



**University of
Sunderland**

Roberts, Nicola and Marsh, Heaven (2020) Evaluating a Bystander Intervention to Disrupt Interpersonal Violence/Abuse. Safer Communities. ISSN 1757-8043 (In Press)

Downloaded from: <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/id/eprint/12666/>

Usage guidelines

Please refer to the usage guidelines at <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact sure@sunderland.ac.uk.



Evaluating a Bystander Intervention to Disrupt Interpersonal Violence/Abuse

Journal:	<i>Safer Communities</i>
Manuscript ID	SC-05-2020-0018.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	interpersonal violence/abuse, universities, bystander interventions, evidence-base, statistical evaluations, recommendations

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

MANUSCRIPT DETAILS

TITLE: Evaluating a Bystander Intervention to Disrupt Interpersonal Violence/Abuse

ABSTRACT:

It is recommended that universities implement bystander interventions to disrupt the interpersonal violence and abuse that students experience in this context. Yet, there are few evaluations of bystander interventions in the UK. Building on an existing evaluation carried out on a bystander intervention at a university in 2017/18, the purpose of this research was to evaluate the intervention.

Using a one-way repeated measures design, ANOVA was used to analyse pre- and post-intervention data gathered from 121 students, during 2018/19.

As the aims of the session were met, it can be inferred individuals who participate in the bystander intervention have the potential to disrupt interpersonal violence and abuse.

The small sample size and design of the survey limited the research. Further evaluations of bystander interventions are needed in the UK that utilises large samples and a validated survey.

This paper notes the importance of engaging many students in a cohort to participate on a bystander intervention.

CUST_SOCIAL_IMPLICATIONS_(LIMIT_100_WORDS) :No data available.

This study adds to the paucity of evaluations of bystander interventions in the UK. Knowing that the intervention has the potential to disrupt interpersonal violence and abuse builds the momentum for other similarly designed interventions to be implemented in universities in the UK.

Evaluating a Bystander Intervention to ~~Tackle-Disrupt~~ Interpersonal Violence/Abuse

Abstract

Purpose

It is recommended that universities implement bystander interventions to ~~tackle-disrupt~~ the interpersonal violence and abuse that students experience in this context. Yet, there are few evaluations of bystander interventions in the UK ~~to assess whether they work~~. Building on an existing evaluation carried out on a bystander intervention at a university in 2017/18, the purpose of this research was to evaluate the intervention.

Design/methodology/approach

Using a one-way repeated measures design, ANOVA was used to analyse pre- and post-intervention data gathered from 121 ~~students participating in the intervention~~, during 2018/19.

Findings

As the aims of the session were met, it can be inferred ~~that participants who~~ ~~engage individuals~~ ~~who participate~~ in the bystander intervention have the potential to ~~tackle-disrupt~~ interpersonal violence and abuse.

Research limitations/implications

The small sample size and design of the survey limited the research. Further evaluations of bystander interventions are needed in the UK that utilises large samples and a validated survey ~~for bystander evaluations~~.

Practical implications

1
2
3 This paper notes the importance of engaging all-many students in a cohort to participate on a
4 bystander intervention. ~~Further research is needed to understand the difficulties of achieving~~
5 ~~this.~~
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 *Originality/value*

13
14 This study adds to the paucity of evaluations of bystander interventions in the UK. Knowing
15 that the intervention has the potential to ~~tackle-disrupt~~ interpersonal violence and abuse builds
16 the momentum for other similarly designed interventions to be implemented in universities in
17 the UK.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Key words*

26
27 Interpersonal violence/abuse, universities, bystander interventions, evidence-base, statistical
28 evaluations, recommendations
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 *Paper type*

36
37 Research paper
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Introduction**

44
45 ~~Students—~~Female students at ~~universities in the~~ UK universities experience interpersonal
46 violence and abuse, particularly sexual violence (NUS, 2011, ~~2018~~; Phipps and Young, 2015;
47 Roberts *et al.*, 2019; Stenning *et al.*, 2013). Research with 2,058 female students identified that
48 68% had experienced verbal and physical sexual harassment, e.g., flashing and groping, and
49 almost one in four had experienced unwanted sexual contact within and outside university.
50 Most respondents reported that they knew the perpetrators (NUS, 2011). Although, this is not
51 the hidden sexual violence that exists within domestic violence relationships, but is as Roberts
52 *et al.* (2019) argue, the perceived hetero-normative practices of pre-dating and courtship. For
53 example, in Phipps and Young's (2015) research with 40 women, they found that over two-
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 thirds discussed sexual harassment and sexual physical assault as normative of university life.
4 Consequently, Universities UK (2016) recommend that universities implement evidence-based
5 bystander interventions.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12 Key components of bystander interventions educate participants about interpersonal violence
13 and abusive behaviours, including the confidence and knowledge to intervene safely to disrupt
14 behaviours such as sexual violence (Fenton et al., 2015; Labhardt et al., 2017). The aim is for
15 students to develop a culture of intolerance to interpersonal violence and abuse, this may
16 benefit wider society due to the large intake of students progressing to higher education
17 (Universities UK, 2016). Most evaluations of bystander interventions have been carried out in
18 the United States (US) (Fenton and Mott, 2017; Labhardt et al., 2017). Very few evaluations
19 have been carried out in the UK (Fenton et al., 2015). More research is needed in this context;
20 it is not clear how applicable the US research is to British context (Fenton and Mott, 2017;
21 Labhardt et al., 2017).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 This paper begins by outlining the bystander effect and how to overcome it. We then review
34 the recent evaluations of bystander interventions carried out in the US and the UK. We also
35 review research on students' experiences of interpersonal violence and abuse carried out at a
36 university in the north of England, ~~as well as an evaluation of a bystander intervention at that~~
37 ~~university.~~ Building on an this existing evaluation of a bystander intervention at the same
38 university, we discuss our methodology to evaluate the intervention ~~provide a statistical~~
39 ~~evaluation to assess whether the intervention meets its aims.~~ After this, we present our findings
40 and a discussion of these, concluding with the limitations of the study and recommendations
41 for future research.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **The Bystander Effect**

53
54
55 ~~The story about~~ The bystander effect originates from usually begins with Kitty Genovese: who
56 was a victim of murder and sexual assault in New York in 1964. ~~The story that was presented~~
57 ~~in the Media and academia reports~~ suggested that there were 38 bystanders who witnessed the
58
59
60

1
2
3 attack and ~~did not act. did nothing about it.~~ This led to the notion of the bystander effect: that
4 individual responsibility is diffused when in the presence of others (Manning *et al.*, 2007).
5 Individuals feels less responsible when in ~~groups or~~ groups/crowds because they assume others
6 will or have acted; or, if no one is acting, they assume that the situation is not an emergency.
7 Individuals thus look to others in a group or crowd setting to ascertain a course of action (Garcia
8 *et al.*, 2002). ~~In this sense then, Thus,~~ urban crowds/groups and ~~groups of people~~ are powerful
9 and ‘a dangerous threat to social stability’ (Manning *et al.*, 2007, p. 560). ~~As a collective, they~~
10 Crowds/groups thereby promote passiveness and inactivity on individuals, meaning. In doing
11 so, social values are either undermined and/or upheld (*ibid*).

22 The case of Genovese addresses this, the sexual and physical attack of a woman in public
23 undermined the value of social responsibility for others (*ibid*). ~~In the case of Kitty Genovese,~~
24 ~~the story of the 38 inactive bystanders upheld the view that the sexual and physical attack of a~~
25 ~~woman in public is no one’s business and undermined the view that it was everyone’s business~~
26 ~~(*ibid*).~~ This perpetuates attitudes towards victim blaming: ‘larger community and societal
27 issues such as gender inequality, along with male social control and entitlement, permeate the
28 foundation of attitudes that condone violence against women’ (Banyard *et al.*, 2004, p. 63). If
29 individuals in a group or crowd setting victims are viewed as the cause of violence, view the
30 victim as causing the violence surrounding bystanders are less likely to feel responsible for the
31 violence themselves, and thus, they are less likely to intervene (*ibid*).

43 Despite Manning *et al.* (2007) arguing that ~~the the story of Kitty Genovese case~~ has been
44 frequently misrepresented, there has been much research since then to support the bystander
45 effect (see Fischer *et al.*, 2011; Garcia *et al.*, 2002). A review conducted by Banyard *et al.*
46 (2004) review of the research, they argue that identified that bystanders are more likely to
47 intervene if they are: aware of the problem, ~~including the negative impact on the victim;~~ view
48 victims as not causing their victimisation; view themselves as the solution to the problem
49 responsible in some way for solving the problem; ~~view others who intervene;~~ and feel they
50 have the skills to believe they are equipped with the skills to intervene; ~~and are asked to help.~~
51 Fenton and Mott (2017) argue that Arguably, it is important that bystanders actively intervene
52 because it sends a message to the perpetrator and other bystanders that the behaviour observed
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

is unacceptable ~~(Fenton & Mott, 2017), creating a culture of intolerance. They also argue that~~ Bystander intervention also sends a message about the acceptability of challenging inappropriate behaviours (Fenton and Mott, 2017). Furthermore, from a victim's perspective, bystander intervention is often 'associated with feeling safe and with decreased harm' (Fileborn, 2017, p. 200). The next section reviews whether bystander interventions work.

Bystander Evaluations in the US

~~Bystander interventions have developed as a strategy that situates the responsibility of preventing interpersonal violence and abuse with the community (Jewkes et al., 2014 cited in Fenton et al., 2015, p.12). Most of the research research~~ underpinning the effectiveness of bystander interventions ~~has been carried out in the~~ is conducted in the US (Fenton and Mott, 2017; Labhardt et al., 2017). Bystander interventions in this context have predominantly focused on addressing sexual and dating violences ~~at on college/university. campuses.~~ The findings ~~from the evaluations~~ suggest that such interventions have the potential to enhance the likelihood of bystanders intervening and thereby reducing violence (see Jouriles et al., 2018; Katz and Moore, 2013). ~~The effects of bystander interventions have been shown to last over time: at least 3 months after the intervention (Jouriles et al., 2018; Senn and Forrest, 2016).~~

Coker et al. (2016) ~~for example,~~ evaluated the *Green Dot* bystander intervention over a 4-year period on one college campus in Kentucky, ~~against two other~~ comparing the effects against two other campuses that ~~which did not have the~~ had no intervention. ~~First year students~~ Students (intervention n=2,979 and comparison campuses n=4,132) were randomly selected ~~for~~ the study. ~~As such, the evaluation was experimental in its design.~~ The intervention ~~sought~~ aimed 'to empower potential bystanders to actively engage their peers' (ibid, p. 296) ~~in order~~ to change social values and reduce the likelihood of violence. The researchers therefore hypothesised that violence would be reduced on the campus as a result of the intervention. The researchers used a survey to measure Violent victimisation rates of dating and sexual violence were measured across the campuses and over 4 years and data was analysed using log-binomial regression. Victimisation rates for sexual and dating violence were significantly lower on the campus that had the bystander intervention compared to the campuses that did not have the intervention, excluding 2013. To account for this finding, Coker et al. (2016) argue that the

reduced sample size may have contributed to a TYPE II error by reducing the power of the tests to find differences in the data.

Bystander Interventions in the UK

Until recently, there were no published studies providing an evidence-base for using bystander interventions in universities in the UK universities (Fenton *et al.*, 2015). This was largely due to the recent addition of such interventions in this context (Fenton *et al.*, 2015).

Research has identified that students hold myths about Fenton and Jones (2017) found that myths about sexual and domestic violence (Fenton and Jones, 2017) were held by new students. Such myths served to ‘scaffold gender-based violence in university settings’ (ibid, p. 147). As such, *The Intervention Initiative* (TII) was designed to disrupt such myths and thus the potential for violence (Fenton and Mott, 2018b). Fenton and Mott (2018a) were the first to evaluate a bystander intervention, the TII, on university students in the UK. To evaluate the TII, Fenton and Mott (2018a) adopted a within subjects repeated measure design, administering a questionnaire before and after 4 two-hour sessions. ; and used paired t tests for 131 matched cases on the measures at pre and post test intervention to analyse the data (after 4 two-hour sessions). Thus, a within subjects repeated measures design was used. They found positive results after Following the intervention, with law students the authors found: decreases of rape and domestic violence myth acceptance and denial; and increases in bystander efficacy, readiness and intent to help, and responsibility scores (Fenton & Mott, 2018a) all key factors which are well founded in the American literature to test when evaluating bystander interventions (Labhardt *et al.*, 2017). However, Although, there was no effect of the intervention on students engaging in bystander behaviours.; albeit the researchers note that To account for this finding, the authors argued that participants may not have had sufficient time at the point they completed the intervention (1 – 8 weeks following) to apply their learning into practice.

1
2
3 There is ~~certainly~~ a need for bystander interventions in the UK given the extent of interpersonal
4 violence ~~and abuse~~ experienced by students at universities in the UK (NUS, 2011, ~~2018~~; Phipps
5 and Young, 2015; Roberts *et al.*, 2019; Stenning *et al.*, 2013). ~~In Roberts et al's. (2019)~~
6 ~~research, using an online university-wide survey in 2016,~~ students were asked ~~about their~~
7 ~~experiences of interpersonal violence and abuse whilst at university.~~ ~~Women were more likely~~
8 ~~to report experiencing verbal sexual harassment and sexual physical assault than men.~~ ~~Roberts~~
9 ~~et al. (2019), using a university wide online survey, found that women reported experiencing~~
10 ~~sexual violence more than men.~~ ~~Such sexual violence, the perceived hetero-normative practices~~
11 ~~of pre-dating and courtship,~~ happened both on and off campus in public spaces, with the ~~sexual~~
12 ~~physical assault~~ particularly occurring ~~in the night-time economy, i.e.,~~ in the pubs and clubs.
13 ~~An analysis of the qualitative responses to the survey found~~ that ~~women reported~~ adopting a
14 range of ~~measures-strategies~~ to resist the sexual violence ~~as well as others intervening.~~ For
15 ~~example, a bystander witnessing sexual harassment of 'a drunk girl' reported to the survey how~~
16 ~~she actively intervened to remove her from the perpetrators (Roberts et al., 2019, p. 332).~~

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 ~~The authors identified that~~ women rarely reported their ~~experiences of sexual~~ violence due to
32 ~~their~~ perceptions that such sexually violent behaviours against women are normal and are
33 accepted ~~at university behaviours, in at a university context~~ (Roberts *et al.*, 2019; see also NUS,
34 2011, ~~2018~~; Phipps and Young, 2015), and in ~~the night-time economy~~ pubs and clubs (Roberts
35 *et al.*, 2019; see also Kavanaugh, 2013). ~~The authors further identified that most~~ of the
36 interpersonal violence and abuse ~~occurred~~ in public spaces. This is important to note because
37 there is some evidence of the bystander effect, where individuals do not intervene because they
38 feel less responsible for the ~~interpersonal~~ violence ~~and abuse~~ when in groups and crowd
39 settings. ~~There were fewer~~ reports of bystanders, ~~other than friends, intervening.~~ ~~Students also~~
40 ~~reported that the sexual violence had affected their mental health and academic study (Roberts~~
41 ~~et al., 2019).~~

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54 ~~Bystander interventions are arguably of great importance when applied to the issues referred~~
55 ~~to above by enhancing the likelihood of bystanders actively intervening, encourage potential~~
56 victims to feel safe and reducing harm caused (Fileborn, 2017). ~~The next section discusses our~~
57 ~~methodology to evaluate a bystander intervention. This is particularly so given the reported~~

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ~~impact of sexual violence where students said it had affected their mental health and academic~~
4 ~~study (Roberts *et al.*, 2019).~~
5
6
7

8
9
10 ~~Given these findings, a 90 minute taster session was designed to enhance bystander~~
11 ~~intervention. It was piloted and evaluated during 2017/18 (Donovan and Corr, 2018), at the~~
12 ~~university where the online survey (discussed above) was carried out (see Roberts *et al.*, 2019).~~
13 ~~The intervention used students' reports (anonymously) from the survey to illustrate students'~~
14 ~~experiences and impact of verbal abuse, including sexual verbal abuse, racism, body shaming,~~
15 ~~homo-bi-transphobia, disablism, islamophobia. Consequently, the bystander session at the~~
16 ~~university was broader than the other bystander interventions discussed in the existing~~
17 ~~evaluations that covered sexual and domestic/dating violence, albeit the underlying model of~~
18 ~~change is the same. Findings from the pilot evaluation suggested the taster session had a~~
19 ~~positive impact (Donovan and Corr, 2018). As such, the bystander session was delivered at the~~
20 ~~university in 2018/19, which we evaluated. The next section discusses our methodology.~~
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Methodology**

34 *The Bystander Session*

35
36
37
38 A a 90 minute taster session¹ had been designed. The session teaches participants about a broad
39 range of interpersonal violence and abusive behaviours, the impact of these, and how to safely
40 intervene to disrupt such behaviours. For example, facilitators delivering the session use
41 students' [anonymous](#) reports to illustrate student experience and impact of verbal abuse,
42 including sexual verbal abuse, racism, homophobia. [The current](#) bystander session was broader
43 in its education of examples of verbal abuse than other bystander interventions reviewed in the
44 existing evaluations that covered primarily sexual and dating/domestic violence, albeit the
45 underlying model of change is the same (see Donovan and Corr, 2018).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Findings from the evaluation of the pilot in 2017/18 suggested the taster session had a positive
57 impact (Donovan and Corr, 2018). Consequently, the bystander session was delivered at the
58 university in 2018/19, which we evaluated to ascertain whether it met its four aims. The 90
59
60

1
2
3 ~~minute bystander session had four aims.~~ The first two aims of: i) ‘increase knowledge about
4 and confidence to be active bystanders’; and ii) ‘increase knowledge and awareness about
5 harms/impacts of interpersonal violence/abuse’ were informed by TII. The session aimed to
6 provide practical information about being an active bystander in a range of contexts and to
7 enhance empathy about victims (Donovan and Corr, 2018, unpaginated; see Fenton and Mott,
8 2018a, 2018b). If these aims are met, it is thought that the intervention will enhance individual
9 responsibility for the interpersonal violence and abuse observed, and thus increase the
10 likelihood of bystander intervention (see Fenton *et al.*, 2015; Labhardt *et al.*, 2017). The last
11 two aims of: iii) ‘raise knowledge and awareness about services provided by the University’;
12 and iv) ‘encourage reporting/help-seeking regardless of where incident(s) take place’
13 (Donovan and Corr, 2018, unpaginated) were informed by the findings from the university-
14 wide online survey, discussed above, university-wide online survey that identified carried out
15 at the university with students (see Roberts *et al.*, 2019) non-reporting of incidents of
16 interpersonal violence and abuse to the university, which happened off campus (Donovan and
17 Corr, 2018, ~~unpaginated~~).

32 *The Survey and the Sample*

33
34
35 We used an adapted version of the survey from the previous evaluation (see Donovan and Corr,
36 2018). Some questions were added/refined to ensure testing of the programme aims. We also
37 changed the response format of the questions to scales, for example, ‘from 1 not at all to 10 yes
38 definitely’, to ensure parametric tests, which are more powerful in finding differences, could
39 be used (see Carifo and Perla, 2007, 2008). The survey was piloted on social science
40 undergraduate students to ensure accuracy in the design and delivery. The study was approved
41 by the university Ethics Research Group. Students were not randomly allocated to the session
42 nor did they self-select to take part in the session, which may avoid introducing bias in such
43 non-probability samples (de Vaus, 2014). The session is often scheduled into students’
44 timetables, as part of their curriculum, because of the synergy between their programmes of
45 study and the bystander session. Before the start of the bystander session, participants were
46 asked to read a study information sheet, confirm that they understood, and that they consented
47 to take part. There were no incentives offered to students to take part in the study.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Sessions ran in late 2018 and in early 2019. The participants completed the survey, mostly
4 electronically in Survey Monkey, but some hard copies were completed, ~~then administered~~
5 before and immediately after the 90 minute session. ~~The aim was to measure differences over~~
6 time, i.e., before and after the session, to ascertain if the aims of the session were met. ~~(hard~~
7 copy or electronic in Survey Monkey), to measure differences over time, and thus, the impact
8 of the session in meeting its 4 aims. Students were not randomly allocated to the session. The
9 session is often scheduled into students' timetables because of the synergy between their
10 programmes of study and the bystander session, and/or, it is important to students' future
11 careers that they undertake the bystander session. The design of the evaluation was thus a
12 within subjects, one-way repeated measures design.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 *Data Analysis*

25
26
27 Data ~~was~~were cleaned and entered into a master SPSS dataset. During 2018/19, 212 new
28 students to the university, participated on the 90 minute bystander session.² Of these students,
29 152, most of whom were at level 3 study,³ completed the pre-test survey. However, not all of
30 these students completed the post-test survey immediately after the session⁴. Given this and the
31 deletion of cases that were not useable⁵, 121 matched cases at pre- and post-intervention were
32 used for testing whether aims i and iv of the session had been met. There were 116 cases paired
33 at pre- and post-intervention to test whether aim ii had been met. This is because there were 5
34 missing responses in total, not at random (see Kang, 2013), on both scale items⁶ of victim-
35 blaming, which were used to test aim ii (see findings section). There were 120 matched cases
36 at pre- and post-intervention testing aim iii because there was 1 missing random response on
37 the scale item testing aim iii. Table I shows the four aims of the intervention, the participants
38 tested at each, and the missing responses.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 'Table I' here

49
50
51 Paired t-tests were unsuitable to test the data due to violations of the assumption of normality
52 found in the data. As one-way within subjects ANOVA is closely related to the paired t-test,
53 and it is more robust to violations of the normality assumption, particularly with large samples
54 >30 (Reid, 2014), we present the findings of one-way repeated measures ANOVA to test
55 whether the programme met its aims. It is hypothesised that if there are statistically significant
56 positive shifts in the mean scores on the scale/s for each of the aims of the programme, from
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 before the intervention to after the intervention, then the session will have met its aims. Time
4 is the independent variable and the scale scores are the dependent variables. The design of the
5 evaluation was thus a within subjects, one-way repeated measures design.
6
7
8
9

15 Findings

17 *The Sample and the Session*

19
20 The sample consisted of 45% (n=55) male and 55% (n=66) female students. The modal age of
21 the sample was 20, the mean age was 25, and 67% (n=81) of the sample were aged between 18
22 and 24. This is a usual distribution of age of students at universities (see Universities UK, 2016)
23 and an age group most at risk of interpersonal violence and abuse (see the *Crime Surveys for*
24 *England and Wales*). As most of the pre- and post-test surveys were completed electronically,
25 we were able to work out the length of the 90 minute bystander session as delivered in practice.
26 We found that the modal time was 63 minutes, the mean and median time were 74 minutes
27 (based on 88 cases). This excludes time to complete the surveys. For some sessions then, the
28 delivery of the bystander session fell short of its prescribed time. Qualitative evaluation of the
29 bystander session, including observations of the session, have been carried out during 2019/20,
30 to assess this finding further. Moving on, frequency data shows that after the session, 98%
31 (n=118) of students rated the quality of the bystander ~~session on a scale from 1 very weak to~~
32 ~~10 excellent,~~ 5 and above. ~~and~~ Seventy nine per cent 79% (n=96) of students rated the quality
33 of the bystander session 8 and above (where 1 is very weak and 10 is excellent). Students after
34 the session selected one of the following responses: they already considered themselves to be
35 an active bystander (46%, n=54); the session had given them the confidence to be an active
36 bystander (48%, n=57); I feel apprehensive/not confident to be an active bystander (6%, n=7)
37 (based on 118 cases⁷). It might be argued that almost half of students do not need the session
38 to be an active bystander, however, shifts in the mean scores of the scales before and after the
39 bystander session indicate that the intervention met its aims, as the next section tabulates
40 shows.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

58 *Evaluating the Session*

1
2
3 As the survey was kept short to maximise the response rate (see for example Fenton and Mott,
4 2018a), there were 10 scale items testing the 4 aims of the session. This meant that aims iii and
5
6 iv were measured using 1 scale item each. Aims i and ii were each tested using 4 scale items.
7
8 We felt that *knowledge* and *confidence* were two different constructs to test aim i: increase
9
10 knowledge about and confidence to be active bystanders. Knowledge was therefore tested with
11
12 1 scale item: on a scale from 1 not at all to 10 yes definitely, do you know what an active
13
14 bystander is? We found a significant effect of time on knowledge score, $F(1, 120) = 536.63$, p
15 $<.001$, $n^2=.82$. There was a significant increase in knowledge score from before (mean = 3.48)
16
17 and after (9.66) the intervention. There was a large effect size. Table II shows this.

18
19
20 'Table II' here

21
22 Confidence was tested with 3 scale items: on a scale from 1 not confident to 10 very confident,
23
24 how confident would you feel intervening if you saw someone being physically assaulted; how
25
26 confident would you feel intervening if you saw someone being verbally abused; how confident
27
28 would you feel intervening if you saw one person being bullied by a group? We found a
29
30 significant effect of time on confidence scores, $F(1, 120) = 97.86$, $p<.001$, $n^2=.45$. There was a
31
32 significant increase in confidence scores from before (mean = 19.02) and after (mean = 23.75)
33
34 the intervention. There was a large effect size. Table III shows this.

35
36 'Table III' here

37
38 To test aim ii of the session: increase knowledge and awareness about harms/impacts of
39
40 interpersonal violence/abuse we used four scale items. First, we asked on a scale from 1 not at
41
42 all to 10 yes definitely, do you understand how people feel who are victimised by
43
44 violence/abuse/bullying/hate comprising one scale item about victim-empathy. We found a
45
46 significant effect of time on victim-empathy score, $F(1, 120) = 13.41$, $p<.001$, $n^2=.10$. There
47
48 was a significant increase in victim-empathy score from before (mean = 8.23) and after (mean
49
50 = 8.94) the intervention. There was a medium effect size. Table IV shows this.

51
52 'Table IV' here

53
54 Second, we asked on a scale from 1 not at all to 10 yes definitely, do you think that girls that
55
56 get drunk are asking for trouble and do you think people who are offended by banter are too
57
58 sensitive, comprising two scale items about victim-blaming.⁸ We found a significant effect of
59
60 time on victim-blaming scores, $F(1, 115) = 7.26$, $p<.008$, $n^2=.06$. There was a significant

1
2
3 decrease in victim-blaming scores from before (mean = 5.87) and after (mean = 5.07) the
4 intervention. There was a medium effect size. ~~Table V show this.~~

5
6
7
8 ~~'Table V' here~~

9
10 Third, we asked on a scale from 1 not at all to 10 yes definitely, do you think it is important to
11 promote attitudes of respect, tolerance and care to challenge bullying (including body
12 shaming), hate acts (e.g., racism, homo-bi-transphobia, disablism, Islamaphobia) and sexual
13 harassment, which comprised one scale item about inclusive attitudes. Results are not
14 significant for the inclusive attitudes scale, $n^2 < .01 = .00$. Students embraced inclusive attitudes
15 before the bystander session, as 70% (n=85) scored 10 on the scale at that time, rising to 79%
16 (n=96) after the session.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 To test aim iii: raise knowledge and awareness about services provided by the University, we
27 asked on a scale from 1 not at all to 10 yes definitely, if something happened to you/a student
28 you know that impacted upon your/their ability to study, would you know where to go/send
29 them in the university for help? We found a significant effect of time on raising awareness
30 about services score, $F(1, 119) = 188.72, p < .001, n^2 = .61$. There was a significant increase in
31 raising awareness about services score from before (mean = 5.34) and after (mean = 9.07) the
32 intervention. There was a large effect. ~~Table VI shows this.~~

33
34
35
36
37
38
39 ~~'Table VI' here~~

40
41
42 To test aim iv: encourage reporting/help-seeking regardless of where incident(s) take place, we
43 asked on a scale from 1 not at all to 10 yes definitely, if something happened to you or a student
44 you know, regardless of where the incident took place, would you report it to the university for
45 help? We found a significant effect of time on reporting score, $F(1, 120) = 54.63, p < .001,$
46 $n^2 = .31$. There was a significant increase in reporting score from before (mean = 5.99) and after
47 (mean = 7.97) the intervention. There was a large effect. ~~Table VII shows this.~~

48
49
50
51
52
53 ~~'Table VII' here~~

54 55 56 57 58 Discussion

59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

There were statistically significant positive shifts in the mean scores on the scale/s from before the intervention to after the intervention for each of the aims of the programme. Although, the difference of the scores on the one scale item about inclusive attitudes, which part measured aim ii, from before the session to after the session, was not statistically significant, the frequency data indicates that participants held fairly inclusive attitudes at the start of the session. Moreover, the other three scale items, which measured aim ii were statistically significant. Like Coker *et al.* (2016), we may have suffered a TYPE II error with our small sample size and inability to find a difference in the data. That said, our evaluation was a repeated measures design where the same participants completed both pre- and post-test surveys. This reduces the error in the data from the 'pre-existing subject differences', as each participant is matched to themselves, they thus serve as their own controls (Reid, 2014, p. 325). Consequently, we are able to make powerful inferences from the data. This is particularly salient given students did not 'self-select' to participate in the session (see also Fenton and Mott, 2018a, p. 655) potentially avoiding bias in the sample (de Vaus, 2014). Moreover, frequency data indicated that most participants rated the quality of the bystander session as veering towards excellent.

As the scale items measuring such changes in knowledge and skills were mostly all statistically significant, there is potential, albeit theoretically, for those participants who participated in the session and the evaluation to become active bystanders. Given the extent of interpersonal violence and abuse that university students experience, it is likely that these participants will observe interpersonal violence and abusive behaviours in the future. As such, they have the potential to challenge the passiveness and inactivity of individuals in a group or crowd setting in such situations, whether that is in the moment or afterwards e.g., by reporting it. In doing so, they have the potential to reduce the bystander effect, uphold important social values about collective responsibility (Manning *et al.*, 2007) and acceptability of challenging inappropriate beliefs and interpersonal violence and abusive behaviours (Fenton and Mott, 2017).

Given the bystander session evaluated in this paper is much broader in educating participants about a wide range of verbal abuse than existing bystander interventions reviewed in the literature, which primarily focus on sexual and dating/domestic violence, students who

1
2
3 participated in the session are likely to have a broader understanding of what constitutes
4 interpersonal violence and abusive behaviours. There is a theoretical argument that supports
5 participants becoming active bystanders after participating in the 90 minute taster session, but
6 there is no empirical support from this research that participants have become active bystanders
7 after participating in the taster session (see also Fenton and Mott, 2018a).
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 15 **Limitations**

16
17
18 There were ~~a number of several~~ limitations. ~~to the research.~~ As we were treating a Likert scale
19 as scale data, analysing single items ~~(i.e., the dependent variables)~~ on an ‘item-by-time’ basis
20 is limiting (Carifio and Perla, 2007, p. 106). If there are sufficient scale points, for example 7,
21 analysing items on a single basis is not so limiting (Carifio and Perla, 2007). Our scales had 10
22 points. ~~Yet, as~~ the survey was not validated, questions might be raised over whether we were
23 ~~sufficiently~~ measuring the aims of the session. Furthermore, our small sample size as a result
24 of attrition, meant that we could not measure the longer-term impact of the session. ~~Despite the~~
25 ~~advantages of using a repeated measures design they are notable for losing sample numbers~~
26 ~~over time (Fenton and Mott, 2018a; Knapp, 2018; Reid, 2014). Small sample sizes also reduce~~
27 ~~the power of ANOVA to find significant differences in the data. Similar to other UK bystander~~
28 ~~evaluation (see Fenton and Mott, 2018a), we~~ could not generalise the findings to a wider sample
29 of students due to non-random sampling. ~~(see also Fenton and Mott, 2018a).~~
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Recommended Changes**

44
45 A number of recommendations arise from the evaluation. ~~for research methodologies,~~
46 ~~bystander interventions, and universities.~~ Firstly, in terms of evaluations, ~~if they~~ are to measure
47 the longer-term impact of ~~an~~ intervention ~~upon participants~~, they must begin with ~~a large~~
48 ~~sample high numbers of participants them~~ to allow for ~~their~~ attrition over time (Knapp, 2018).
49 ~~Carrying out a prospective power analysis to indicate the appropriate sample size is~~
50 ~~fundamental This will to~~ ensure ~~the power of the tests, such as the tests, such as~~ ANOVA, ~~are~~
51 ~~powerful to find differences in the data. In doing so, are commensurate with appropriate sample~~
52 ~~sizes and thereby avoiding~~ a Type II error ~~is avoided~~ (see Clark-Carter, 1997).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Moreover, surveys need to be validated for their use in evaluations of bystander interventions
7 (see also Fenton and Mott, 2018a). Using Cronbach's alpha to test the internal consistency of
8 the scales prior to analysis is paramount (Allen and Seaman, 2007 cited in Leung, 2011, p.
9 413). A pilot of the survey is therefore advised. Scales on the survey should start with 0 to
10 indicate complete absence of the attribute, which is being measured (Leung, 2011). ~~If we had~~
11 ~~done this, we could have reverse coded our data, where needed.~~
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 While our statistical evaluation can tell us that the session ~~works in meeting~~met its aims, ~~we~~
21 ~~do not know if the positive results lead to a reduction in the bystander effect when participants~~
22 ~~are in a group or crowd setting observing interpersonal violence and abuse, and thus, we do not~~
23 ~~know if they become active bystanders. Nor does our data~~ ~~it does not tell us~~ ~~inform~~ how and
24 why ~~it the session met its aims~~works. Therefore, a recommendation for future research is to
25 assess the long term behaviour change of participants (see Banyard *et al.*, 2004; 2005; Fenton
26 and Mott, 2018a), including why they do or do not intervene ~~when observing interpersonal~~
27 ~~violence and abuse~~ (Banyard *et al.*, 2005; Fileborn, 2017; Labhardt *et al.*, 2017). The surveys
28 used in our statistical evaluation gathered qualitative data about how and why the session works
29 (which is the focus of another paper), and students were invited for interview to discuss this,
30 but ~~take up the response~~ was low. ~~The data gathered from these sources will add to the~~
31 ~~qualitative evaluation of the bystander intervention during 2019/20, which we are carrying out~~
32 ~~to address these gaps in the research.~~
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 In terms of the content of the bystander session, it is advised that one of the aims of the session
47 explicitly states 'to increase individual responsibility in a group/crowd setting' because this is
48 the theoretical premise for overcoming the bystander effect. Whilst this is implicit in aims ii
49 and iv of the current session, making it explicit ensures it is central, ~~and the design of the~~
50 ~~session can be adapted accordingly~~. This is important because much of the interpersonal
51 violence and ~~abusive behaviours~~ against students found at the university occurred in public
52 spaces amongst crowds and groups ~~and~~ it was ~~also~~ normalised (Roberts *et al.*, 2019). ~~If~~
53 ~~bystanders are less likely to view the behaviours as a problem (Fileborn, 2017), and/or, they~~
54 ~~blame the victim for causing their own victimisation, they will not consider themselves as~~
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ~~individually responsible for the violence and abuse, and thus, they are less likely to intervene~~
4 ~~(Banyard *et al.*, 2004).~~ Lastly, the bystander session is short. Single sessions are not thought to
5 be effective at changing behaviours long term (DeGue, 2014 cited in Fenton and Mott, 2018b,
6 p. 182).⁹ Other bystander interventions have longer and multiple sessions (see Fenton and Mott,
7 2018a).

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 ~~In summary, despite the limitations,~~ a specific recommendation for universities would be to
16 implement the bystander session to all ~~students in a year group~~ (University of Exeter, 2020) ~~or~~
17 ~~at least most students in a year group.~~ ~~As Coker *et al.*, (2016, p. 301) claimed that the *Green*~~
18 ~~*Dot* bystander intervention had the potential to impact upon students who had not participated~~
19 ~~on the intervention by those who had participated on the intervention ‘modelling bystander~~
20 ~~behaviours’.~~ ~~This creates a~~ culture of intolerance to ~~violent~~ and ~~abusive behaviours,~~ ~~which~~
21 needs to be driven by cohorts so they all act together to challenge the beliefs that uphold such
22 behaviours ~~because all members of a community are responsible for acting: not just the~~
23 ~~perpetrators and victims~~ (Banyard *et al.*, 2004). ~~Given the small numbers of new students to~~
24 ~~the university who participated in the bystander session in 2018/19,~~ further research is needed
25 to understand ~~how to extend the delivery of the session to more students in a year group.~~
26 ~~particularly noting the difficulties of harnessing staff and students in to engage in the~~
27 ~~session achieving this.~~

References

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G. and Moynihan, M.M. (2004) “Bystander Education: bringing a
broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention”, *Journal of Community
Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 61-79.

~~Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G. and Moynihan, M.M. (2005) *Rape Prevention Through Bystander
Education: bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention*, available
at: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf> (accessed 13 February 2020).~~

1
2
3 Carifio, J. and Perla, R. (2007) “Ten Common Misunderstandings, Misconceptions, Persistent
4 Myths and Urban Legends about Likert Scales and Likert Response Formats and their
5 Antidotes”, *Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp.106-116.
6
7

8
9 Carifio, J. and Perla, R. (2008) “Resolving the 50-Year Debate Around Using and Misusing
10 Likert Scales”, *Medical Education*, Vol. 42, pp. 1152-1154.
11
12

13
14 Clark-Carter, D. (1997) “The Account taken of Statistical Power in Research Published in the
15 *British Journal of Psychology*”, *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 88, pp. 71-83.
16
17

18
19 Coker, A.L., Bush, H.M., Fisher, B.S., Swan, S.C., Williams, C.M., Clear, E.R. and DeGue, S.
20 (2016) “Multi-College Bystander Intervention Evaluation for Violence Prevention”, *American*
21 *Journal of Preventive Medicine*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 295-302.
22
23

24
25 de Vaus, D. (2014) *Surveys in Social Research*, 6th ed., Routledge, London.
26

27
28 Donovan, C. and Corr, E. (2018) *Be the Difference: an evaluation of a 90-minute Active*
29 *Bystander Pilot*, unpublished.
30
31

32
33 Fenton, R.A., Mott, H.L., McCartan, K. and Rumney, P.N.S. (2015) *A Review of Evidence for*
34 *Bystander Intervention to Prevent Sexual and Domestic Violence in Universities*, available at:
35 [https://www2.uwe.ac.uk/faculties/BBS/BUS/law/Law%20docs/dvilitreviewproof0.6.forCLR.p](https://www2.uwe.ac.uk/faculties/BBS/BUS/law/Law%20docs/dvilitreviewproof0.6.forCLR.pdf)
36 [df](https://www2.uwe.ac.uk/faculties/BBS/BUS/law/Law%20docs/dvilitreviewproof0.6.forCLR.pdf) (accessed 5 February 2020).
37
38

39
40 Fenton, R. and Jones, C. (2017) “An Exploratory Study on the Beliefs about Gender-Based
41 Violence held by Incoming Undergraduates in England”, *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*,
42 Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 147-67.
43
44

45
46 Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H.L. (2017) “The Bystander Approach to Violence Prevention:
47 considerations for implementation in Europe”, *Psychology of Violence*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 450-
48 458.
49
50

51
52 Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H.L. (2018a) “Evaluation of the Intervention Initiative: a bystander
53 intervention program to prevent violence against women in universities”, *Violence and Victims*,
54 Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 645-662.
55
56

57
58 Fenton, R.A. and Mott, H.L. (2018b) “The Intervention Initiative: theoretical underpinnings,
59 development and implementation”, in Anitha, S. and Lewis, R. (Ed.s.) *Gender Based Violence*
60

1
2
3 *in University Communities: policy, prevention and educational initiatives*, Policy Press,
4 Bristol, pp. 169-188.

5
6
7
8 Fileborn, B. (2017) "Bystander Intervention from the Victims' Perspective: experiences,
9 impacts and justice needs of street harassment victims", *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*,
10 Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 187-204.

11
12
13
14 Fischer, P., Krueger, J.I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmuller, A., Frey, D., Heene,
15 M., Wicher, M. and Kainbacher, M. (2011) "The Bystander-Effect: a meta-analytic review of
16 bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies", *Psychological Bulletin*,
17 Vol. 137 No. 4, pp. 517-537.

18
19
20
21 Garcia, S.M., Weaver, K., Moskowitz, G.B. and Darley, J.M. (2002) "Crowded Minds: the
22 implicit bystander effect", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 83 No. 4, pp.
23 843-853.

24
25
26
27 Jouriles, E.N., Krauss, A., Vu, N.L., Banyard, V.L. and McDonald, R. (2018) "Bystander
28 programs addressing sexual violence on college campuses: a systematic review and meta-
29 analysis of program outcomes and delivery methods", *Journal of American College Health*,
30 Vol. 66 No. 6, pp. 457-466.

31
32
33
34 Kang, H. (2013) "The Prevention and Handling of the Missing Data", *Korean Journal of*
35 *Anesthesiology*, Vol. 64 No. 5, pp. 402-406.

36
37
38
39 Katz, J. and Moore, J. (2013) "Bystander education training for campus sexual assault
40 prevention: an initial meta-analysis", *Violence and Victims*, Vol. 28 No. 6, pp. 1054-1067.

41
42
43
44 Kavanaugh, P.R. (2013) "The Continuum of Sexual Violence: women's accounts of
45 victimisation in urban nightlife", *Feminist Criminology*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 20-39.

46
47
48
49 [Knapp, H. \(2018\) *Intermediate Statistics Using SPSS*, Sage: London.](#)

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 Labhardt, D., Holdsworth, E., Brown, S. and Howat, D. (2017) "You See But You Do Not
58 Observe: a review of bystander intervention and sexual assault on university campuses",
59 *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 35, pp. 13-25.

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Manning, R., Levine, M. and Collins, A. (2007) "The Kitty Genovese Murder and the Social
4 Psychology of Helping: the parable of the 38 witnesses", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 62 No.
5 6, pp. 555-562.
6
7

8
9 NUS (2011) *Hidden Marks: a study of women students' experiences of harassment, stalking,*
10 *violence and sexual assault*, available at:
11 https://www.nus.org.uk/global/nus_hidden_marks_report_2nd_edition_web.pdf (accessed 29
12 April 2020).
13
14
15

16
17 ~~NUS (2018) *Power in the Academy: staff sexual misconduct in UK higher education*, available~~
18 ~~at: — <https://www.nuseconnect.org.uk/resources/nus-staff-student-sexual-misconduct-report>~~
19 ~~(accessed 10 February 2020).~~ Phipps, A. and Young, I. (2015) "Neoliberalisation and 'lad
20 ~~culture' in higher education", *Sociology*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 305-322.
21
22
23~~

24
25 Reid, H. M. (2014) *Introduction to Statistics: Fundamental concepts and procedures of data*
26 *analysis*, Sage, London.
27
28

29
30 Roberts, N., Donovan, C. and Durey, M. (2019) "Agency, Resistance and the Non-'Ideal'
31 Victim: how women deal with sexual violence", *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, Vol. 3 No.
32 3, pp. 323-338.
33
34

35
36 ~~Senn, C. Y. and Forrest, A. (2016) "'And Then One Night When I Went to Class...': the impact~~
37 ~~of sexual assault bystander intervention workshops incorporated in academic courses",~~
38 ~~*Psychology of Violence*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 607-618.~~
39
40
41

42 Stenning, P., Mitra-Kahn, T. and Gunby, C. (2013) "Sexual Violence against Female
43 University Students in the U.K.: a case study", *Rivista di Criminologia, Vittimologia e*
44 *Sicurezza*, Vol. 7 No. 2, pp. 100-119.
45
46

47
48 University of Exeter (2020) *The Intervention Initiative*, available at:
49 <https://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/research/interventioninitiative/universities/foruniversities/>
50 (accessed 13 February 2020).
51
52

53
54 Universities UK (2016) *Changing the Culture: Report of the Universities UK Taskforce*
55 *examining violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students*,
56 available at: [http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/changing-the-](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/changing-the-culture-final-report.aspx)
57 [culture-final-report.aspx](http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/changing-the-culture-final-report.aspx) (accessed 6 December 2019).
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 [1] There is an 8 week programme at the university that follows-on from the taster/'introductory' session.

8 [2] Rough estimates suggest that this is around 6% of new students at the university who ~~engaged-participated~~ in
9 the bystander session in 2018/19.

10 [3] This is the foundation stage: the year prior to first-year undergraduate study.

11 [4] The reasons why some students did not complete the post-test survey were because they did not take part in the
12 whole session, e.g., they had walked-out, or, for some students who remained in the session, they chose not to
13 complete it.

14 [5] Examples of why cases were not useable were because students did not provide usernames and there were non-
15 responses across the two surveys so cases/variables could not be paired for testing.

16 [6] Failure to remove cases of non-responses on scale items could deflate/inflate the score of the scale for testing
17 (see for example de Vaus, 2014).

18 [7] Difference in figures are non-responses.

19 [8] This was a reverse scale and the equal number of scale points did not allow us to reverse code the data.

20 ~~[9] There is an 8 week programme at the university that follows-on from the short bystander session, but n~~Not
21 many students ~~engage-participate in it~~ the 8 week programme that follows the taster session, at the university
22 ~~or~~
23 ~~its entirety.~~

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Tables for Article (SCJ)**Table I:** Aims of the intervention, number of participants, and missing responses

Aim	n = participants (pre-intervention)	n = participants (post-intervention)	n = missing responses
i	121	121	0
ii	116	116	5
iii	120	120	1
iv	121	121	0

Table II: Means (and standard deviations) of aim i—knowledge scale:

	Before Bystander	After Bystander
Mean (SD)	3.48 (2.87)	9.66 (0.89)

Table III: Means (and standard deviations) of aim i—confidence scale (3 scale items):

	Before Bystander	After Bystander
Mean (SD)	19.02 (7.18)	23.75 (6.05)

Table IV: Means (and standard deviations) of aim ii—victim-empathy scale:

	Before Bystander	After Bystander
Mean (SD)	8.23 (2.21)	8.94 (1.77)

Table V: Means (and standard deviations) of aim ii—victim-blaming scale (2 scale items):

	Before Bystander	After Bystander
Mean (SD)	5.87 (3.75)	5.07 (3.54)

Table VI: Means (and standard deviations) of aim iii.

	Before Bystander	After Bystander
Mean (SD)	5.34 (3.01)	9.07 (1.65)

Table VII: Means (and standard deviations) of aim iv:

	Before Bystander	After Bystander
Mean (SD)	5.99 (2.84)	7.97 (2.47)