Does Green Dot Active Bystanding Intervention Increase Bystanding Behaviors?
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BACKGROUND

- Up to 25% of women may be sexually assaulted during college

- Dating and sexual violence (DV/SV) rates are highest among those in their late teens to mid-twenties; thus college students are at the age of greatest risk
**Federal Legislation**

- Clery Act in 1998
  - Disclose publicly annual crime statistics
  - State sexual assault policy

- Funds to encourage developing programs that address dating violence, sexual assault and stalking on college campuses

- NO requirement for evaluation of program efficacy
ACTION ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

- Implementation of awareness and risk reduction programs
  - Awareness strategies have sought to increase students’ knowledge about the dangers of sexual violence and what intervention programs are available.
  - Risk reduction strategies seek to teach women strategies for reducing the likelihood that they would be victimized.
  - Neither have worked well to reduce violence
**Bystander Approach to Violence Prevention**

- Mid 1990’s, the bystander approach to the prevention of campus violence emerged
- Earlier strategies were missing a “broader perspective” to the problem of sexual violence on campus
- To address campus violence requires a shift in social and cultural norms
  - Involve both men and women to change the context or environment that may tacitly support violence against women.
**Other Studies Evaluation**

**Bystander Interventions**

- Men's Project
  - Recruited male college students on athletic teams, in fraternities and male residence halls
  - Found that having a support group was essential to their ability to challenge their sexist environment and effectively use bystander behaviors

- Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante (2007) provided the first empirical evidence that a bystander intervention for sexual violence prevention resulted in significant and sustained changes in knowledge, attitudes, and bystander behaviors in both college men and women
**Violence Prevention Intervention: Green Dot**

- **Purpose:** To increase proactive bystanding behaviors and reduce dating and sexual violence on college campuses.

- Understanding how perpetrators target victims allows the bystander to assess the situation, view their options for action and select a safe proactive bystanding behavior that they are willing to carry out.
What is a Green Dot?

A green dot is any behavior, choice, word, or attitude that promotes safety for everyone and communicates utter intolerance for rape, domestic violence, child abuse, and stalking. A green dot is intervening in a high risk situation – a green dot is sponsoring a fundraiser for prevention efforts – a green dot is responding to a victim blaming statement with words of support – a green dot is hanging a prevention poster in your office or business – a green dot is teaching your kids about respect – a green dot is putting a link on your website to your local prevention program – a green dot is providing safety information on the counter at your business. A green dot is simply your individual choice at any given moment to make our state safer.
IMPLEMENTATION OF GREEN DOT

- 50 minute motivational speech

- Students Educating and Empowering to Develop Safety (SEEDS)

- Peer Opinion Leaders (POL) strategy to recruit for SEEDS
OBJECTIVES

- To evaluate the efficacy of Green Dot in a sample of college students
  - Examined actual and observed bystanding behaviors by intervention
  - Also examined social norms associated with dating and sexual violence
**STUDY DESIGN**

- One cross-sectional survey

- Random sample of 2,000 students from each class (Freshman-Seniors)

- Letter to participate in a web-based survey with $2 cash
  - Email with Zoomerang survey link was sent two days later
  - Reminders were sent approximately every three days for two weeks
Of the 7945 students invited to participate in the web-based survey
  • 3872 clicked on the link to the web-site
  • 3417 completed the survey

The overall response rate was 43%
  • 88% of those who clicked on the link completed the survey

Analytic Sample Size = 2484 (excluded incomplete surveys and students >26)
### Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Undergraduate Population (Spring 2010)</th>
<th>Random Sample</th>
<th>Analytic Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18806</td>
<td>7945</td>
<td>2484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>60.4%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age (SD)</td>
<td>22.1 (4.4)</td>
<td>22.4 (5.0)</td>
<td>21.0 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freshman</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>28.9%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Fraternity / Sorority</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.0%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p <0.0001; ** p = 0.001
INTERVENTION EXPOSURE

- Hierarchical Green Dot Exposure Matrix
- Any SEEDS training (n=351):
  - 95% had heard a Green Dot speech
  - 42% were VIP volunteers or clients

- Green Dot Speech only (n=693)
- Unexposed group (n=1281): no SEEDS training, no connection with VIP, never heard a Green Dot speech
Actual and Observed Bystanding Behaviors

- Twelve items about behaviors used or observed in the current school year
- Response options: 0=not at all; 1=1-2 times; 2=3-5 times; 3=6 or more times
- Scores ranged from 0-36
- Sample items:
  - Spoke up if somebody said that someone deserved to be raped or to be hit by their partner
  - Asked someone that looked very upset if they were okay or needed help
**Acceptance of General Dating Violence Scale**

- Five items with responses from strongly disagree (=1) to strongly agree (=4)
- Scores range from 5-20
  - Higher scores indicate greater acceptance of dating violence

**Examples**
- There are times when dating violence between couples is okay.
- Someone who makes their partner jealous on purpose deserves to be hit.
**ILLINOIS RAPE MYTH ACCEPTANCE SCALE**

- Seven items with responses from strongly disagree (=1) to strongly agree (=4)
- Scores range from 7-28
  - Higher scores indicate greater acceptance of dating violence
- Examples:
  - When women are raped, it is often because the way they said “no” was unclear.
  - A woman who dresses in skimpy clothes should not be surprised if a man tries to force her to have sex
STATISTICAL ANALYSES

- Multiple Analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test all hypotheses
  - Controlled for gender, class, social fraternity or sorority affiliation, current relationship status, and parental education

- Conducted using SAS 9.2
## MANOVA Analyses: Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean Scores (F, p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEDS trained</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Dot alone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=1281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance</td>
<td>9.40 (5.92, .01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.58 (2.07, .15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.45 (REF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of General Dating Violence</td>
<td>5.65 (0.99, .31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.65 (.00, .94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.70 (REF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MANOVA Analyses: Bystanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>SEEDS trained n=351</th>
<th>Green Dot alone n=693</th>
<th>No Intervention n=1281</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Active Bystanding</td>
<td>12.29 (144.81, &lt;.0001)</td>
<td>11.45 (38.24, &lt;.0001)</td>
<td>7.17 (REF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Active Bystanding</td>
<td>12.22 (95.71, &lt;.0001)</td>
<td>11.45 (18.38, &lt;.0001)</td>
<td>8.32 (REF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

- All levels of the intervention significantly increased bystanding behaviors.
- SEEDS trained students reported a significant increased in actual and observed active bystanding compared to students who heard a Green Dot speech.
- While having heard a Green Dot speech alone may have an effect on increasing bystanding behaviors, the addition of SEEDS training noticeably increased active bystanding behaviors.
DISCUSSION

- Findings are consistent with other recent studies which provide evidence for the promise of a bystander approach to address sexual violence.

- Green Dot persuasive speeches alone (50 minute intervention) do have some effect on increasing bystander behaviors.
  - Implications for cost-effective prevention intervention.
LIMITATIONS

- Selection bias
  - Survey response rates
- SEEDS training / VIP volunteers
  - May be those with greater interest in violence prevention
  - Possibly more likely to engage in bystanding behaviors because they or someone they know may have experienced violence or they had another important connection to violence and need for prevention efforts
CONCLUSIONS

- Green Dot significantly increased both observed and actual bystanding behaviors in the general population of students.

- SEEDS training, which is primarily bystander capacity and efficacy, is superior to Green Dot speeches alone.