	1%	1%	1%	4.69 (.60) [215]	4.69 (.48) [113]	4.71 (.46) [123]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (before)	10%	40%	37%	12%	1%	3.47 (.86) [214]	3.39 (1.02) [112]	3.29 (.89) [129]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (after)	70%	29%	--	--	1%	4.67 (.58) [214]	4.68 (.47) [112]	4.50 (.55) [123]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	9%	34%	43%	11%	2%	3.37 (.88) [216]	3.42 (1.00) [113]	3.22 (.91) [129]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	68%	29%	2%	--	1%	4.63 (.62) [215]	4.61 (.49) [113]	4.48 (.50) [122]

Table 8: Learning Outcome Statement

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

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.

Respondents were asked who the facilitator(s) of their workshops were. Table 9 contains the facilitator frequencies based on the answers given to that question. The most frequent responses included Jon Hill and Kalyn Cavazos.

Facilitator:	Percent 2021- 2022
Jon Hill	38%
Kalyn Cavazos	31%
Kaysey Aguilar	25%
Jazmin Jones	22%
Kalee Castanon	19%
Christina Bishop	17%
Suzanne Swierc	15%
Dr. Denise Crisafi	13%
Lauren Dorsett	6%
Dr. Sara Fehr	3%
Megan Woodfield	2%
Sarah Beth Heiar	1%

Table 9: Facilitator Frequencies (n=413)

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. Noted in Table 10, nearly all agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging and effectively answered questions.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2021- 2022 Mean (sd) [n]	Spring 2021 Mean (sd) [n]	2019- 2020 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators effectively answered questions about the subject presented	92%	8%	1%	--	--	4.60 (1.24) [218]	4.80 (.78) [110]	4.56 (.94) [126]
The facilitators were engaging within the learning environment	94%	5%	1%	--	--	4.57 (1.31) [218]	4.74 (.86) [111]	*

Table 10: Facilitator Evaluation - Students

*Question not asked

Respondents were requested to write how they felt the workshop could be improved. Of the 173 respondents, most of them said that they enjoyed the workshop and that no changes were needed. A few respondents said that the workshop could have been more engaging and interactive, and a couple students also felt that the workshop was too long and should be shortened.

Green Dot Intervention Training (Staff and Faculty Survey)

The first question of the survey requested the respondent to put in the date of the workshop they were attending; workshop dates recorded can be found in the attached quantitative outputs. Table 11 provides the self-reported 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. A majority of participants were staff members, female, and White.

Demographic Statements	2021-2022 Percent
Classification	n=55
Staff	75%
Faculty	13%
Graduate Student	13%
Gender	n=86
Female	77%
Male	23%
Ethnicity	n=58
White	64%
African American/Black	10%
Hispanic/Latinx	16%
Asian American/Pacific Islander	10%

Table 11: Staff and Faculty Demographics

Participants were asked why they attended the program. Of the 86 respondents, 61% indicated personal interest, 37% were referred by faculty/staff, 4% were referred by their student organization, and 4% selected the option referred by a friend.

The staff, faculty and community members 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 12, on the next page, in descending “after” mean order, shows that after training, staff members indicated having 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)	2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (before)	13%	48%	31%	8%	--	3.66 (.81) [85]	3.74 (.87) [93]	3.49 (.80) [172]
My understanding of what power-based personal violence means (after)	76%	21%	1%	--	2%	4.67 (.73) [86]	4.82 (.42) [92]	4.72 (.48) [167]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	5%	38%	32%	20%	5%	3.18 (.97) [84]	3.01 (1.00) [94]	3.00 (.89) [171]
My understanding of strategies I can use to intervene when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	69%	27%	1%	1%	2%	4.58 (.80) [83]	4.73 (.49) [93]	4.68 (.53) [166]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (before)	9%	45%	28%	15%	2%	3.44 (.94) [85]	3.34 (.87) [94]	3.52 (.93) [172]
My willingness to take actions to prevent incidents of power-based personal violence from occurring (after)	62%	35%	1%	1%	1%	4.55 (.70) [86]	4.59 (.54) [93]	4.57 (.59) [166]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	6%	35%	41%	14%	4%	3.26 (.90) [85]	3.16 (.91) [94]	3.43 (.99) [172]
My willingness to intervene when an act of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	48%	50%	--	1%	1%	4.42 (.68) [84]	4.53 (.50) [93]	4.54 (.54) [166]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (before)	7%	40%	39%	14%	--	3.40 (.82) [85]	3.19 (.99) [94]	3.34 (.93) [172]
My understanding of my own personal barriers that prevent me from intervening when an incident of power-based personal violence is occurring (after)	45%	51%	2%	--	1%	4.40 (.66) [86]	4.62 (.53) [93]	4.60 (.52) [166]

Table 12: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked about their barriers/obstacles to intervening. This question had 88 respondents. Many answered that fear for their personal safety or for others who were with them prevented them from intervening. Shyness, tendency to avoid conflict, personal connection to individuals, and feeling it was none of their business were also mentioned. Quite a few indicated that they were afraid intervening would cause a negative backlash or

retaliation. A few indicated a lack of protection and small physical appearance would also stop them from getting involved.

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.

Respondents were asked who the facilitator(s) of their workshops were. Table 13 contains the facilitator frequencies based on the answers given to that question. The most frequent responses included Kristen Brunson and Kalyn Cavazos.

Facilitator:	Percent 2021- 2022
Kalyn Cavazos	76%
Kristen Brunson	48%
Jon Hill	24%
Amanda Hernandez	21%
Kalee Castanon	18%
Suzanne Swierc	13%

Table 13: Facilitator Frequencies (n=166)

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 or disagreement. As shown in Table 14, most participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging and effectively answer questions.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2021- 2022 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators effectively answered questions about the subject presented	82%	17%	1%	--	--	4.81 (.43) [83]
The facilitators made the content engaging within the learning environment	84%	14%	1%	1%	--	4.80 (.51) [85]

Table 14: Facilitator Evaluation

*Question not asked

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 needs for breaks in between modules.

Participants were requested to write how they felt the workshop could be improved. Of the 53 respondents, most of them said that they enjoyed the workshop and that no changes were needed. A few respondents said that the workshop was too long and should be shortened, that more practical techniques should have been shared, more role-playing scenarios included that go into more detail about the 3 D's use.

Background

Through 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. This is the sixth year that Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research (SAPAR) has worked with Student Life to help them assess the Green Dot programs.

Project Details

Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research (SAPAR) 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 SAPAR are funded, in part, by the Texas A&M University Advancement Fee. Results of this project and other assessment projects done through SAPAR can be found at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/results/>. Additionally, anyone can follow SAPAR on Facebook.

To work with SAPAR for future assessment projects, please fill out the Assessment Questionnaire at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/aqform/>.

Report prepared for: Dr. Denise Cristafi, Health Promotion, Student Life
Report Prepared by: Avanish Shah and Susan Fox-Forrester, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research
Report Prepared on: November 30, 2022
Analysis Prepared by: Judith Barrera, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research
Surveys Created by: Susan Fox- Forrester and Barbara Schumacher, Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research