



Bystander Intervention Programming with Faculty: Recommendations for Institutions of Higher Education

Nada Elias-Lambert¹ · Sarah R. Leat² · Jessica Grace¹

Accepted: 14 January 2022

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2022

Abstract

While bystander intervention programs have been implemented to help prevent sexual violence on campus, little is known about the impact of these programs on faculty members. We examined faculty perspectives and motivations regarding participation in a faculty-focused bystander intervention program. We facilitated three faculty focus groups ($N = 10$) in 2017 at a southwestern university in the U.S. Faculty were recruited through their voluntary participation in a faculty bystander intervention program. We found that faculty gained a variety of new skills from their participation in this program including new vocabulary to facilitate sensitive conversations, increased awareness regarding best practices for intervention, and practical tools to apply when intervening. Study results also revealed strategies for implementing faculty-focused bystander intervention programs that will increase the likelihood that they will affect changes in bystander behavior at all levels of the university and promote cultures of non-violence at institutions of higher education.

Keywords Bystander intervention · Higher education · Faculty · Violence prevention · Sexual violence

Over the past decade, institutions of higher education have developed and implemented initiatives to address gender-based violence on campus and have recently engaged faculty and staff in these initiatives. There is now a consensus that university students are at a particularly high risk for experiencing gender-based violence

✉ Nada Elias-Lambert
n.eliaslambert@tcu.edu

¹ Department of Social Work, Texas Christian University, TCU Box 298750, 76129 Fort Worth, TX, USA

² University of Memphis, Memphis, USA

(Cantor et al., 2015; Carey et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2018). The community constitutes a key component in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) social-ecological model for violence prevention. The CDC have recommended the adoption of a public health approach that focuses on the responsibility of all community members to reduce gender-based violence (CDC, 2004). Application of the social-ecological model on college campuses not only supports bystander intervention training for students but seeks to involve faculty and administrators in prevention efforts to collaboratively challenge community norms that facilitate violence. McMahon (2015) calls for further research with campus authority figures to determine the impact modeling bystander behaviors may play in the prevention of campus sexual violence. 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 intervention approach (Department of Education, 2014; White House, 2017).

The bystander model frames sexual violence as a community issue and focuses both on increasing community members' receptivity to prevention messages and training and supporting bystander behaviors (Banyard et al., 2007; Edwards, 2009; Foubert, 2000; 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 concerning sexual violence (Banyard et al., 2007). The bystander model targets all community members as potential bystanders and seeks to engage them in creating solutions. This reflects the CDC's public health approach of community responsibility to reduce sexual violence (Potter et al., 2009). In response to McMahon's (2015) call for additional research with campus stakeholders, the purpose of our study was to gather university faculty perspectives and motivations for participation in a faculty-focused bystander intervention program.

Review of Literature

Faculty Role in Bystander Intervention

To implement the community-focused approach of the bystander model on college campuses, faculty involvement in bystander intervention training is essential. However, the inclusion of faculty and their role in addressing sexual violence, is often not addressed in these trainings (Banyard et al., 2004; McMahon, 2015). More emphasis is directed on changing individual level behaviors or targeting small groups of students, while neglecting the community or cultural norms that allow sexual violence to exist (Banyard et al., 2004). If colleges seek to create safe, violence-free environments for all members on campus, leveraging the role of faculty members constitutes a key opportunity. As some campuses have found success in programs that engage students who are popular opinion leaders to become trained bystander facilitators and to model prosocial behavior to others (Coker et al., 2011); faculty and staff can be empowered to do the same.

Geller and Klapperich's (2016) faculty/staff initiative was part of a larger campus-wide effort to engage the community in sexual violence prevention. A special focus was directed to engage faculty and staff in bystander education and to become trained facilitators. However, administrators realized that even if faculty members chose not to become facilitators, their involvement in the program might generate support and interest from other community members on campus (Geller & Klapperich, 2016). Initial feedback from the program indicated receptiveness by faculty to participate in bystander education (Geller & Klapperich, 2016).

Research also notes a growing awareness of the potential benefit that having faculty engage in sexual violence prevention can bring to students and their university communities (Graham et al., 2019; McMahan, 2015; Robinson et al., 2020). Since faculty serve in multiple roles as teachers, committee members, and student advisors, their influence on policies, decisions, and attitudes can be extensive and effective. Although research on bystander education with faculty may be minimal, scholars point to the potential research, funding, and leadership opportunities that can emerge if faculty are engaged in this work (Graham et al., 2019; McMahan, 2015; Robinson et al., 2020).

Faculty Barriers and Facilitators to Bystander Intervention

In order to create an effective faculty-focused bystander intervention program, it is important to understand what motivates or deters a faculty member from intervening to address violence. Faculty who choose to intervene may do so with the goal of preventing students from experiencing the same marginalization or discrimination they faced in their own lives (Meyer, 2008). Some bystanders report having a sense of responsibility that compels them to respond when they see violence (Bennett et al., 2014). Bystanders are more likely to intervene if they have a relationship with those involved or a strong connection to their community (Bennett et al., 2017; Nicksa, 2014). If faculty members are perceived as allies, then relationships between campus stakeholders can be formed, promoting communication and a level of trust that increases the likelihood of intervening when violence takes place (Meyer, 2008).

While some faculty members feel compelled to help their students, others express hesitation. Most faculty point to campus administration as the reason they do not intervene. Prior experiences of reporting students to campus authorities for sexual assault or other types of violence has proved disappointing and has resulted in little action for victims (Meyer, 2008). This lack of consequences can make faculty members feel alone in their efforts to intervene as bystanders and disincentivizes intervention (Meyer, 2008). Faculty also express pressure from colleagues as a barrier to acting as a bystander. New faculty members, in particular, were concerned that intervening could result in ridicule by senior faculty (Meyer, 2008). In addition, the lack of training in how to respond to sexual violence makes some faculty feel ill equipped to handle these types of incidents. (Bennett et al., 2014; Meyer, 2008).

Program Participant Feedback

Understanding the impact and experiences of participants is a critical component in evaluating the overall effectiveness of a program. Involving program participants in the evaluation process helps them feel valued and heard, in turn making them more invested in the development of the program and its success (Nichols, 2002). Gathering participant feedback also helps diminish unbalanced power dynamics between participants and program facilitators, allowing for more effective and ethical program evaluations to occur (Nichols, 2002; Smits & Champagne, 2008).

Research supports the involvement of potential program participants in the development and implementation of bystander intervention programs (Adhia et al., 2017; Letendre et al., 2016; McMahan & Dick, 2011). Letendre et al. (2016) recruited teachers and staff to better understand the factors which helped or hindered the implementation of a positive bystander bullying prevention program in schools. They found that teachers, staff, and administrators all saw value in integrating the program into their classroom, demonstrating an acceptance and readiness for change in that setting. When feedback from potential participants is gathered prior to implementation, it can inform program development and be instructive in understanding the climate of the research setting (Adhia et al., 2017; McMahan & Dick, 2011).

Theoretical Framework

Banyard (2011) examines the three layers of Bronfenbrenner's (2005) ecological model, the microsystem, exosystem, and macrosystem, to determine key factors that promote and hinder helpful bystander intervention. According to the ecological model, a variety of factors such as gender, cognition, and emotion influence bystander behavior. Banyard (2011) argues that understanding these factors can serve as an opportunity to create change in preventing sexual violence. While previous research explores factors that influence bystander behavior on the microsystem level, Banyard (2011) uses the ecological model to emphasize the importance of analyzing the next levels in bystander behavior. Banyard (2011) suggests developing working relationships with campus stakeholders representing various communities, cultures, and groups to better understand the leverage points to increase bystander behavior. Engaging faculty in bystander intervention initiatives would align with the exo- and macrosystems of the ecological model. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to gather faculty members' feedback on their participation in a bystander intervention program.

Methods

This study utilizes a qualitative, exploratory design to gather university faculty perceptions and motivation for involvement in a faculty-focused bystander intervention program. Our study was grounded in a constructivist theoretical framework in which themes and patterns in collected data were discovered rather than predetermined.

This study is part of a larger evaluation study of a faculty-focused bystander intervention program.

Bystander Intervention Program

The bystander intervention program is comprised of two workshops: a faculty-focused bystander intervention workshop and a train-the-trainer workshop for individuals who are interested in facilitating the intervention workshop. Our two-hour bystander intervention workshop empowers faculty members to recognize, discourage, and prevent a culture that enables violence. Faculty participants were taught to recognize dangerous behaviors, to create a safe learning environment, to model positive bystander skills, to support students and colleagues, and to promote a culture of nonviolence. Faculty participants were also taught facts about sexual violence in America, how to apply five bystander intervention steps specified by Latane and Darley (1970), how to discuss the culture of violence on college campuses, and to understand mandated reporting guidelines. Faculty participants also discussed and practiced specific bystander intervention strategies for interacting with students and other members of the campus community.

Faculty who attended the intervention workshop and were also interested in facilitating that workshop with colleagues in their own departments could choose to attend the two-hour train-the-trainer workshop. This workshop includes a discussion of potential issues that may arise during the workshop facilitation as well as ideas on how to customize the workshop to meet the needs of different groups. Workshop participants received all the materials needed to facilitate the workshop and joined a team of trainers that collaborate to build a safe campus community. Both workshops, which are evidence-informed, were developed by one of the authors over the past four years.

Study Design

We chose focus groups as our primary data collection method for several reasons. First, focus groups are an effective format to listen and learn from others (Morgan, 1998), which was a main goal of this study. Also, we were interested in creating lines of communication between us as moderators, and the participants, as well as among the participants themselves. Using focus groups allows the researcher to gain information about a particular topic and listen to people's perspectives in a safe, non-threatening environment (Litosseliti, 2003). The flexible nature of focus groups offers the researcher insight into participants' unique descriptions of their beliefs and experiences, which then fosters opportunities to explore new ideas as a group (Litosseliti, 2003). Also, we wanted to use participating faculty members' actual statements in reporting the results of this study. The study received human subject approval from the university Institutional Review Board.

Recruitment

We recruited a purposive sample of faculty at a university in the Southwestern part of the U.S. for this investigation. The sample met the following inclusion criteria: (1) attendance in a two-hour faculty-focused bystander intervention program, (2) attendance in a faculty-focused train-the-trainer bystander intervention program, (3) currently working as an instructor at this university in the southwestern US, and (4) fluent in English. We shared the study information including focus group topic, dates, and locations via email with the 14 eligible faculty who had attended both the bystander intervention workshop and the bystander intervention train-the-trainer workshop. Interested faculty responded via email with their availability. No monetary incentive was provided to faculty to attend the workshops or the focus groups, however a meal was provided during the focus groups.

Data Collection Procedures

Three mixed-gender focus groups were conducted in 2017. Two focus groups included three participants and the third focus group had four participants. Each focus group lasted about 60 to 90 min. The research team conducting the focus groups consisted of one university professor and three social work students: one undergraduate student, one masters student, and one doctoral student. Each focus group was moderated by two members of the research team. Three focus group moderators were women, and the undergraduate student was a man. The social work students were trained in best practices for moderating focus groups by a co-investigator with experience conducting qualitative research involving focus groups. One moderator led each focus group and the other moderator took note of participants' nonverbal cues. All focus groups were hosted on campus in a conference room that was familiar and easily accessible to the participants. No faculty members participated in more than one focus group. Informed consent was obtained from all participants. The focus groups were directed by a semi-structured moderator's guide created by the researchers (see Appendix A). The guide included questions that addressed faculty perspectives regarding their participation in the faculty-focused bystander intervention workshop and the train-the-trainer workshop. The guide was followed by each moderator for consistency, but each moderator went into greater depth with questioning when appropriate. To ensure fidelity across focus groups, the university professor was one of the moderators for each focus group.

Data Analysis

The focus groups were audiotaped and professionally transcribed. To assist with the analysis, the transcriptions were imported into the qualitative software analysis program, Dedoose, and analyzed using open coding that sought meaningful categories via inductive content analysis (Creswell, 2007). Using Dedoose, three of the researchers independently read and coded the transcripts to generate a series of emergent themes and subthemes. The three researchers met several times to compare their assigned codes. When differences emerged, the researchers discussed the differences

in codes using an agreed upon definition of the codes until a consensus was reached. The researchers also used memoing during the coding process to note agreement and disagreement across code assignments to aid in theme development.

Data analysis included initial open coding during the data collection process. Initial open coding was used to break down the data into first level distinct concepts and categories. This allowed for the later exploration of themes that had been identified in early focus groups. Initial coding also allowed for the recognition of potential gaps in the data that led to positive methodological changes in future focus groups. Focused coding was then performed to condense and sharpen the themes and concepts that had emerged from the data (Creswell, 2007). Focused coding required examining what the initial codes implied and revealed about the data. This coding was guided by concepts and categories identified during the initial coding process. A thematic analysis was then used to identify faculty perceptions regarding best practices for bystander intervention programming on campus.

To enhance the rigor of this study, the researchers used three different types of triangulation strategies (Patton, 2001). First, two of the researchers used investigator triangulation (using multiple analysts to review findings). This type of triangulation can provide a check on selective perception and illuminate blind spots in an interpretive analysis. The fact that both researchers produced similar themes enhanced the validity of the key themes. Second, we achieved triangulation of sources (examining the consistency of different data sources from within the same method) by searching the data to determine whether points existed at which the data from one group supported the data from other groups. There were several instances in which this occurred. Lastly, the researchers used perspective triangulation (multiple perspectives to examine and interpret the data) as they identified relationships among the codes.

Results

Participants

Ten faculty members participated in three focus groups. At the time of this study, there were 14 faculty members who were eligible to participate in the study as they had attended both the faculty bystander intervention program and the train-the-trainer workshop, so 71% of eligible faculty participated in the study. Six participants were women and four were men. Nine participants were European American and one was African American. Five colleges from the same university were represented in the sample. Three faculty members were from Fine Arts, three from Liberal Arts, two from Nursing and Health Sciences, one from Communication, and one from Science and Engineering. Participants included two associate professors, three assistant professors, three instructors, and two doctoral students.

This study yielded results that are important for gaining a better understanding of faculty engagement in the bystander program, as well as for gaining insight into the program itself. Four main themes emerged from the results of the focus groups: (1) skills gained from program participation, (2) the importance of support, (3) barriers

and facilitators to program involvement, and (4) suggestions for ongoing program development.

Skills Gained From Program Participation

The results of this study indicate faculty gained a variety of new bystander intervention skills to support students and impact the campus community. Several participants noted the training provided them with new vocabulary to discuss difficult topics with students. One participant said, “I don’t know if it’s really dramatically altered my approach or understanding, but it’s given me more vocabulary.” Another participant expressed that the training gave them the permission to have difficult conversations with students, saying,

No, that’s my place. I’ve always talked to them about taking care of their body and eating and sleeping, so why can’t I talk to them about taking care of their emotional and mental needs, and those kinds of things. And so, hopefully that will have a positive effect. Hopefully it will get them in, hopefully they’ll start taking care of those things.

Being provided with additional training on topics related to sexual violence and other challenging conversation topics allowed participants to feel more comfortable initiating conversations with students because they felt they had the words to engage students in dialogues.

Secondly, participants discussed how the training gave them an increased awareness of their environment and the ability to identify dangerous situations. One participant said,

... just those kind of simple everyday things that you can do, and that has stuck in my brain, and because of that I now view, my eyes are little more open, and I look at interactions between people slightly differently because now I have a tool that I feel like, well now I don’t have to be like worried about it, I can do something really easy, I can just walk up to them and be like, ‘Hey, where’s the library?’ You know? And so now I’m looking for that, like a situation where I can use that.

Participants felt the training taught them to be more observant of those around them and they felt that if something were to happen around them that required intervention, they were more likely to notice. Gaining skills to recognize a potentially dangerous situation increased their likelihood of engaging as an active bystander.

Finally, participants described the practical tools they gained to intervene, including walking up to the person at risk and asking a simple question. One participant said,

Well I think I gained some, just real simple skills, that are usable every day. One thing that always sticks in my mind from the training was just the idea of disruption of some kind of event that’s happening. You know like, you see

something that looks wrong and you walk up and say, ‘do you have the time’, or ‘where’s (campus building)?’

Acquiring tangible tools from the bystander training that were perceived as minimal risk helped participants feel confident to act prosocially.

Ultimately the faculty appreciated that the training gave them the opportunity to develop and practice prosocial bystander skills. One participant expressed gratitude over the ability to learn and practice prosocial intervention skills, saying,

I think that’s just as important because it’s like why you have fire drills, so that when it happens you got some kind of ability to do something and you’re not going to panic or freeze, or something like that.

The idea of being able to practice skills before an intervention was necessary helped participants feel confident that they would intervene if they witnessed a potentially dangerous situation. Additionally, participants expressed that the training helped them feel empowered to use those skills. One participant said, “Empowerment is a big part of what the whole process is about, you know, us being empowered to recognize and feel confident that we can recognize the situation when we see it and then know what to do to act on it.” Participants discussed how the training challenged them to get out of their comfort zones. One participant said,

So it made me think about those things empowering me to say, ‘No, this isn’t really okay, you can’t do that’, and also just to be a little ... I’m trying to think what the, what the word is. The word that’s popping to mind is irritant, but that’s not quite right (laughs), like just something that says, you know what, you can’t be okay with this, like something that’s gonna push me out of my comfort zone a little bit.

Another participant described how the training gave them the confidence to intervene, saying, “But I do think that I would be more confident taking that risk even in a situation where I thought, well there could be ramifications now, than I might have been before this.” Participants also commented that the training helped them to become empowered to view prosocial behavior as part of their role as faculty. One participant said, “And so I think for me it’s empowered me a little bit more and given me permission to do that part of my job.” Faculty expressed the training not only assisted them in developing prosocial bystander skills, but it also empowered them to use those skills on campus and gave them the permission to see prosocial bystander behavior as part of their jobs as faculty.

The Importance of Support

The next primary theme that emerged from the study is the importance of support. Participants noted the training gave them the skills to ask for support from colleagues when facing dangerous situations. Several participants felt the training increased

their connection to their colleagues and helped them develop a sense of comradery in their different departments. One participant said,

I don't feel like it's just me swimming upstream alone, which is really, really helpful because it gives me more confidence to bring these things up in addition to having the tools, like, who to contact for certain issues or, what steps to take to figure out how to deal with the situation. So all of those things I think just, just makes it easier to do what I was wanting to do anyway.

Knowing that there were other faculty who were potentially trained in bystander intervention or in another supportive role helped participants feel comforted that if they did intervene, they would have support.

Participants also said that having peer support through the program helped them feel more confident in making changes on campus. Concerning peer support, one participant stated that "The more we can be visible on campus and develop relationships, the more support, participation, co-leadership, and changes we'll see." Furthermore, participants noted that having support at administrative levels, such as from department heads, deans of colleges, or other supervisors gave them confidence to participate in the bystander intervention program in the first place. Participants also agreed that if the administration of the university actively supports incorporating bystander intervention programs, more involvement among faculty is possible. One participant said,

You're gonna need some top-down, you know, it's the old you-can-talk-the-talk, but you've gotta walk-the-walk. And that means our chancellor and provost need to be involved, they just do. And I think we're in a college where our dean is supportive of it, and so you get the visibility and the push for it. But it's got to be top-down.

The participants felt that having the support from the upper levels of administration would encourage more faculty to participate, which could lead to increased visibility of bystander intervention programs and more prosocial bystander behavior in and out of the classroom. Being connected with other faculty who received bystander training as well as being connected with administrative supports led participants to believe that more faculty and staff would be encouraged to engage in prosocial behavior since they would know there would be support.

Barriers and Facilitators to Program Involvement

Another theme discussed by participants were barriers and facilitators to program involvement. The faculty discussed factors that hindered their involvement as well as facilitators that encouraged them to participate.

Barriers Participants commented that they faced challenges finding the time to attend the program as well as a lack of knowledge concerning what bystander intervention training was, which ultimately discouraged their involvement. Several faculty dis-

cussed many challenges finding the time to attend the training. They also expressed challenges getting their colleagues involved. One participant said, “I don’t think I’m speaking out of turn here, I don’t think I have a prayer of getting my colleagues together for 60 minutes across the college.” Several participants agreed that asking their colleagues to commit the time for the training is a barrier to program involvement. Lastly, participants noted that having misconceptions about what it means to be a bystander in the first place served as a barrier to program participation. For example, a participant offered, “Bystander kind of scared me at first...what does it mean to be a bystander? Am I jumping in the way?” Another participant agreed and described an interaction they had with a colleague saying, “One reason he wouldn’t want to even participate, he wouldn’t want to intervene because he doesn’t want to deal with repercussions. And he was thinking that bystander intervention means kind of throwing yourself in front of a punch basically.” Misinformation about what it means to be an active bystander led to participants who had received training facing barriers to involving their colleagues and departments. Based on the focus group data, barriers included committing the time for the training as well as misconceptions about what it means to be a prosocial bystander hindered involvement in the program.

Facilitators Participants also described facilitators that helped motivate faculty to participate in the program. Faculty noted if they had a personal connection to the bystander message, such as having a personal experience with sexual violence or having children currently attending college, then they were more likely to participate. For example, one faculty member stated, “I think that my motivation was probably a little more personal. I have a daughter that just turned 20 and she’s a student at (university).” Having a daughter who was college age led to this participant feeling compelled to receive the training so she could help other students similar to her daughter. In addition, having a personal connection to social injustices such as racism, sexism, ableism served as a facilitator to program participation. One participant said,

I feel like I’m an advocate for anti-oppression work and particularly, uh, anti-sexist work. I feel like I’m an ally to women in particular and I just think that this work is ever important, and as we were speaking about before, as these issues are more and more prevalent, I feel that it is our responsibility and it behooves us to, um, do this work on campus.

This participant viewed his role on campus as an advocate for oppressed and marginalized groups and therefore found the bystander intervention program to align with his personal values and role. Finally, participants noted their desire to become part of the university community as well as have an impact on campus facilitated their involvement in the program. One participant said,

I like the idea of changing the community. Of getting students, faculty, of everyone who is here at (university) to be able to look at the world, look at our behaviors, look at how we interact with each other and hopefully change it by being responsible bystanders.

This participant felt that participation in the bystander intervention program and acquiring new prosocial skills had the ability to impact the university community and that faculty have the ability to serve as role models for other members of the university community. Having a connection to the message of the bystander intervention program facilitated involvement for participants and they felt that if other faculty and staff were able to gain a personal connection to the bystander message, they would be encouraged to participate as well.

Suggestions for Ongoing Program Development

The final theme that emerged revealed strategies for ongoing development of a bystander intervention program specifically targeting faculty. Participants first describe positive attributes about the program that should be maintained. Faculty expressed that the program was an appropriate length and the information provided was delivered concisely. In addition, they appreciated the materials and resources provided as well as the opportunity to build on the knowledge they gained from other trainings offered at the university which reinforced their skills. Faculty also appreciated the flexibility offered by the program. One participant said, "It's nice to have the (program materials) available, but then also to have that flexibility like everyone's saying to shape it to the conversation that's happening."

Next, participants offered suggestions for improvement of the program moving forward. Participants suggested that breaking the content into several shorter sessions may allow for a larger audience to participate. One participant said, "I'm wondering if as this program gains traction, which I think that it will and should, I wonder, would it be something to investigate, to perhaps address all of these things, but maybe breaking up into more focused components." Participants also suggested presenting the information in different mediums, such as panel discussions or creating an online platform to host the information, in order to encourage involvement. One participant said,

I am also wondering if in addition to workshops if there could be panel discussions or a speaker series or something more interactive I think would be good. And it's not like a workshop. I think maybe workshop has one particular connotation to it. And maybe a panel discussion wouldn't have that same kind of like, um, I don't know, would encourage you to participate but not the pressure to participate in the same way that a workshop would.

This participant felt that making the program more interactive and offering it in a variety of settings would encourage more participation across the campus.

Participants also suggested incentivizing the program to keep the program momentum going in the future. Several faculty suggested creating a rewards system or offering a certificate for successful completion of the training. One participant said, "Now you have this, and here's this plaque or the certificate you can put on your wall to show that you're an upstanding faculty." Offering a tangible representation of successful program participation might encourage more participation among faculty and staff at universities.

Lastly, participants suggested several additional ways to disseminate the information in the future. Participants discussed including bystander intervention programs in trainings already in place at the university to increase information dissemination. One participant said,

So, I wonder if a two-step approach could somehow, moving forward, whereas first we bring people, make them aware that they have some power and should intervene socially, be prosocial, so that's a big thing. And then we start showing them how that could apply in different scenarios.

Providing different levels of training could allow faculty to gain additional skills and get feedback on completed intervention. Participants also discussed applying the training to different social issues in order to demonstrate the multitudinous application of the bystander intervention training message. One participant discussed creating a “bystander 2.0” program which expands beyond the issues of sexual violence to racism and heterosexism. Ultimately faculty felt the bystander intervention training program should be included on campus and felt the message should be expanded to encourage more involvement across the university.

Discussion

The study results revealed four key themes regarding university faculty perspectives and motivations for participation in a faculty-focused bystander intervention program. Results highlight important implications for the continued development of bystander intervention programs for university faculty. Gaining a new skill set was a salient theme. Through program participation, faculty gained important skills to help them more effectively communicate with students and take appropriate, supportive action when a student comes to them for assistance. Faculty also learned skills to confront a variety of social injustices such as sexism, racism, heterosexism in the classroom and beyond. Similarly, Geller and Klapperich (2016) also found that through program participation, faculty learned how to more effectively engage students in constructive dialogue around sensitive topics. Based on Bronfenbrenner's (2005) ecological model and Banyard's (2011) further examination of that model, it is critical to engage faculty in bystander intervention initiatives on campus. With the skills gained from program participation, faculty have the potential to impact all levels—micro, exo, and macro—of the ecological model to effectively change campus social norms and promote a culture of tolerance and social justice. Faculty play an important role in modeling prosocial bystander behaviors for students. It is important to include faculty in intervention initiatives in order to demonstrate that violence is a community problem, and all community members must be involved to prevent it.

The importance of support at all levels was the second theme that emerged from the focus group results. The results indicate that faculty are motivated to participate in bystander intervention programming when they perceive support from administrators and colleagues. Participants felt supported by the administration to engage with the program, which led to them feeling empowered to be prosocial bystanders

without fear of the potential consequences. Previous research has highlighted that faculty who perceive inaction on the part of administration regarding issues such as sexual violence, sexism, and racism are less motivated to take action themselves for social change (Meyer, 2008). Faculty connected with colleagues who also participated in the program which led to an increased sense of community and ability to reach out to faculty colleagues for support in addressing social injustices. This peer support is critical to engaging faculty in prevention initiatives. Meyer (2008) found that new faculty members would base their behavior on what senior faculty members were modeling regardless of whether that modeled behavior was prosocial or not. If faculty perceive more support from administration and colleagues, they are more likely to participate in the program and gain skills to impact and support change in the campus culture. Support from upper administration appears to be critical in engaging faculty in acting as prosocial bystanders to promote cultures of non-violence on campus and in the community.

A third theme that emerged from the results was faculty-identified facilitators and barriers to program involvement. Participants expressed that a main reason they engaged and shared the bystander messaging is either a personal connection to message or to a specific social injustice. Similarly, Meyer (2008) found that faculty who acted as prosocial bystanders did so based on internal motivators such as personal experiences or observation of students' experiences with marginalization or discrimination. Bystander intervention initiatives offer skills and a space for individuals to collaboratively work to make positive changes in their campus community. This desire to be part of a community and impact change was a motivator for the study participants as well. Participants also identified potential barriers to consider when developing and implementing bystander intervention programming with faculty. These barriers included the time required to attend the programs, the potential professional consequences of prosocial behaviors, and a lack of understanding regarding the term intervention. It is critical for administration to encourage bystander intervention initiatives so faculty feel supported in creating time to engage in this programming as well as ensuring that no professional consequences will arise from faculty intervention as prosocial bystanders when appropriate. It is also important to be mindful of how bystander intervention programs are marketed to faculty. If there is a misunderstanding based on how the program is marketed regarding the actual content of the program, faculty are less likely to attend and engage with the content. It may be worth being cautious of the term intervention when marketing the program to ensure faculty do not mistakenly attribute specific behaviors to the term intervention, but instead attend the program and understand that each individuals has the ability to impact change in ways that are comfortable and safe to them.

The final theme that emerged identified strategies for the continued development and implementation of bystander intervention initiatives that are relevant and impactful to faculty audiences. Participants provided feedback on how to improve current bystander intervention programming and shared suggestions for future initiatives. Based on participants' suggestions, it may be important to consider the length of this type of programming and offer different program options to allow for more versatility in the way the program is delivered. Faculty also expressed that incentivizing the program with something as simple as a certificate of completion could engage

more faculty in the initiatives. Previous research supports incorporating program participant feedback to improve the development and implementation of bystander intervention programs (Adhia et al., 2017; Letendre et al., 2016; McMahon & Dick, 2011). This critical insight directly from engaged faculty could help strengthen future bystander intervention initiatives. Involving participants through gathering their program participation feedback could also help diminish power dynamics between participants and program facilitators, which continues to support the messaging that it is critical that all community members engage as prosocial bystanders to impact positive change (Nichols, 2002; Smits & Champagne, 2008). To develop bystander intervention programming that will meet the needs of the university community, it is important to consider and incorporate feedback from faculty participants to ensure the program is relevant to the target audience.

Limitations

The results of this study should be considered in light of a few limitations. Since inclusion in this study was limited to those who had completed a faculty-focused bystander intervention program, the sample size was relatively small in comparison to the size of the university. In addition, the faculty that participated in this study may feel more strongly about the need for faculty to be involved in sexual violence prevention given they were motivated to participate in the bystander intervention program even though it was not a requirement for their employment. Finally, the researchers who analyzed the qualitative data were part of the bystander intervention program's development and therefore there is the potential for bias during the data analysis process.

Practice and Policy Implications

The results of this study highlight important implications for practice as well as ongoing policy development. First, to effectively prevent campus sexual violence, faculty must be included in prevention models. Faculty play a critical role in setting the culture on university campuses and therefore can be examples for prosocial behavior when moments of intervention arise. For this reason, universities should support and encourage bystander training for both faculty and staff in order to effectively prevent campus sexual violence. Furthermore, advocates from social work and similar disciplines should call for revisions to the Campus SAVE Act (Department of Education, 2014; White House, 2017) to mandate bystander training for faculty and staff. Currently the Campus SAVE Act mandates bystander training for students but offers no provisions for faculty and staff. Providing training to faculty and staff will allow for intervention to take place at multiple levels.

Secondly, program participation was facilitated by a personal connection to the bystander message as well as a personal connection to social justice issues. Furthermore, the ability to gain new skills was an important takeaway for program participants. Universities that choose to incorporate a faculty bystander intervention program should highlight the program's ability to offer space to practice prosocial behavior and refine intervention skills for incidents involving social injustices. This

may encourage program participation and make the bystander message more salient throughout campus.

Finally, the incorporation of a bystander intervention program must have support from multiple levels at the university to successfully encourage engagement from faculty and staff. Participants in this study were appreciative of the comradery they received with other program participants and felt they would be supported should they choose to intervene. In addition, support from upper administration encouraged program engagement and participants felt comforted that the administration was concerned with social justice issues by supporting a faculty and staff bystander intervention program. For a bystander program for faculty and staff to be successful, support from the upper administration of a university is critical. Furthermore, creating a safe environment through a bystander intervention program for faculty and staff to support each other while they practice intervention skills will allow for a more salient prevention message.

Conclusions and Future Directions

Future research could focus on improving the inclusivity of bystander intervention programs by conducting focus groups with faculty with diverse identities to better assess what intervention means to them. It is possible that intervention by someone with a diverse identity carries a different set of risks than someone from a majority group. It could also prove useful to develop and validate a scale to assess faculty bystander behaviors and attitudes. To date, bystander behavior and attitudes scales have only been developed and validated for student populations. The development of a faculty bystander attitude and behavior scale could allow for a quantitative evaluation of bystander attitudes and behaviors of university faculty. This could also allow for an effective evaluation of faculty-focused bystander intervention programming at the university level.

The results of this study contribute to our understanding of faculty perspectives regarding engagement with bystander intervention programming and messaging. The results of this study will allow universities to develop and implement bystander intervention initiatives that are relevant and impactful to faculty to ensure that this programming will affect change at all levels of the university and promote cultures of non-violence at institutions of higher education.

Appendix A: Focus Group Guide

Involvement in the Faculty Bystander Intervention Program (FBIP).

- Why have you committed to being involved in this initiative?
 - What was your motivation for involvement in this initiative?
- Has your involvement in this initiative benefitted you? If so, how?
- Has your involvement in this initiative benefitted students? If so, how?

- What do you see as your role in changing the culture on campus regarding sexual violence?
 - Has your perception of your role changed based on your involvement in the FBIP?
- What do you see as your role in changing the culture on campus, in general?
 - Has your perception of your role changed based on your involvement in the FBIP?

FBIP Skills Development.

- What new skills have you learned through your involvement in this initiative?
 - How will/have you use(d) the skills you have learned when interacting with students?
 - How will/have you use(d) the skills you have learned when interacting with colleagues?
- How would/do you address sexual violence on campus?
- If you acted as pro-social bystander, do you believe there would be the repercussions?
 - If so, what would those be? (TCU, college, department)
- Do you believe you have the skills to teach others how to be pro-social bystanders?
- Do you have suggestions on ways to encourage faculty to act as pro-social bystanders on campus?

The FBIP.

- What worked well in the FBIP?
- What could be improved in the FBIP?
- How do you think your involvement in the FBIP has been received by your college?
- Have you experienced any victories or challenges through involvement in the FBIP?
 - If so, please share (if they share a challenge, ask for further information about strategies they used to overcome that challenge)..
- Do you have suggestions on how to improve the implementation of the FBIP?
- Do you have suggestions on how to recruit more faculty to participate in the FBIP?

Acknowledgements Study funded by the Texas Christian University Research and Creative Activities Fund.

Funding Study funded by the Texas Christian University Research and Creative Activities Fund.

Conflicts of Interest/Competing Interests The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article. Availability of Data and Material The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, NE, upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to them containing information that could compromise research participant privacy/consent.

Code Availability Not applicable.

References

- Adhia, A., Potter, S. J., Stapleton, J., Zuckerman, B., Phan, N., & Bair-Merritt, M. (2017). Encouraging bystanders to promote positive parenting and prevent child maltreatment in retail settings: Results of an exploratory qualitative study. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 26(3), 276–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2016.1264527>
- Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(3), 216–229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023739>
- 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. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.10078>
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Edwards, K. M. (2017). The impact of the bystander's relationship with the victim and the perpetrator on intent to help in situations involving sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(5), 682–702. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515586373>
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Garnhart, L. (2014). To act or not to act, that is the question? Barriers and facilitators of bystander intervention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(3), 476–496. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505210>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Sage Publications
- 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*. 288
- 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>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Author. (2004). *Sexual violence prevention: Beginning the dialogue*. Atlanta, GA: Author. <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/svprevention-a.pdf>
- Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., & Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: An active bystander intervention to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 777–796. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211410264>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- 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>
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women: Findings from two national-level studies*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>

- Foubert, J. D. (2000). The longitudinal effects of a rape-prevention program on fraternity men's attitudes, behavioral intent, and behavior. *Journal of American College Health*, 48, 158–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448480009595691>
- Geller, M., & Klapperich, L. (2016). A community approach to sustainable sexual assault prevention strategies. In S. C. Wooten & R. W. Mitchell (Eds.), *Preventing sexual violence on campus: Challenging traditional approaches through program innovation* (pp. 138–166). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315537856>
- Graham, L. M., Mennicke, A., Rizo, C. F., Wood, L., & Mengo, C. W. (2019). Interpersonal violence prevention and response on college and university campuses: Opportunities for faculty leadership. *Journal of Family Violence*, 34(3), 189–198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-018-9968-1>
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?*. Appleton-Century-Crofts
- Letendre, J., Ostrander, J. A., & Mickens, A. (2016). Teacher and staff voices: Implementation of a positive behavior bullying prevention program in an urban school. *Children & Schools*, 38(4), 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/cdw032>
- Litosseliti, L. (2003). *Using focus groups in research*. NY: Continuum
- McMahon, S., & Dick, A. (2011). “Being in a room with like-minded men”: An exploratory study of men's participation in a bystander intervention program to prevent intimate partner violence. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 19(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1901.3>
- McMahon, S. (2015). Call for research on bystander intervention to prevent sexual violence: The role of campus environments. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55, 472–489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-015-9724-0>
- Meyer, E. J. (2008). A feminist reframing of bullying and harassment: Transforming schools through critical pedagogy. *McGill Journal of Education*, 43(1), 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.7202/019572ar>
- Morgan, D. L. (1998). *The focus group guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- 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>
- Nichols, L. (2002). Participatory program planning: Including program participants and evaluators. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 25(1), 1–14
- Nicksa, S. C. (2014). Bystander's willingness to report theft, physical assault, and sexual assault: The impact of gender, anonymity, and relationship with the offender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(2), 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505146>
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Potter, S. J., Moynihan, M. M., Stapleton, J. G., & Banyard, V. L. (2009). Empowering bystanders to prevent campus violence against women: A preliminary evaluation of a poster campaign. *Violence Against Women*, 15(1), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208327482>
- Robinson, S. R., 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>
- Smits, P. A., & Champagne, F. (2008). An assessment of the theoretical underpinnings of practical participatory evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214008325203>
- 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*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e308842004-001>
- 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/images/Documents/1.4.17.VAW%20Event.TF%20Report.PDF>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com