



## Development of the Bystander Attitude and Behavior Scales for Gender-Based and Oppressive Violence with University Faculty

Nada Elias-Lambert, Sarah R. Leat, Kristin W. Bolton, Richard S. Pond Jr & Jessica Grace

To cite this article: Nada Elias-Lambert, Sarah R. Leat, Kristin W. Bolton, Richard S. Pond Jr & Jessica Grace (2023): Development of the Bystander Attitude and Behavior Scales for Gender-Based and Oppressive Violence with University Faculty, Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, DOI: [10.1080/10926771.2023.2248055](https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2023.2248055)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2023.2248055>



Published online: 17 Aug 2023.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 6



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



## Development of the Bystander Attitude and Behavior Scales for Gender-Based and Oppressive Violence with University Faculty

Nada Elias-Lambert<sup>a</sup>, Sarah R. Leat<sup>b</sup>, Kristin W. Bolton<sup>c</sup>, Richard S. Pond Jr<sup>c</sup>, and Jessica Grace<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Social Work, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX, USA; <sup>b</sup>Social Work, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN, USA; <sup>c</sup>Social Work and Psychology, University of North Carolina Wilmington, North Carolina, USA

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop and explore the factor structure of university faculty-focused bystander attitude and behavior measures regarding gender-based violence and to expand on the inclusion of oppressive behaviors in these measures. An online survey was administered to a convenience sample of 167 faculty from a university in the US. Two scales, Faculty Bystander Attitude Scale (FBAS) and Faculty Bystander Behavior Scale (FBBS), were developed to assess faculty bystander attitudes and behaviors. After exploratory factor analysis, the 27-item FBBS successfully loaded on three factors and, after eliminating two items, the 25-item FBAS successfully loaded on three factors. A confirmatory factor analysis will be a useful next step in confirming the factor structure of the modified measures. Faculty specific bystander attitude and behavior scales are necessary to assess the efficacy of violence prevention programming for faculty. These scales can also be incorporated into campus climate surveys to determine faculty's willingness to intervene when they witness behaviors along the continuum of violence.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 2 February 2023  
Revised 25 July 2023  
Accepted 1 August 2023

### KEYWORDS

Bystander; gender-based violence; measurement; oppression; university faculty

Gender-based violence has continued to be an epidemic on college campuses. While estimates of the prevalence of gender-based violence vary, consensus exists that university students are at particularly high risk for experiencing gender-based violence (Cantor et al., 2015; Carey et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2018). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have recommended adoption of a public health approach that focuses on the responsibility of all community members to reduce gender-based violence (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019). The Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act and the Second Report of the White House Task Force Report to Protect Students from Sexual Assault call for institutions of higher education to increase efforts to address campus sexual

assault and explicitly promote a bystander approach (Department of Education, 2014; The White House, 2017).

The bystander model, which frames sexual violence as a community issue and focuses both on increasing community members' receptivity to prevention messages and training and supporting bystander behaviors, can be used to address and prevent both gender-based violence as well as other oppressive behaviors (Banyard et al., 2007; Edwards, 2009; Moynihan & Banyard, 2008). The bystander model is unique in that it does not solely target victims or perpetrators of violence; rather, it calls upon all community members to work together to enhance efforts to change broader group and community norms around sexual violence (Banyard et al., 2007). The bystander model engages all community members as potential bystanders and seeks to engage them in creating solutions. This coincides with both the CDC's social-ecological model of prevention and public health approach of community responsibility to reduce sexual violence and other oppressive behaviors (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2019).

Gender-based violence includes a spectrum of behaviors from subtle sexist comments and jokes to more severe acts of physical violence and sexual assault, so it is critical that violence prevention strategies confront the social and cultural norms that enable these behaviors to exist. Frequently, these behaviors are rooted in oppressive belief systems that include sexism, racism, and heterosexism (Guy, 2006). The CDC and the American Medical Association (AMA) have both recently formally recognized racism as a public health threat (American Medical Association, 2020; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021). As the research around gender-based violence expands, bystander programs should consider the role of intersectionality in confronting belief systems and the spectrum of violent behaviors (Orsini et al., 2019). Specifically, bystander programs should consider the impact of intersecting identities and power imbalances on individuals' willingness to engage in bystander behaviors to address violence (Orsini et al., 2019).

As universities have continued to develop and implement initiatives to address violence on campus, some are also working to engage faculty and staff in these initiatives (Finley & Levenson, 2018; Martini & De Piccoli, 2021). Since faculty and staff are an integral part of the university, they are critical players in creating and fostering a culture of respect (Martini & De Piccoli, 2021). Research highlights the importance of faculty in knowing, understanding, and supporting the prevention principles provided to students, as faculty often serve as "first responders" to student disclosure of violence (Eriksen et al., 2022; Finley & Levenson, 2018; Sharoni & Klocke, 2019). Student survivor advocates have articulated the need for visible support from university leadership, including faculty (Eriksen et al., 2022). Despite faculty observing the firsthand impacts of violence on student performance and attendance,

they still report receiving little to no training focused on sexual violence prevention (Finley & Levenson, 2018). If universities want to utilize a community or bystander approach to combating sexual violence on campus, faculty must be a central component of those strategies. For far too long, faculty have been an untapped resource in campus sexual violence prevention efforts, and that needs to change (Finley & Levenson, 2018).

As faculty-focused bystander intervention programs are being developed, it has become evident that in order to effectively evaluate the outcomes of these initiatives, faculty-focused bystander attitude and behaviors scales need to be developed to inform prevention programming efforts. It is critical to develop and validate instruments that can reliably assess the constructs being targeted by the prevention programs. Since there is a clear connection between changing attitudes and behaviors associated with gender-based violence and other oppressive behaviors (Johnson et al., 2019), it is important to consider expanding the constructs measured by these scales to include both attitudes and behaviors related to all forms of oppressive behaviors.

Previously, McMahan et al. (2011) validated two scales that assessed bystander attitudes and behaviors. Currently, these scales are used to measure bystander attitudes and behaviors related to sexual violence with university students. To date, there are no existing scales to measure bystander attitudes and behaviors among university faculty. In the present study, the two scales validated by McMahan et al. (2011) were adapted to reflect the experiences of university faculty and conceptually expanded to assess distinct types of oppressive behaviors including sexual violence, sexism, racism, and heterosexism. Specifically, the purpose of this study was threefold: 1) adapt two existing bystander attitude and behavior measures for a university faculty population; 2) expand on the inclusion of oppressive attitudes and behaviors; and 3) explore the factor structure of the modified self-reported scales.

### **Current measurements of bystander intervention**

Currently scales used to capture prosocial behavior are designed to measure three dimensions of being a bystander: efficacy, attitudes, and behaviors. Efficacy scales are used to measure individuals' level of confidence in their skills or ability to act prosocially and perform bystander intervention behaviors. The most frequently used scales to assess efficacy are the Bystander Efficacy Scale (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2005) and the Bystander Confidence Scale (Banyard et al., 2005). These scales were informed by earlier scales, such as the Slaby Bystander Efficacy Scale (Slaby et al., 1994) and the MVP Efficacy Scale (Ward, 2001) that were used to capture a person's general beliefs regarding the efficacy of gender-based violence prevention but did not focus on one's beliefs about their personal efficacy to engage in violence prevention behaviors. The Bystander Efficacy Scale and the Bystander

Confidence Scale were developed to be used with college students and have demonstrated good reliability ranging from .87 to .92 (Amar et al., 2015; Banyard, 2008; Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Banyard et al., 2007; Peterson et al., 2018; Yule & Grych, 2020).

The second category of scales are those used to capture attitudes about prosocial behavior and engaging in active bystander behaviors. These scales assess decision-making processes and willingness to engage and intervene. The most frequently used scales to assess attitudes are the Bystander Attitudes Scale (Banyard et al., 2005), the Decisional Balance Scale (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2005), the Bystander Intention to Help Scale – Short Form (Banyard, 2008), and the Willingness to Help Scale (Banyard et al., 2005). These scales were also developed to be used with college students and have been demonstrated to be reliable and valid measures to assess university students' attitudes regarding prosocial behavior (Alegría-Flores et al., 2017; Amar et al., 2015; Gable et al., 2021; Peterson et al., 2018).

The last category of scales consist of those used to measure bystander behaviors. These scales were developed to capture participants' opportunities to be an active bystander and their completed intervention. In addition, these scales have been used to identify missed intervention opportunities by comparing participants' opportunities for intervention with their completed interventions. Scales used to assess bystander behavior are the Bystander Behavior Scale (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Banyard et al., 2005), Bystander Situation Questionnaire (Yule & Grych, 2020), Bystander Behavior (Friends) Scale (Banyard et al., 2014), and Gender-Specific Barriers to Bystander Behavior (Burns, 2009). These scales have also been used with university students and have demonstrated good reliability (Amar et al., 2015; Burns, 2009; Cascardi et al., 2018; Jouriles et al., 2017; Yule & Grych, 2020). In addition, two scales, the Sexual Assault Bystander Behavior Questionnaire (Hoxmeier et al., 2020) and the Bystander Situations Scale (Kania & Cale, 2021), were developed to capture both intentions and attitudes toward bystander intervention as well as completed bystander behaviors among college students. These scales provided lists of different types of intervention and asked participants to rate their willingness to complete the intervention, opportunities to complete the intervention, and whether they exhibited the intervention behavior.

While there have been many scales developed that have captured efficacy, attitudes, and behaviors about bystander intervention, these scales have primarily been designed to capture prosocial attitudes and behaviors among college students. To date, no scales have been formulated to assess attitudes and behaviors among university faculty and staff. Although, one study developed scales to be used with high school personnel in response to gender-based violence among high school students (Edwards et al., 2021). Recently, Edwards et al. (2021) developed three scales to be used with teachers, coaches, and staff. The Bystander Efficacy Scale (Banyard, 2008; Banyard et al., 2014) was

modified to ask high school personnel to rate their confidence to perform various bystander actions in situations related to teen relationship abuse and sexual assault. In addition, two scales were developed to assess attitudes, The Bystander Intent to Help Scale – School Personnel, and behaviors, The Barriers to Bystander Action Scale- School Personnel. These scales were used with 1,150 participants and demonstrated good reliability, .79 and .65 respectively. However, these scales focused on prosocial behavior with high school students and included scenarios related to violence among teenagers. Therefore, scales used to assess attitudes and behaviors among university faculty and staff are needed.

## **Continuum of violence**

The documented connection between sexual violence and other forms of oppression, such as racism, sexism, and homophobia, has facilitated the need for more inclusive measures (Johnson et al., 2019). As Guy (2006) explains; sexual violence exists on a continuum of behaviors rooted in systems of oppression, indicating that anti-violence work of any kind must include addressing all forms of oppression. The National Sexual Violence Resource Center concludes that all prevention work is inextricably tied to anti-oppression efforts (National Sexual Violence Resource Center, 2019). In most bystander research studies, there has been a focus on measuring prosocial behaviors and attitudes; targeting an individual's reported willingness to intervene in situations is typically viewed as a positive indicator on which to build violence prevention (Banyard, 2008; Chen & Jin, 2020; Gracia et al., 2018). Yet, as researchers have noted limitations in these measures to capture a broader spectrum of behaviors and attitudes, there has been support for the development of new scales (Johnson et al., 2019; McMahon et al., 2011). In attempting to measure the attitudes and behaviors of faculty members to inform prevention efforts, the authors concluded that current measures were not as comprehensive as needed. The absence of faculty-specific bystander scales, along with expanded bystander behaviors and attitudes toward other forms of oppression, facilitated the development of new scales for this study.

## **Methods**

### **Sample**

The present study consists of a convenience sample of 167 faculty at a mid-sized, central private university in the US (see Table 1). Participants mostly identified as female ( $n = 110$ , 66.0%), Caucasian ( $n = 134$ , 80.2%), and heterosexual ( $n = 145$ , 86.8%). As the sample was from a predominantly white institution, the faculty representation was similar to the sample in that about 77.4% of faculty identified

as White. Participants were also primarily associate professors ( $n = 43$ , 25.7%) from disciplines related to fine arts ( $n = 30$ , 18.0%), liberal arts ( $n = 30$ , 18.0%), and nursing and health sciences ( $n = 37$ , 22.2%).

### ***Recruitment and data collection procedures***

A study flyer was used to recruit faculty that attended a bystander intervention workshop to participate in a survey related to attitudes and behaviors regarding bystander intervention to prevent violence. In addition, the authors shared the study flyer and survey link via e-mail with faculty who had not attended the bystander intervention workshop but were in the same academic units as an instructor who had attended the bystander intervention workshop. All faculty in an academic unit with a trained facilitator were invited to complete the survey. The sample met the following inclusion criteria: (1) participation in a faculty-focused bystander intervention program; (2) instructor who did not participate in the faculty-focused bystander intervention program, but was in the same academic unit as an instructor who participated in the faculty-focused bystander intervention program; (3) currently working as an instructor at this university in the southwestern US; and, (4) fluent in the English language. Informed consent was obtained at the start of the online survey from all participants. No incentive was provided to faculty to complete the survey. The study received approval from a university institutional review board.

### ***Measures***

#### ***Faculty bystander scales adaptation process***

The original bystander measures, the Bystander Attitude Scale and the Bystander Behavior Scale, were developed by Banyard et al. (2005) to assess bystander attitudes and behaviors regarding sexual violence among university students. Later, researchers updated and validated these two scales (McMahon et al., 2011). The present study utilized a similar modification and validation process as McMahon et al. (2011). Specifically, this effort seeks to modify the BAS-R and BBS-R for a faculty population and to establish reliability and content validity. The following steps were taken to modify and adapt the measures:

- (1) Anecdotal information, including example bystander intervention situations that faculty encounter, was gathered from the research teams' lived experience with faculty engaging in faculty-focused bystander intervention programming over a four-year period. Developed through an intersectional lens, the bystander intervention program provided a sustainable way (via a train-the-trainer component) for everyone to learn and apply trauma-informed upstander intervention



techniques to prevent moments of injustice, including sexual violence, racism, sexism, and heterosexism. Program practice scenarios included examples of all these types of oppressive behaviors. To further inform the development of the scale items, the bystander intervention program focused on consultation with faculty who participated in a train-the-trainer bystander intervention program and were now facilitating the faculty-focused bystander intervention program with faculty in their own units. These trained faculty provided feedback that was used to modify the items from the original BAS-R and BBS-R scales.

(2) Process evaluation data was gathered from faculty that participated in a bystander intervention program administered on a university campus. This information was gathered both formally and informally through surveys and focus groups and included example bystander scenarios that faculty had encountered.

a. Three focus groups were conducted with faculty who attended a faculty-focused bystander intervention program and a faculty-focused train-the-trainer bystander intervention program. Focus group participants were asked about the behaviors faculty can engage in as prosocial bystanders and what role faculty can play to address violence on campus. For example, faculty stated that there are many opportunities for faculty to model bystander

**Table 1.** Participant demographics.

| Variable                    | Total (%)   |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Gender                      |             |
| Female                      | 110 (66.0%) |
| Male                        | 50 (30.0%)  |
| Race/ethnicity              |             |
| Caucasian                   | 134 (80.2%) |
| Other                       | 14 (8.4%)   |
| Multiracial                 | 12 (7.2%)   |
| Sexual orientation          |             |
| Heterosexual                | 145 (86.8%) |
| Other                       | 15 (9.06%)  |
| College at university       |             |
| Nursing and Health Sciences | 37 (22.2%)  |
| Liberal Arts                | 30 (18.0%)  |
| Fine Arts                   | 30 (18.0%)  |
| Science and Engineering     | 24 (14.4%)  |
| Communications              | 14 (8.4%)   |
| Education                   | 13 (7.8%)   |
| Other                       | 10 (6.0%)   |
| Position at university      |             |
| Associate Professor         | 43 (25.7%)  |
| Assistant Professor         | 35 (21.0%)  |
| Instructor                  | 25 (15.0%)  |
| Full Professor              | 23 (13.8%)  |
| Staff                       | 13 (7.8%)   |
| Other                       | 16 (9.6%)   |



behaviors for students on campus, so we added several items to capture the opportunity to model bystander behaviors for students inside and outside the classroom. Faculty also suggested that they can be an ally to students in a classroom setting, so we added items such as “express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment toward another student in class.” Faculty also suggested that they have the power to take action to change the culture on campus, so we added items such as “participate in a rally on campus to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors (e.g.: racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.).” Table 2 outlines how different scale items were generated based on the process evaluation results.

3) Based on the focus groups, faculty also agreed that the bystander intervention skills taught in the intervention program could be applied to other types of oppressive behaviors and encouraged us to expand the types of bystander behaviors to include constructs beyond sexual violence

**Table 2.** Item generation based on process evaluation results.

---

Expand constructs beyond gender-based violence to include other types of oppression including sexism, racism, and heterosexism

---

1. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a sexist comment.
  2. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a racist comment.
  3. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a heterosexist comment.
  4. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making sexist comments about the students in his/her class when speaking to a colleague.
  5. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making racist comments about the students in his/her class when speaking to a colleague.
  6. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making heterosexist comments about the students in his/her class when speaking to a colleague.
  7. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making sexist comments about another faculty member.
  8. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making racist comments about another faculty member.
  9. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making heterosexist comments about another faculty member.
  10. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment.
  11. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment.
  12. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment.
  13. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment to a faculty member.
  14. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment to a faculty member.
  15. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment to a faculty member.
  16. Express my concern if I overhear a student making sexist comments about another faculty member.
  17. Express my concern if I overhear a student making racist comments about another faculty member.
  18. Express my concern if I overhear a student making heterosexist comments about another faculty member.
- Items that provided opportunity for faculty to model bystander behavior
1. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment toward another student in class.
  2. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment toward another student in class.
  3. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment toward another student in class.
- Items that provided opportunity for faculty to be an ally to students
1. Provide resources and/or referrals to a student if they disclose they have been sexually assaulted.
  2. Provide support to a student if they disclose they have been sexually assaulted.
- Items that provided opportunity for faculty to take action to change the culture on campus
1. Visit a web site to learn more about sexual violence and other risky behaviors (e.g.: racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.).
  2. Join an organization that works to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors (e.g.: racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.).
  3. Participate in a rally on campus to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors (e.g.: racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.).
  4. Attend workshop to learn more about sexual violence and other risky behaviors (e.g.: racism, sexism, heterosexism, etc.).
-

(see Table 2). A thorough review of the literature was conducted to include an exhaustive conceptual lens associated with oppressive behaviors. Specifically, literature associated with sexual violence, sexism, racism, and heterosexism was explored. As a result, the authors also expanded the scope of the scale to not only assess bystander behaviors related to sexual violence, but also related to sexism, racism, and heterosexism. For the purpose of these scales, sexual violence is defined as any sexual act or attempt to obtain a sexual act by violence or coercion, acts to traffic a person, or acts directed against a person's sexuality, regardless of the relationship to the victim. Sexism is defined as prejudice, stereotyping, or discrimination, typically against women, based on sex. Racism is defined as prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one's own race is superior. Heterosexism is defined as discrimination or prejudice against homosexuals or the assumption that heterosexuality is the typical sexual orientation.

Once the new items were generated, face validity was established using two different methods: 1) the measure was distributed to bystander intervention trained faculty. This group was asked to review the oppressive behaviors and practice example scenarios. Feedback from this group was used to enhance the alignment of the items with the concepts they represent and the relevance to a faculty population. 2) the measure was administered to faculty that were not trained or considered an expert in bystander intervention. This group was not asked to review the items on the measures for definition validation, rather they were asked to focus on understanding, readability, and overall flow of the items on the measures. Feedback from this group was used to increase understanding for a larger faculty audience. At the completion of the face validity assessment, the measures were entered into Qualtrics and administered to study participants.

### ***Modified faculty measures***

#### ***Faculty Bystander Attitude Scale (FBAS)***

The final Faculty Bystander Attitude Scale (FBAS) includes 27 potential bystander helping behaviors that participants are asked to respond to on a 5-point Likert-type scale indicating how likely they would be to engage in that bystander behavior. We utilized the Likert-type scale from the original BAS-R (McMahon et al., 2011). Higher scores indicated more likelihood to engage in prosocial bystander behaviors. Total scores ranged from 40 to 135 with higher scores indicating more prosocial attitudes. Cronbach's alpha for the BAS-R with university students was .86 and Cronbach's alpha for the FBAS for the current sample was .95.

### ***Faculty bystander behavior scale (FBBS)***

The final Faculty Bystander Behavior Scale (FBBS) is used to assess bystander behaviors participants engaged in during the 6 months prior to survey administration. This scale includes the same 27 potential bystander helping behaviors as the FBAS. The response options include “yes,” “no,” and “wasn’t in the situation.” We utilized the same response options as the original BAS-R (McMahon et al., 2011). Higher scores indicated more prosocial bystander behaviors in which participants engaged in during the 6 months prior to survey administration. Total scores ranged from 0 to 54 with higher scores indicating more prosocial behaviors. Cronbach’s alpha for the BBS-R was .69 with university students and Cronbach’s alpha for the FBBS for the current sample was .96.

### ***Data analysis***

All analyses were computed with SPSS version 21. Covarying groups of items were explored using factor analysis. A principal-axis factor analysis, using direct oblimin rotation, was conducted separately on the twenty-seven attitude items and the twenty-seven behavior items. Items were retained if they loaded above .30 on one, and only one, factor. However, two attitude items were discarded after extraction due to low communalities (<.20) or low factor loadings on the pattern matrix (<.30). A subsequent principal-axis factor analysis, using direct oblimin rotation, was conducted on the remaining twenty-five attitude items. None of the behavior items were discarded. Analyses for the attitude items and behavior items are described separately below.

## **Results**

### ***Faculty bystander attitudes***

For faculty bystander attitude items, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .88, indicating that the items shared a sufficient amount of common variance for factor analysis. Furthermore, Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, indicating that the items related to each other enough to warrant factor analysis,  $\chi^2(300, N = 137) = 4664.82, p < .001$ . A visual scree test was used to determine how many factors to extract (Cattell, 1966). Three factors, explaining 73% of the total variance, were extracted with eigenvalues of 13.26, 2.56, and 2.35 respectively. As indicated on the pattern matrix, each of the 25 items loaded at least .63 on one and only one factor. The interpretation of the factors appears straightforward (see Table 3). Factor 1 contains 12 items and measures the expression of concern over inappropriate statements made by students. Factor 2 contains 9 items and

**Table 3.** Factor loadings for FBAS.

| Faculty Bystander Attitudes Scale Items  | Factor Loadings |      |      |
|--|-----------------|------|------|
|  | 1               | 2    | 3    |
| Factor 1: Concern over inappropriate comments made by students   |                 |      |      |
| 1. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment  | .782            |      |      |
| 2. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment  | .863            |      |      |
| 3. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment  | .828            |      |      |
| 4. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment toward another student in class  | .756            |      |      |
| 5. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment toward another student in class  | .717            |      |      |
| 6. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment toward another student in class  | .769            |      |      |
| 7. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment to a faculty member  | .860            |      |      |
| 8. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment to a faculty member  | .848            |      |      |
| 9. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment to a faculty member  | .913            |      |      |
| 10. Express my concern if I overhear a student making sexist comments about another faculty member   | .820            |      |      |
| 11. Express my concern if I overhear a student making racist comments about another faculty member   | .799            |      |      |
| 12. Express my concern if I overhear a student making heterosexist comments about another faculty member                                   | .866            |      |      |
| Factor 2: Concern over inappropriate comments made by another faculty member   |                 |      |      |
| 1. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a sexist comment   |                 | .638 |      |
| 2. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a racist comment   |                 | .654 |      |
| 3. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a heterosexist comment   |                 | .634 |      |
| 4. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making sexist comments about the students in class when speaking to a colleague       |                 | .855 |      |
| 5. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making racist comments about the students in class when speaking to a colleague       |                 | .915 |      |
| 6. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making heterosexist comments about the students in class when speaking to a colleague |                 | .839 |      |
| 7. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making sexist comments about another faculty member                                   |                 | .943 |      |
| 8. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making racist comments about another faculty member                                   |                 | .958 |      |
| 9. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making heterosexist comments about another faculty member                             |                 | .902 |      |
| Factor 3: Desire to participate in activities to end sexual violence   |                 |      |      |
| 1. Visit a website to learn more about sexual violence and other risky behaviors   |                 |      | .670 |
| 2. Join an organization that works to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors   |                 |      | .900 |
| 3. Participate in a rally on campus to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors  |                 |      | .798 |
| 4. Attend a workshop to learn more about sexual violence and other risky behaviors   |                 |      | .761 |

measures the expression of concern over inappropriate statements made by another faculty member. Finally, Factor 3 contains 4 items that measure desire to participate in activities that help end sexual violence. The three factors exhibited moderate correlations with each other ( $r_s = .35$  to  $.66$ ).

### **Faculty bystander behavior**

For faculty bystander behavior items, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was  $.93$ , again indicating that the items shared a sufficient amount of common variance for factor analysis. Bartlett's test of sphericity was also significant, indicating that the items related to each other enough to warrant factor analysis,  $\chi^2(351, N = 132) = 5003.46, p < .001$ . A visual scree test was, again, used to determine how many factors to extract

(Cattell, 1966). Three factors, explaining 76% of the total variance, were extracted with eigenvalues of 16.50, 3.02, and 1.23 respectively. As indicated on the pattern matrix, each of the 27 items loaded at least .41 on one and only one factor. The interpretation of the factors appears straightforward (see Table 4). Factor 1 contains 17 items and measures concern regarding the victims of sexual assault and inappropriate comments. Factor 2 contains 4 items and measures participation in activities that help end sexual violence. Finally, Factor 3 contains 6 items that measure the expression of concern over inappropriate statements made by either another faculty member or a student. Factors 1 and 3 were strongly correlated ( $r = .78$ ), whereas they were each weakly associated with Factor 2 ( $r_s = .23$  and  $.13$ , respectively).

**Table 4.** Factor loadings for FBBS.

| Faculty Bystander Behavior Scale Items   | Factor Loadings |      |      |
|--|-----------------|------|------|
|  | 1               | 2    | 3    |
| Factor 1: Concern over victims of sexual assault and inappropriate comments  |                 |      |      |
| 1. Provide resources or referrals to a student if they disclose they have been sexually assaulted  | .466            |      |      |
| 2. Provide support to a student if they disclose they have been sexually assaulted   | .433            |      |      |
| 3. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making sexist comments about the students in class when speaking to a colleague       | .831            |      |      |
| 4. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making racist comments about the students in class when speaking to a colleague       | 1.107           |      |      |
| 5. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making heterosexist comments about the students in class when speaking to a colleague | .813            |      |      |
| 6. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making sexist comments about another faculty member                                   | .749            |      |      |
| 7. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making racist comments about another faculty member                                   | .982            |      |      |
| 8. Express my concern if I overhear a faculty member making heterosexist comments about another faculty member                             | .800            |      |      |
| 9. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment toward another student in class  | .616            |      |      |
| 10. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment toward another student in class   | .778            |      |      |
| 11. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment toward another student in class   | .749            |      |      |
| 12. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment to a faculty member   | .565            |      |      |
| 13. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment to a faculty member   | .785            |      |      |
| 14. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment to a faculty member   | .934            |      |      |
| 15. Express my concern if I overhear a student making sexist comments about another faculty member   | .895            |      |      |
| 16. Express my concern if I overhear a student making racist comments about another faculty member   | .718            |      |      |
| 17. Express my concern if I overhear a student making heterosexist comments about another faculty member                                   | .907            |      |      |
| Factor 2: Participation in activities to help end sexual violence  |                 |      |      |
| 1. Visit a website to learn more about sexual violence   |                 | .806 |      |
| 2. Join an organization that works to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors   |                 | .850 |      |
| 3. Participate in a rally on campus to stop sexual violence and other risky behaviors  |                 | .869 |      |
| 4. Attend a workshop to learn more about sexual violence and other risky behaviors   |                 | .859 |      |
| Factor 3: Concern over inappropriate statements made by students and faculty members   |                 |      |      |
| 1. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a sexist comment   |                 |      | .610 |
| 2. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a racist comment   |                 |      | .415 |
| 3. Express my concern if a faculty member makes a heterosexist comment   |                 |      | .648 |
| 4. Express my concern if a student makes a sexist comment  |                 |      | .728 |
| 5. Express my concern if a student makes a racist comment  |                 |      | .747 |
| 6. Express my concern if a student makes a heterosexist comment  |                 |      | .702 |

### **Measurement finalization**

Results of the EFA revealed that all 27 items of the FBBS loaded successfully on the three factors. Therefore, no additional revisions were required for the scale, and the reliability analysis remained consistent. However, the EFA on the FBAS revealed that only 25 items successfully loaded onto the three factors. Two items, specifically the questions “Provide resources and/or referrals to a student if they disclose they have been sexually assaulted” and “Provide support to a student if they disclose they have been sexually assaulted” loaded onto factors less than .30 and therefore were removed from the final version of the FBAS. The final version of the FBAS is 25 items. Reliability analysis was rerun on the 25 items and the Cronbach’s alpha remained consistent for the sample at .95.

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to conduct an EFA on two measures used to capture attitudes about engaging in prosocial behaviors and actual committed bystander behaviors among university faculty. The results demonstrate that the measures have good internal reliability and accurately assess bystander behaviors and attitudes. These scales are the first known to the authors that have been created to capture bystander attitudes and behaviors among faculty. Given that faculty have the potential to see their role on campus as models for prosocial behavior and should be included in bystander programming (Elias-Lambert et al., 2022; Robinson et al., 2020), the development of these scales is a necessary step toward measuring faculty member’s beliefs and attitudes and determining the efficacy of faculty-focused bystander intervention programming. In addition, these scales could be incorporated into campus climate surveys to determine faculty’s willingness to intervene when they witness behaviors along the continuum of violence. Understanding how students, along with faculty, see their role in preventing violent and oppressive behavior can help universities determine if their violence prevention programs are effective.

Through the process of adapting the Bystander Attitude Scale, Revised and the Bystander Behavior Scale, Revised (Banyard et al., 2005; McMahan et al., 2011), the authors were able to understand university faculty culture and attitudes and behaviors regarding engaging in prosocial behaviors when faced with violent or oppressive situations in and out of the classroom. The list of potential bystander behaviors derived in this study can be utilized in faculty-focused prevention programs as concrete examples of scenarios that faculty can engage in as prosocial bystanders to challenge social norms regarding violent and oppressive behaviors.

As violence exists on a continuum (Guy, 2006), it is critical to measure both bystander attitudes and behaviors related to sexual violence as well as other

oppressive behaviors to ensure effective behavior change across the entire continuum of violence. The study results demonstrate that the new measures have good internal reliability, which reinforces the relationship between sexual violence and other oppressive behaviors and confirms that these behaviors could be assessed simultaneously. For true prevention to take place, prevention programs need to target and measure attitude and behavior change across a larger range of oppressive behaviors (NSVRC, 2019). Prevention educators also need the ability to measure intervention earlier on the continuum as bystanders are engaging in prosocial behaviors to impact “low-risk” situations that are often normalized as part of our culture (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Bystanders cannot only intervene at different points along the continuum of violence, but they can also intervene in different types of violent situations such as gender-based violence, racism, and sexism. The ability to measure intervention across the continuum of violence as well as across different types of violent situations will allow prevention educators to determine the efficacy of prevention programming at affecting attitude and behavior change among faculty.

### **Limitations**

Several limitations exist with this study. Measurement related to gender-based violence and other oppressive behaviors may be influenced by social desirability bias due to the sensitive nature of these topics. In addition, although this study attempted to adapt the measures for a faculty population, due to the lack of diversity in the sample, it may not reflect the attitudes and behaviors of faculty with diverse identities. Given the demographics of the predominantly white institution where the study took place, obtaining a diverse sample was challenging; however, future studies should focus on diversifying the sample to ensure that the results apply to faculty with diverse identities as well.

### **Conclusions and future research**

Bystander intervention programming with faculty is a relatively new initiative, however faculty-focused bystander attitude and behavior scales are necessary to assess the efficacy of prevention programming with faculty. Future studies should focus on further testing the validity of the modified faculty bystander attitude and behavior scales. A confirmatory factor analysis would also be a useful next step in confirming the factor structure of the modified measures. Studies focused on expanding student bystander attitude and behavior scales to include a more expansive range of oppressive behaviors would be beneficial to assess the efficacy of bystander programming for students. Furthermore, reliability and validity testing of the measures should be explored with more diverse samples to better understand bystander intervention differences based



on intersectional identities and power dynamics. Addressing the prevention of gender-based violence along with other oppressive behaviors in programming is also a new initiative; however, for true prevention to take place, it should be a critical focus for prevention programming for all populations. Measuring willingness to engage in bystander behaviors is a step toward violence prevention and enhancing the efficacy of violence prevention programming. Violence is a public health issue that affects not only the individuals experiencing violence, but all members of the college campus and society. Faculty and staff can model bystander behaviors that all community members can use to prevent violence.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

### Data availability statement

The authors confirm that the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article.

### References

- Alegria-Flores, K., Raker, K., Pleasants, R. K., Weaver, M. A., & Weinberger, M. (2017). Preventing interpersonal violence on college campuses: The effect of one act training on bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(7), 1103–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515587666>
- Amar, A. F., Tuccinardi, N., Heislein, J. H., & Simpson, S. (2015). Friends helping friends: A nonrandomized control trial of a peer-based response to dating violence. *Nursing Outlook, 63*(4), 496–503. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2015.01.004>
- American Medical Association. (2020, November 16). *New AMA Policy Recognizes Racism as a Public Health Threat*. <https://www.ama-assn.org/press-center/press-releases/new-ama-policy-recognizes-racism-public-health-threat>
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence & Victims, 23*(1), 83–97. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83>
- Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(4), 287–301. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023544>
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A. C., & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence, 4*(1), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033470>
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463–481. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20159>

- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape prevention through bystander education: Final report to NIJ for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from [www.ncjrs.org/0pdffiles10nij0grants0208701.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.org/0pdffiles10nij0grants0208701.pdf)
- Burns, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60(11), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5>
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. The Association of American Universities.
- Carey, K. B., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2015). Incapacitated and forcible rape of college women: Prevalence across the first year. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 56(6), 678–680. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.02.018>
- Cascardi, M., King, C. M., Rector, D., & DelPozzo, J. (2018). School-based bullying and teen dating violence prevention laws: Overlapping or distinct? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(21), 3267–3297. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518798357>
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The screen test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1(2), 245–276. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr0102_10)
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). The social-ecological model: A framework for prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/publichealthissue/social-ecologicalmodel.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021, April 12). *Racism and Health*. <https://www.cdc.gov/healthequity/racism-disparities/>
- Chen, L.-M., & Jin, K.-Y. (2020). Development and validation of the willingness to intervene in bullying scale. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90(S1), 224–239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12319>
- Department of Education. (2014). Violence against women act; final rule. *Federal Register*, 79(202), 62752–62790.
- Edwards, D. (2009). *Green dot model*. Violence Intervention and Prevention Center, University of Kentucky. <http://www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/VIPCenter/greendot.html>
- Edwards, K. M., Sessarego, S. N., Stanley, L. R., Mitchell, K. J., Eckstein, R. P., Rodenhizer, K. A. E., Levya, P. C., & Banyard, V. L. (2021). Development and psychometrics of instruments to assess school personnel’s bystander action in situations of teen relationship abuse and sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(3–4), 1586–1606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517746946>
- Elias-Lambert, N., Robinson, S., & Grace, J. (2022). Bystander intervention programming with faculty: Recommendations for institutions of higher education. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 43(2), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-022-00669-0>
- Eriksen, S., Chib, S., Katz, J., Cortez-Barba, Y., Rayburn, P., & Aldridge, L. (2022). The best of times, the worst of times: “Best practices” for survivor support and gender violence prevention education on college campuses. *Women & Therapy*, 45(1), 7–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02703149.2021.1978047>
- Finley, L., & Levenson, J. (2018). The untapped resources of faculty in campus sexual violence prevention: Issues and recommendations. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 10(2), 123–133. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-05-2017-0297>
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women: Findings from two national-level studies*. National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>
- Gable, S. C., Lamb, S., Brodt, M., & Atwell, L. (2021). Intervening in a “sketchy situation”: Exploring the moral motivations of college bystanders of sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(1–2), 311–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517730027>

- Gracia, E., Martín-Fernández, M., Marco, M., Santirso, F. A., Vargas, V., & Lila, M. (2018). The willingness to intervene in cases of intimate partner violence against women (WI-IPVAW) scale: Development and validation of the long and short versions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01146>
- Guy, L. (2006). Re-visioning the sexual violence continuum. *Partners in Social Change*. Retrieved from the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape: <https://pcar.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdfs/re-visioning-the-sexual-violence-continuum.pdf>
- Hoxmeier, J. C., Acock, A. C., & Flay, B. R. (2020). Students as prosocial bystanders to sexual assault: Demographic correlates of intervention norms, intentions, and missed opportunities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(3–4), 731–754. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517689888>
- Johnson, N. L., Walker, R. V., & Rojas-Ashe, E. E. (2019). A social justice approach to measuring bystander behavior: introducing the critically conscious bystander scale. *Sex Roles, 81*(11), 731–747. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-019-01028-w>
- Jouriles, E. N., Sargent, K. S., Salis, K. L., Caiozzo, C., Rosenfield, D., Cascardi, M., Grych, J. H., O’Leary, K. D., & McDonald, R. (2017). TakeCARE, a video to promote bystander behavior on college campuses: Replication and extension. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*(23–24), 5653–5675. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517718189>
- Kania, R., & Cale, J. (2021). Preventing sexual violence through bystander intervention: Attitudes, behaviors, missed opportunities, and barriers to intervention among Australian university students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5–6), 2816–2840. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518764395>
- Martini, M., & De Piccoli, N. (2021). Evaluation of USVreact: A staff training program to prevent sexual violence at universities. *Health Education & Behavior, 48*(4), 507–515. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198120939487>
- McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 13*(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015>
- McMahon, S., Postmus, J. L., & Koenick, R. A. (2011). Conceptualizing the engaging bystander approach to sexual violence prevention on college campuses. *Journal of College Student Development, 52*(1), 115–130. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2011.0002>
- Moynihan, M. M., & Banyard, V. L. (2008). Community responsibility for preventing sexual violence: A pilot study with campus Greeks and intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 36*(1/2), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852350802022274>
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center. (2019). *Sexual Violence and Oppression: Framing Our Work Using the Sexual Violence Continuum*. <https://www.nsvrc.org/blogs/preventivista/sexual-violence-and-oppression-framing-our-work-using-sexual-violence>
- Orsini, M. M., Milroy, J. J., Bernick, J. B., Bruce, S., Gonzalez, J., Bell, B., & Wyrick, D. L. (2019). Bystander intervention training that goes beyond sexual violence prevention. *American Journal of Health Studies, 34*(2), 80–87. <https://doi.org/10.47779/ajhs.2019.35>
- Peterson, K., Sharps, P., Banyard, V., Powers, R. A., Kaukinen, C., Gross, D., Decker, M. R., Baatz, C., & Campbell, J. (2018). An evaluation of two dating violence prevention programs on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(23), 3630–3655. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516636069>
- Robinson, S., Elias-Lambert, N., Casiano, A., & Ward, L. (2020). “Culture-bearer, culture-sharer, culture-changer”: The role of faculty in preventing sexual violence on campus. *Advances in Social Work, 20*(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.18060/23381>

- Sharoni, S., & Klocke, B. (2019). Faculty confronting gender-based violence on campus: Opportunities and challenges. *Violence Against Women*, 25(11), 1352–1369. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219844597>
- Slaby, R., Wilson-Brewer, R., & DeVos, H. (1994). Final report for aggressors, victims, and bystanders project. Education Development Center.
- Smith, S. G., Zhang, X., Basile, K. C., Merrick, M. T., Wang, J., Kresnow, M., & Chen, J. (2018). *The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2015 data brief — updated release*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e308842004-001>
- Ward, K. J. (2001). Mentors in Violence Prevention Program Evaluation 1999–2000. Unpublished report, Northeastern University,
- The White House. (2017). The second report of the White House task force to protect students from sexual assault. Retrieved October 6, 2020, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/files/imagmes/Documents/1.4.17.VAW%20Event.TF%20Report.PDF>
- Yule, K., & Grych, J. (2020). College students' perceptions of barriers to bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(15–16), 2971–2992. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517706764>