

## **“Culture-Bearer, Culture-Sharer, Culture-Changer”: The Role of Faculty in Preventing Sexual Violence on Campus**

**Sarah R. Robinson  
Nada Elias-Lambert  
Abdel Casiano  
Lauren Ward**

**Abstract:** *Sexual violence is a prevalent issue on university campuses today. Bystander intervention programs, which frame violence as a community problem, are a possible solution to address the issue of sexual violence on campus. As members of the university community, faculty can play an integral role in preventing sexual violence on campus. However, little research has assessed faculty members’ perceptions of their role on campus in the prevention of sexual violence. In this study, three focus groups were conducted with ten faculty members who had participated in a faculty-focused bystander intervention workshop. Researchers coded the narrative data from the focus groups and three themes emerged about faculty members’ perceptions of their role on campus: 1) modeling bystander behavior, 2) ally to students, and 3) changing cultural norms. The study findings reveal that faculty see themselves as having varied roles in the prevention of sexual violence on campus. Social work faculty can use their unique skillset to raise awareness among their faculty colleagues about the need for bystander intervention training for all faculty. The findings also reveal important implications about including faculty in bystander intervention programs in order to change cultural norms around sexual violence on university campuses.*

**Keywords:** *Bystander intervention, faculty, sexual violence prevention, qualitative, university*

Sexual assault is the most common violent crime committed on college campuses today (Carey et al., 2015). One in three women and one in four men will experience sexual violence in their lifetimes (Smith et al., 2018). One in five women is sexually assaulted while in college; 16% of women experience some form of sexual violence during the academic year, with 47% identifying as repeat victims (Fisher et al., 2010). Female victims of sexual violence often experience long-term psychological and physical effects and are more likely to drop out of college than other female students (Maletzky, 2000; Monnier et al., 2002; Schiefelbein, 2002; Söchting et al., 2004).

As part of an institution of higher education’s comprehensive plan to prevent sexual violence on campus, it is critical to select prevention strategies that adhere to specific principles for effective prevention and are based on best practices and available evidence (Nation et al., 2003). Research is clear that using a multi-pronged approach to prevention is most effective (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002; Nation et al., 2003). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2004) recommends adoption of a public health approach that focuses on the responsibility of all community members to reduce sexual violence.

---

Sarah R. Robinson, LMSW, Doctoral student, University of Texas at Arlington School of Social Work, Arlington, TX.  
Nada Elias-Lambert, PhD, LMSW; Abdel Casiano, LBSW; Lauren Ward, LMSW, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX.

The CDC uses the social-ecological model to better understand violence and the effect of potential prevention strategies (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). The social-ecological model offers a theory-based framework to promote prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. Bystander intervention works at multiple levels of the social-ecological model. This model considers the complex interplay between individual, relationship, community, and societal factors and suggests that in order to prevent violence, it is necessary to act across multiple levels of the model simultaneously (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). 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, the macro and exosystem, to ask questions concerning different communities, cultures, norms, and peer groups to better understand the leverage points to increase bystander behavior. This comprehensive approach is more likely to sustain prevention efforts over time than any single intervention (Nation et al., 2003).

The Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE, 2013) Act and the White House Task Force Report to Protect Students from Campus 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; White House, 2014). The bystander model frames sexual violence as a community issue and focuses both on increasing community members' receptivity to prevention messages, 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 around sexual violence (Banyard et al., 2007). Most campus-based bystander intervention programs currently target students; however, offering bystander intervention programming to faculty is critical to preventing sexual violence since faculty play significant roles in shaping the norms on college campuses (Hektner & Swenson, 2012; Kousholt & Fisker, 2015; Sanner-Stiehr & Ward-Smith, 2017).

As members of the campus community, faculty can play an integral part in preventing sexual violence on college campuses. 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. However, no studies known to the authors assess how faculty perceive their roles pertaining to sexual violence prevention on campus. The purpose of this study was to gather university faculty perceptions regarding their role in prevention of sexual violence on campus.

### **Faculty Role in Shaping Campus Culture**

As part of the campus community, faculty play a role in shaping the culture on campus. Research has primarily focused on the role of teachers in preventing bullying in primary and secondary schools and healthcare faculty in universities. In a study with elementary and middle school teachers, Hektner and Swenson (2012) explain how teachers' beliefs about bullying determine both the culture of the school environment as well as how teachers respond to both bullying and students who are victimized within that environment.

The results of the study show that, although the teachers sampled did not agree on any measurable belief about bullying, teachers' attitudes and behaviors about bullying shape the overall culture of bullying in schools. Furthermore, in a review of research to reduce bullying in primary and secondary schools, Kousholt and Fisker (2015) identified the need to target both first order and second order perspectives in preventing bullying in schools. First order perspectives on bullying, which influence traditional strategies to prevent bullying, assert that bullying happens solely on individual levels between the perpetrator and the victim (Kousholt & Fisker, 2015). Second order perspectives, however, incorporate social contexts as the basis of bullying and address teachers' bystander behavior as the goal of prevention strategies (Kousholt & Fisker, 2015). These kinds of approaches shift the focus away from individual bullying experiences to the overall school environment to implement prevention methods on multiple levels and bring about large-scale cultural change (Farley, 2018). Second order change takes place when social structures change (Kousholt & Fisker, 2015). Therefore, teachers have the ability to influence the culture of the classroom through their beliefs about appropriate behavior and their actions towards students (Farley, 2018; Storer et al., 2017).

In addition to primary and secondary education teachers, research has focused on healthcare faculty members' ability to shape the culture of the university. Sanner-Stiehr and Ward-Smith (2017) found that nursing faculty have the ability to shape norms around appropriate workplace behavior by modeling appropriate conduct with students. This, in turn, demonstrates how nursing students should treat their patients as well as their colleagues (Labrague et al., 2015). Faculty can play a large role in creating environments on campus that are safe, respectful, and that reward professionalism (Moutier et al., 2016). These studies exemplify the overarching concept that those in leadership roles greatly influence the culture of an institution (Hektner & Swenson, 2012; Kousholt & Fisker, 2015; Sanner-Stiehr & Ward-Smith, 2017). Therefore, faculty, like teachers, play a critical role in shaping campus culture.

### **Faculty Role in Sexual Violence Prevention**

In addition to impacting campus culture, faculty may also influence the prevention of sexual violence on campus. Graham and colleagues (2019) recommend faculty leverage their leadership positions on campus to advocate for the prevention of intimate partner violence among students. Graham et al. (2019) also recommend that faculty use their various roles in research, teaching, and service to create opportunities to advocate for students who have experienced violence, whether it be intimate partner violence or sexual violence. Furthermore, Laughton (2015) argues that faculty should be included in bystander intervention programs given that faculty members' leadership on campus gives them the ability to model appropriate prosocial behaviors such as expectations of respectful classroom conduct. While there are no empirical studies about the role of university faculty influencing attitudes about bystander intervention related specifically to campus sexual violence, a few studies on bullying show that expectations of teachers and other authority figures may have an impact on students' decisions to intervene (Fonagy et al., 2009; Hektner & Swenson, 2012; Jaime et al., 2014; McLaughlin et al., 2005). While researchers

recommend faculty be involved in prevention efforts, there has been some resistance from faculty about whether their involvement is part of their faculty role.

Research indicates that faculty face challenges setting boundaries with students who are experiencing mental health challenges (Hughes & Byrom, 2018; Laws & Fielder, 2012; Poorman et al., 2011). Particularly faculty in healthcare fields, such as nursing, find difficulty in knowing when to assist students facing personal challenges with their mental health, as students often come to them for healthcare advice (Hughes & Byrom, 2018). Furthermore, faculty expressed that the university administration is often unaware of the time faculty devote to assisting students with personal challenges and fails to provide faculty with resources to address the additional emotional load of this work (Laws & Fielder, 2012). When it comes to interpersonal violence prevention, faculty have expressed resistance incorporating violence prevention messages into their curriculum for fear that it would lead students to disclose violence, for which the faculty would be unprepared (Lovi et al., 2018). In addition, faculty feel unprepared to intervene if they are presented with a student in need of assistance with violence-related issues (Kousholt & Fisker, 2015). However, no research known to the authors specifically explores faculty members' perceptions of their role in sexual violence prevention. Because faculty have the potential to shape attitudes by modeling prosocial behavior and contributing to a safe campus culture, it is critical to understand how faculty perceive their role on campus. McMahon (2015) calls for future research to examine the influence of role models on college campuses, such as faculty, staff, and administration, to determine how they respond to sexual violence as well as how they promote bystander intervention when working with students. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore faculty members' perceptions of their role in preventing sexual violence on university campuses.

## Method

A qualitative, exploratory design was used to gather university faculty perceptions regarding their role in the prevention of sexual violence on campus. This study is part of a larger evaluation study of a faculty-focused bystander intervention program. The study was grounded in a constructivist theoretical framework in which themes and patterns in collected data were discovered rather than predetermined. Focus groups were chosen to collect the data for several reasons. First, focus groups are a way of listening to people and learning from them, which was a main goal of this study (Morgan, 1998). Also, the researchers were interested in creating lines of communication between facilitators and participants, as well as between the individual participants. 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 the participants' unique description of their beliefs and experiences, which then fosters opportunities to explore new ideas as a group (Litosseliti, 2003). Also, the researchers wanted to use the faculty members' actual statements in communicating the results of this study. The study received university human subject approval.

## **Recruitment**

A purposive sample of faculty at a university in the Southwestern region of the U.S. was recruited for this investigation. All members of the sample must have attended both the faculty-focused bystander intervention program and the faculty-focused train-the-trainer bystander intervention program. The sample met the following inclusion criteria: (1) participant in a faculty-focused bystander intervention program; (2) participant in a faculty-focused train-the-trainer bystander intervention program; (3) currently working as an instructor at the university in the Southwestern US; and, (4) fluent in the English language. The first author shared the study flyer via email with all faculty who had attended both the bystander intervention workshop and the bystander intervention train-the-trainer workshop.

## **Bystander Intervention Program**

The two-hour bystander intervention workshop empowers faculty members to recognize, discourage, and prevent a culture that enables violence. Faculty participants learn to recognize dangerous behaviors, work to create a safe learning environment, model bystander skills, support students and colleagues, and promote a culture of nonviolence. Faculty participants learn facts about sexual violence in America, learn how to apply the five bystander intervention steps (see Latane & Darley, 1970), discuss the culture of violence on college campuses, and understand mandated reporting guidelines. Faculty participants also discuss and practice specific bystander intervention strategies for interacting with students and other members of the campus community.

The two-hour bystander intervention train-the-trainer workshop provides a sustainable way for participants to facilitate the bystander intervention program with colleagues in their units. The train-the-trainer workshop includes a discussion of potential issues that may arise during the workshop facilitation as well as ideas about how to customize the workshop to meet the needs of different groups. Train-the-trainer workshop participants receive all materials needed to facilitate the workshop and join a collaborative team of trainers who work together to build a safe campus community. Both workshops, which are evidence-informed, were developed by one of the authors over the past four years. No incentive was provided to faculty to attend the workshops; however, many faculty clearly expressed interest in learning how they could help change campus culture.

## **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 from 60 to 90 minutes. The research team conducting the focus groups consisted of one university professor and three social work students: one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and one PhD student. Each focus group was led by the university professor and one of the students. Three focus group facilitators were women and one, the undergraduate student, was a man. The social work students were trained in best practices for facilitating focus groups by a co-investigator with experience conducting qualitative research involving focus groups. All focus groups were hosted on campus in locations that

were 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 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 program and the train-the-trainer workshop. The guide was followed by each facilitator for consistency, but each facilitator went into greater depth with questioning when appropriate.

### **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 authors discussed the differences in codes using an agreed upon definition of the codes until a consensus was reached. The authors also used memoing during the coding process 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 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, investigator triangulation (using multiple analysts to review findings) by two of the researchers was used. 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, triangulation of sources (examining the consistency of different data sources from within the same method) was achieved 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. Thus, 71% of eligible faculty participated in the study. Table 1 reports the demographic characteristics of the sample. Sixty percent of the participants were women. The majority of the participants (90%) were European American.

Table 1. *Sample Demographic Characteristics (n=10)*

Variable	%
<b>Gender</b>	
Female	60
Male	40
<b>Ethnicity</b>	
European American	90
African American	10
<b>College Representation</b>	
Fine Arts	30
Nursing and Health Sciences	20
Science and Engineering	10
Communication	10
Liberal Arts	30
<b>Faculty Position</b>	
Associate Professor	20
Assistant Professor	30
Instructor	30
PhD Student Instructors	20

This study yielded results that are important for gaining a better understanding of faculty perceptions regarding their role in preventing sexual violence on campus. Three main themes emerged from the focus groups: 1) modeling bystander behavior, 2) ally to students, and 3) changing cultural norms. Each theme is accompanied by participant statements that were made during the focus groups.

### Modeling Bystander Behavior

Faculty discussed their perception of their role as a model for prosocial bystander behavior. Participants described how they gained an increased awareness of the need for prosocial behavior which informed their views of their role on campus. One participant said, "I think it's reminded me that it is my business, it is my obligation, it is a part of my job and my duty as a human being and as a professor and as a part of this community to

intervene. I think before I would tell myself it's my job to teach them this subject not to get involved in their personal life." Participants also described how they have changed their personal behavior to be a better model for students. One participant said, "It's a difference, so it makes me think about my own language when I speak, the kinds of ways that I talk with my colleagues. It just makes me reevaluate the kinds of, the ways that I talk and how that fits into this goal of creating a better culture." Furthermore, participants discussed how their position of authority places them in a role to be a model for prosocial behavior which made them mindful of their actions. One participant, who was a graduate teaching assistant, said,

*I think I see myself as like a bridge builder kinda role with my students, cause, as a grad student I'm still very close to them in terms of education and everything. And I think also because I look like a lot of the (university's) undergrads, so kind of modeling, you know, you know, someone that they can, you know, look at and be like, "Oh, okay, he's a grad student and he's white," you know, like, okay, so here's how you ... here's how masculinity probably should be, that kinda thing.*

An increased awareness of the need for prosocial behavior allowed the faculty included in the focus groups to view their role as models for prosocial behavior. One participant summed up their view of faculty members' role saying, "By understanding that we can intervene in a non-threatening way. In a non-confrontational way, but, but simply intervene in a way that is effective, that we can think through our behaviors and hopefully change how the community functions." Participants felt that by modeling prosocial behavior for students, they could make an impact on campus culture relating to the prevention of sexual violence.

### **Ally to Students**

The second theme that emerged from the data concerned the participants' views of their role as a resource to students. Faculty included in the focus groups perceived their role as a potential confidant for students. One participant said, "I want students to know they can come to me without having to like mention it every day in class, like, by the way if you're having a problem, you know." Several participants discussed the importance of creating an open line of communication so that if students needed assistance or resources, they would perceive faculty members as open to discussing sensitive topics. One participant said, "I try creating a space where students feel they can approach us if they have concerns, fears, anxieties, that they know that we're a resource for them to get them to a place where they can seek help, guidance, those kinds of things." Furthermore, they discussed the importance of faculty remaining open and non-judgmental. One participant said, "If students understand we get it, we're not judging you in any manner. We just want to support and, I think that's important."

In addition to viewing themselves as a potential confidant for students, the participants discussed how their role puts them in the position to identify students who are potentially at risk. One participant said, "I look at it from the perspective of a faculty member that I think sometimes we can be folks who are identifying, or at least in a position to get those students to support, who don't even know sometimes they need it." The participants also

noted that they could influence students to take care of themselves. One participant said, “It is my job to become invested in the community. And to remind them to take care of themselves.” The participants viewed their role as a potential confidant for students who could provide a safe space for support and resources when necessary as well as individuals who are in the position to recognize when a student is at risk and therefore, model how to take care of themselves.

### **Changing Cultural Norms**

Finally, faculty involved in the focus groups commented on their perception of their role in changing cultural norms around the topic of sexual violence. Participants expressed that if faculty recognized their role as prosocial bystanders, change is possible on campus. One participant said, “I feel that this work (bystander) allows for more visibility on campus, both in terms of this work and my role in culture-bearer and culture-sharer and a culture-changer. So, you put out this information and it is reflected back at you. I'll speak for myself, reflected back at me, and so I'm able to see, what needs to be nuanced in terms of my delivery and my leadership.” Participants each described individually how they viewed their role in preventing sexual violence on campus. Most commonly, the participants perceived their role as decreasing victim blaming and changing gender norms. One participant said of their role, “And that's, to me that's the piece I feel like, that's the part I want to solve is, is taking the, the blame away from the victims. And I, that's, that's that emotional hygiene piece I don't know how to fix.” The participants also discussed how they could use their position as faculty to leverage change in views of gender norms. One participant said,

*And I'm thinking about gender and gender politics and gender roles. I'm gonna be teaching a ballet class for some football players in the next semester and I recognize that not all sexual violence is targeted at women and, given the research, as you've shared with us, there's a higher percentage. So I think it's, I think for me in terms of my role in changing the culture around sexual violence, it's a conversation about gender and what it actually means to be a man, and the ways in which we are programmed to be and act.*

Another participant, in describing their view of faculty members' roles, said, “I think that's a responsibility that all of us needs to take more seriously, to be fighting the toxic masculinity that's intrinsic in rape culture.” The participants acknowledged that their role as faculty gave them the position to make changes that could begin to prevent sexual violence on campus, and they felt they could have the greatest impact decreasing victim blaming and changing views of gender norms.

### **Discussion**

The results of this study reveal important insights into faculty members' perspectives about their role in preventing violence on campus as well as their role in the lives of students. After participating in bystander intervention training, faculty members felt that they could play a critical part in violence prevention and should be included in efforts to prevent sexual violence on university campuses.

First, participants viewed one of their roles as modeling prosocial behavior. The participants gained an awareness that part of their job as faculty was to model prosocial behavior for students considering they are in a position of authority. This was particularly noted by participants who possessed similar attributes to the majority of the student body, such as being a member of the majority racial group and having a younger looking appearance. Therefore, participants described changing their personal behavior to be more effective examples for students. While research has demonstrated the potential role conflict and boundary confusion some faculty may face modeling prosocial behaviors (Hughes & Byrom, 2018; Kousholt & Fisker, 2015; Laws & Fielder, 2012; Poorman et al., 2011), these results demonstrate that after receiving bystander intervention training, the participants developed a new understanding of their role which empowered them to model prosocial behavior for students. Incorporating faculty into bystander prevention programming has the ability to help faculty navigate their role as both faculty and university culture-bearers and ultimately empowers them to challenge cultural norms by changing their personal actions (Graham et al., 2019).

The faculty involved in this study also discussed their role in the lives of students. Participants expressed the desire to be perceived by students as an ally and as a resource. Participants wanted students to feel comfortable talking with faculty about their personal struggles and experiences with violence. This finding emphasizes the importance of providing faculty the necessary training in order to have conversations with students and inform them about the appropriate resources. Research has demonstrated that faculty are apprehensive about being involved in the lives of students since they feel unprepared for what students might disclose (Kousholt & Fisker, 2015; Lovi et al., 2018). Therefore, providing faculty with the knowledge of available resources for students and also giving them the ability to practice having hypothetical conversations about violent experiences with their colleagues during training could empower faculty to step into their role as allies for students.

Finally, participants described their role as culture-changers who challenge cultural norms around sexual violence. Specifically, they discussed their role in terms of decreasing victim-blaming and changing gender norms. Participants felt they could have the greatest impact by targeting maladaptive beliefs about gender in their classroom. Although some faculty may express hesitation in incorporating discussions on violence in their classes, findings further demonstrate the need to provide faculty with appropriate training to effectively broach these topics with students (Baldwin-White & Elias-Lambert, 2016; Lovi et al., 2018). Giving faculty the space to learn about these issues and brainstorm with their colleagues on the appropriate places to incorporate issues of gender into their curriculum could empower faculty to see the importance of having these conversations and the skills to navigate them effectively. By including faculty in bystander intervention programming, faculty could gain the skills to recognize when students are at risk and intervene safely by providing students with needed resources.

### **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.

### **Implications for Future Research and Practice**

The results of this study demonstrate the importance of including faculty in bystander intervention programming. Participants included in this study felt faculty play a critical role in shaping campus culture and should be given the tools and training to be able to create a campus culture that is safe and free of violence. Since this study included only those faculty who had been through a bystander intervention training specifically targeting faculty, future research should seek to gather perspectives of faculty who have not received formal training. Understanding the perceptions of untrained faculty members could reveal important implications for the continued development of bystander intervention training for faculty. In addition, exploring faculty members' perceptions of their role in other social issues, such as racism, ableism, and heterosexism, could aid in the development of a program which targets multiple maladaptive cultural norms that perpetuate discrimination and violence on college campuses. Future research should also focus on determining the benefit of expanding bystander intervention training to both faculty and staff members as well as the benefits and challenges to mandating this type of training for faculty and staff.

Social work educators, given their potential for understanding larger social issues affecting university campuses, are in the unique position to formulate evidence-based bystander intervention programs and model prosocial behavior for their colleagues. This study revealed important implications for social work faculty who can use their unique positions to raise awareness among their colleagues from other professions about the need for bystander intervention training for faculty. Advocating for more faculty to be involved in bystander intervention training has the potential to create a safer campus environment as faculty challenge cultural norms around violence and model prosocial behavior.

### **References**

- Baldwin-White, A., & Elias-Lambert, N. (2016). Influence of victim and perpetrators' alcohol use on social work student's levels of rape myth acceptance. *Advances in Social Work, 17*(2), 235-253. <https://doi.org/10.18060/20882>
- 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>
- Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act of 2013, S. 128 §§ 304 (2013).

- 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.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.02.018>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2004). *Sexual violence prevention: Beginning the dialogue*. Atlanta, GA: Author.  
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/svprevention-a.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dahlberg, L. L., & Krug, E. G. (2002). Violence – A global public health problem. In E. Krug, L. L. Dahlberg, J. A. Mercy, A. B. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World Report on Violence and Health* pp. 1-56). Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03405037>
- 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>
- Farley, J. (2018). Teachers as obligated bystanders: Grading and relating administrator support and peer response to teacher direct intervention in school bullying. *Psychology in Schools, 55*(9), 1056-1070. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22149>
- 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>
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., & Cullen, F. T. (2010). What distinguishes single from recurrent sexual victims? The role of lifestyle-routine activities and first-incident characteristics. *Justice Quarterly, 27*(1), 102-129.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820902763061>
- Fonagy, P., Twemlow, S. W., Vernberg, E. M., Mize Nelson, J., Dill, E. J., Little, T. D., & Sargent, J. A. (2009). A cluster randomized controlled trial of child-focused psychiatric consultation and a school systems-focused intervention to reduce aggression. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 50*(5), 607-616.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02025.x>
- 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>
- 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>
- Hektner, J. M., & Swenson, C. A. (2012). Links from teacher beliefs to peer victimization and bystander intervention: Tests of mediating processes. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 32(4), 516-536. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431611402502>
- Hughes, G. J., & Byrom, N. C. (2018). Managing student mental health: The challenges faced by academics on professional healthcare courses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 75(7), 1539-1548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13989>
- Jaime, M. C., McCauley, H. L., Tancredi, D. J., Nettiksimmons, J., Decker, M. R., Silverman, J. G., O'Connor, B., Stetkevich, N., & Miller, E. (2014). Athletic coaches as violence prevention advocates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(7), 1090-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514539847>
- Kousholt, K., & Fisker, T. B. (2015). Approaches to reduce bullying in schools: A critical analysis from the viewpoint of first- and second-order perspectives on bullying. *Children & Society*, 29, 593-603. <https://doi.org/10.1111/chso.12094>
- Labrague, L. J., McEnroe-Petitte, D. M., Papathanasiou, I. V., Edet, O. B., & Arulappan, J. (2015). Impact of instructors' caring on students' perceptions of their own caring behaviors. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 47(4), 338-346.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12139>
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Laughton, K. (2015). Violence on campus: We all have a role to play. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 54(5), 239-240. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20150417-10>
- Laws, T. A., & Fiedler, B. A. (2012). Universities' expectations of pastoral care: Trends, stressors, resource gaps, and support needs for teaching staff. *Nurse Education Today*, 32(7), 796-802. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2012.04.024>
- Litosseliti, L. (2003). *Using focus groups in research*. NY: Continuum.
- Lovi, R., Hutchinson, M., & Hurley, J. (2018). Inclusion of intimate partner violence-related content within undergraduate health care professional curriculum: Mixed methods study of academics' attitudes and beliefs. *Contemporary Nurse*, 54(6), 592-602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10376178.2018.1530946>
- Maletzky, B. M. (2000). Sexual assault. In V. B. Van Hasselt & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Aggression and violence: An introductory text* (pp. 152-197). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- McLaughlin, C., Arnold, R., & Boyd, E. (2005). Bystanders in schools: What do they do and what do they think? Factors influencing the behaviour of English students as bystanders. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 23(2), 17-22.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0264-3944.2005.00327.x>

- 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>
- Monnier, J., Resnick, H. S., Kilpatrick, D. G., & Seals, B. (2002). The relationship between distress and resource loss following rape. *Violence and Victims, 17*, 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.1891/vivi.17.1.85.33637>
- Morgan, D. L. (1998). *The focus group guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moutier, C., Wingard, D., Gudea, M., Jeste, D., Goodman, S., & Reznik, V. (2016). The culture of academic medicine: Faculty behaviors impacting the learning environment. *Academic Psychiatry, 40*(6), 912-918. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-016-0582-3>
- 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>
- Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist, 58*(6-7), 449-456. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.58.6-7.449>
- Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Poorman, S. G., Mastorovich, M. L., & Webb, C. A. (2011). Helping students who struggle academically: Finding the right level of involvement and living with our judgments. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 32*(6), 369-374. <https://doi.org/10.5480/1536-5026-32.6.369>
- Sanner-Stiehr, E., & Ward-Smith, P. (2017). Lateral violence in nursing: Implications and strategies for nurse educators. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 33*(2), 113-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2016.08.007>
- Schiefelbein, V. L. (2002). Rape and sexual assault. In J. Sandoval (Ed.), *Handbook of crisis counseling, intervention, and prevention in the schools* (2nd ed., pp. 359-392). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10098>
- 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>
- Söchting, I., Fairbrother, N., & Koch, W. J. (2004). Sexual assault of women: Prevention efforts and risk factors. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 73-93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801203255680>

Storer, H. L., Casey, E. A., & Herrenkohl, T. I. (2017). Developing 'whole school' bystander interventions: The role of school-settings in influencing adolescents' responses to dating violence and bullying. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 74, 87-95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.01.018>

The White House. (2014). The first report of the White House task force to protect students from sexual assault. Retrieved July 9, 2019, from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/lis2many/notalone>

**Author note:** Address correspondence to Sarah Robinson, University of Texas at Arlington School of Social Work, 211 South Cooper Street, Arlington, TX 76019. Email: [sarah.robinson@uta.edu](mailto:sarah.robinson@uta.edu)

## 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?