A Qualitative Analysis of Men's Intended Bystander Behaviors in Response to a Sexual Assault Vignette

Evelyn Day

A Qualitative Analysis of Men's Intended Bystander Behaviors in Response to a Sexual Assault Vignette

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelors in Public Health

by

Evelyn Day

Spring 2019
Public Health
College of Education and Health Professions
The University of Arkansas

A Qualitative Analysis of Men's Intended Bystander Behaviors in Response to a Sexual Assault Vignette

Abstract

Sexual assault is a pervasive problem; there are myriad negative consequences associated with sexual assault victimization. Given the commonality and consequences associated with victimization, preventing sexual assault is paramount. One mechanism thought to reduce rates of sexual assault is bystander intervention, in which third parties are encouraged to intervene when witnessing sexual assault risk factors and to challenge cultural norms regarding rape and assault. Despite the benefits of bystanding, not everyone intervenes. Previous research indicates that compared with women, men are less likely to intervene. Although some men intervene, researchers' understanding of how men bystand is limited. The goal of this study was to assess the behaviors men use to bystand. A national sample of adult men ($N = 1477$, $M_{age} = 24.67$, $SD = 4.60$) were recruited via Qualtrics Survey Company. Participants responded to an open-ended question after reading a vignette involving a friend using sexual coercion to obtain sex. Men were asked how they would respond to their friend's story. From the 1477 responses, a subsample of participants ($N = 634$, $M_{age} = 24.88$, $SD = 5.24$) was analyzed. From this sub-sample, nearly 65% of men reported some type of intervention behavior ($n = 409$). Of those that did report intervention behavior, 30.3% ($n = 124$) reported they would engage in "exaggerated intervention strategies," 54.5% ($n = 223$) reported "direct intervention strategies," 22.2% ($n = 91$) reported "indirect intervention strategies," and 13.4% ($n = 55$) reported a clarifying behavior. Social desirability and socially-learned aggression may explain the exaggerated responses. Direct responses to the vignette may be due to social media exposure and sexual assault prevention initiative (SAPI) exposure. Indirect responses may be more realistic due to social circles and peer

2

norms. These findings are relevant to SA prevention and should be incorporated into existing and future BIP.

<div align="center">**Introduction**</div>

Sexual assault is defined as any non-consensual oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse that is obtained through force, coercion, or other purposeful methods (e.g., intoxication; Black, et al., 2010; Cantor, et al., 2015). Sexual assault is pervasive problem for women; approximately one in three women experience physical or sexual violence in their lifetime and nearly one in five women have experienced attempted or completed rape in their lifetime (Black, et al., 2010; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2019). Victims of sexual assault report numerous negative side effects including posttraumatic stress symptomology and other negative physical, mental, and sexual health outcomes (e.g., Angelone, Marcantonio, & Melillo, 2017; Jozkowski & Sanders, 2012; Najdowski & Ullman, 2011; Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). As such, focusing on mechanisms to prevent sexual assault that align with federal recommendations is imperative (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). One promising mechanism thought to reduce rates of sexual assault is bystander programs.

Bystanding Programs

Bystander intervention programs (BIP) work to encourage third parties to intervene when they recognize or notice sexual assault risk factors (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). These programs are a specific type of sexual assault prevention initiative (SAPI) that aim to challenge social norms regarding sexual assault and rape, such as rape myth acceptance, using sexist or derogatory language primarily toward women, and victim-blaming (Burn, 2009; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2019).

Researchers and educators note several benefits to focusing on bystanders in the community rather than potential victims or perpetrators. First, bystander interventions can avoid some of the criticisms associated with more traditional interventions (e.g., victim blaming,

alienating men when discussing assault). Another benefit to BIP is that they target multiple types of intervention by involving the community in addressing sexual violence. Specifically, BIP address primary prevention (e.g., by changing attitudes and social norms contributing to sexually violent behavior), secondary prevention (e.g., by encouraging individuals to intervene if they witness a potential sexual assault or rape), and tertiary prevention (e.g., by creating communities of knowledgeable, empathic peers to support victims of sexual violence). Finally, unlike other SAPI (DeGue et al., 2014), BIP are grounded in theory (Banyard, 2011). Specifically, BIP are grounded in the Social-Ecological Theoretical Model (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Bronfenbrenner, 2005), which considers the interaction between the individual and their surroundings.

Given the strong theoretical and practical application of bystanding programs, researchers have assessed bystander's role in preventing sexual assault. Researchers have estimated that a bystander is present at nearly one-third of sexual assaults (Planty, 2002) and the presence of a bystander makes a completed rape 44% less likely (Clay-Warner, 2002). Further, interventions that target bystanding programs have shown positive results in changing attitudes and behaviors (Jouriles, Krauss, Vu, Banyard, & McDonald, 2018; Katz & Moore, 2013) For instance, a SAPI using informative posters—which informed students on how to bystand—was implemented on a college campus over a four week period. Students who saw the poster had greater awareness that sexual violence was a problem for young adults, greater willingness to intervene during a sexual assault scenario, and reported more intervention behaviors compared with those that did not see the poster (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, & Banyard, 2009). In an evaluation conducted by Gidycz, Orchowski, and Berkowitz (2011), women and men in first-year dormitories on college campuses were selected to participate in single-sex BIP and risk-reduction programs, respectively. Men who participated in the BIP covering social norms and bystander intervention

5

education were less sexually aggressive at the four-month follow-up point than men in the control group. Men in this program also reported fewer associations with sexually aggressive peers (Gidcyz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011). Taken together, BIP have the potential to reduce rates of sexual assault and programs that target bystanders appear successful at motivating people to intervene.

The Role of Men in Bystanding

Despite the benefits of bystanding, individuals do not always intervene. Specifically, there are gender differences regarding intention to bystand and actual bystanding behavior. Overall, women seem to be more motivated and willing to intervene than men, and consequently, they also report greater likelihood of intervening (e.g., Banyard, 2008). In fact, men were significantly less likely to provide emotional, formal, and instrumental support to survivors of intimate partner violence (Beeble, Post, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2008) and were more likely to report that they could not prevent an assault from occurring (Exner & Cummings, 2011). Men may also be less likely to intervene because they do not view it as their place to step in (Pugh, Ningard, Vander, & Butler, 2015). Men may be worried about challenging male peer norms, such as not "cockblocking" or preventing other men from pursuing sex. Further, men are generally more likely than women to disagree that sexual assault is a problem on a college campus (Exner & Cummings, 2011) and thus, may be less likely to notice or intervene on sexual assaultive situations.

Although men are less likely to intervene compared with women, research suggests that some men *will* intervene (Beeble, Post, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2008; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2009; Gidcyz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011). Factors that relate to helping survivors of intimate partner violence (IPV) include closeness in age, attitudes about the criminal justice

6

system, witnessing IPV as a child, and lifetime occurrence IPV (Beeble, Post, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2008). These measures may increase the likelihood that men would intervene during an assault. In a SAPI program study conducted by Foubert et al., 79% of 184 college-aged men reported an attitude change, behavior change, or both following their participation in an all-male SAPI. Additionally, after seeing "The Men's Program," men in this study reported intervening to prevent rapes from occuring (Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2009). Lastly, in another study conducted by Gidcyz and colleagues, men that participated in an all-male SAPI reported less reinforcement for engaging in sexually aggressive behavior and reported fewer associations with other sexually aggressive men (Gidcyz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011). These studies show promising results for men and bystanding; however, our understanding of *how* men chose to intervene remains unclear.

There is a dearth of information regarding how men choose to intervene during a sexual assault. Researchers may lack information about how men intervene due to methodology limitations. For example, some researchers only examined men's attitudes or intentions to intervene (e.g., Banyard, 2008; Exner & Cummings, 2011; Pugh, Ningard, Vander, & Butler, 2015). Other studies such as Banyard et al. (2007) focused on bystander intention. That is, they provided men with a checklist of predetermined behaviors, and asked participants which behaviors they would have engaged in during a certain time frame (e.g., Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). Finally, much of the research conducted on bystanding focuses on college students (e.g., Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, & Banyard, 2009); it is unclear how men who are not college aged or college students would intervene.

Although bystanding at the collegiate level is important, there are many women who are sexually assaulted either prior to or after college; annual incidence of experiencing sexual

violence in the military for women is 3%, and incidence of experiencing sexual coercion and unwanted sexual attention for women in the military is 8% and 27%, respectively (Lipari & Lancaster, 2002). Additionally, a study conducted by the EEOC says that about one in four women will be the victim of sexual harassment in the workplace, with many not reporting their experience (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Regarding women in the general population, according to a study of a convenience sample of 2,915 women, 47.8% of women reported having experienced forced or coercive sex (Jozkowski & Sanders, 2012). Thus, it is crucial to create discourse about bystanding outside of the college atmosphere.

Given that sexual assault is a problem for women nationwide, not just those on college campuses, an assessment of how men in the general population would bystand is warranted. As such, the goal of this study was to assess men's bystanding behaviors to a hypothetical sexual assault vignette. Specifically, I want to understand what percentage of men say they intended to bystand. Further, of the men who reported they would bystand, how many would bystand "appropriately" for the given vignette—meaning a direct behavior that may mitigate a potential sexual assault from occurring. I hypothesize that (1) the majority of the participants would indicate they would intervene (i.e., engage in a bystanding behavior), and out of those who would bystand, (2) the majority of the participants would indicate an "appropriate" bystanding behavior given the vignette.

Method

A national sample of adult men ($N = 1477$, $M_{age} = 24.67$, $SD = 4.60$) were recruited via Qualtrics Survey Company. From this sample, a subsample of The sample included 634 men from across the United States of varying ages was selected ($M_{age} = 24.88$, $SD = 5.24$). The

majority of the subsample identified as heterosexual (87.4%) and the level of education men had varied with the majority completing high school, receiving a GED, or attending some college (61.2%). The majority of the sample identified as Caucasian (57.7%), followed by African American (17.9%).

Procedure

Participants were invited to take the survey via Qualtrics Survey Company, a national data aggregator. Eligible participants in Qualtrics' panels were sent an incentivized invitation to participate in the study. The survey took approximately 30 minutes to complete. All responses were anonymous, and participants were notified that their involvement in the study was voluntary. Prior to starting the survey, participants were provided a study information sheet. By clicking through the survey, participants were informed that they were indicating their consent to participate. Next, participants were prompted to respond to items assessing demographic characteristics, followed by a battery of assessments focused on their attitudes, sexually aggressive behaviors, and bystanding perceptions and behaviors. Men who did not report engaging in sexually aggressive behaviors before, were redirected to a set of questions on bystanding. For the bystanding questions, men were prompted with a vignette that informed them their friend was telling the participant a story about a questionable sexual encounter. After men read the vignette, men were asked one open-ended question about how they would respond to their friend's story. The study protocol was approved by the author's Institutional Review Board.

Measures

Vignette. The vignette was developed from the Sexual Strategies Scale (Strang, Peterson, Hill, & Heiman, 2013). An item from the scale was selected to represent a common form of

sexual assault–pursuing sex post-refusal (e.g., Lottes, 1991; O'Sullivan, Byers, & Finkelman, 1998). Participants were asked to respond to the following story: *Imagine your friend comes to you and says he had the following sexual experience last night: after someone initially said "no" to sex with them, they continued touching and kissing another person in the hopes that they would give in to sex. Please describe how you would respond to your friend's story.*

Analysis

To analyze the open-ended responses, an inductive content analysis coding procedure was used based on Middlestadt's salient belief elicitation methodological approach (Middlestadt, Bhattacharyya, Rosenbaum, Fishbein, & Shepherd, 1996). Another researcher and I went through a subset of responses independently to identify similarities or themes in participants' responses to how they would bystand in our vignette. The research team then met to discuss these responses, developed a set of codes, and created operational definitions for each code. Three initial overarching themes emerged regarding the types of intervention participants described. During coding, it was clear that a fourth theme had emerged; thus, we revised the codebook to account for the fourth, additional theme, and re-coded all data.

Next, I prepared the data for coding. In Excel, participants were given an identification (ID) number, as all data was kept anonymous. I trained three research assistants (RA) on the codebook. To finalize the codebook, the coding team and I reviewed all operational definitions and examples to ensure they adequately described the construct. After this, each coder was given a subset of 10 responses to practice, which was reviewed by me for accuracy. Any discrepancies were discussed in a weekly team meeting. After two practice subsets were completed with over 90% congruency, I assigned each coder to code 150-responses each week. Coders were separated

10

into teams of two and assigned different sub-sets of the larger dataset to code. Coding began in late October 2018 and continued through March 2019.

Our coding involved a two-step process. First, a RA decided if a response entailed an intervention behavior or not. If the response was an intervention behavior, it received a sub-theme. Of 634 responses, 18.1% ($n = 115$) did not include a bystander behavior. Further, 9.1% ($n = 58$) were deemed as unclear or ambiguous responses. After removing responses unrelated to the study, there were 409 responses left that received one of our themes: (1) exaggerated intervention, (2) direct intervention, (3) indirect intervention, and (4) clarifying behaviors.

*Exaggerated Intervention***.** Exaggerated intervention entails a high intensity type of intervention where the response uses direct action against the friend; these actions may be aggressive and seem inappropriate given the vignette. Exaggerated intervention includes behaviors that individuals may stereotypically see as intervening and bystanding for an in-person sexual assault situation (e.g., hitting someone, calling the police, using aggressive language).

*Direct Intervention***.** Direct intervention responses indicated a more direct or moderate type of intervention. This type of intervention entails informing the friend they were wrong for their actions and often directly addressed why they were wrong.

*Indirect Intervention***.** Indirect intervention is defined as responses that use passive language and do not actively engage or inform the friend they were wrong for pursuing sex after someone say no. This theme was still considered an intervention as participants would subtly suggest they were disapproving of their friend's behavior; however, they did not directly confront them. Some of the examples that surfaced under indirect intervention were disengagement, warnings, and using indeterminate/passive language.

11

During the coding process, the research team and I noticed an additional theme start to emerge: Clarifying Behaviors. As such, the codebook was revised, and our fourth theme was added.

Clarifying Behaviors. Clarifying behaviors occur pre-intervention and are defined by the responses that indicate some type of bystanding behavior but do not fit into the other themes. Many of these responses stretch over several categories. Responses mentioning any type of intervention behavior that would not fit directly into the previous themes were given this theme. Additionally, if the response asks the friend a question about consent or a clarifying question about the situation, it also received this theme.

In updating the codebook for our fourth theme, we clarified the language of our three other sub-themes. The RAs and I went through additional rounds of training with the new theme included. The RAs and I then went back and reviewed the codes we had given to previous responses to ensure they did not meet the qualifications of the fourth theme. After coding was completed, inter-rater reliability was calculated overall ($K_{avg} = .687$) and for each of the four themes: exaggerated intervention: .722, direct intervention: .781, indirect intervention: .591, and clarifying behaviors: .592. We then calculated frequencies for each type of intervention behavior men reported they would do in our vignette.

Results

Exaggerated Intervention

About 30.3% ($n = 124$) of responses that included a bystanding behavior indicated an exaggerated intervention behavior. There were several different types of intervention behaviors men suggested they would do in this theme. A common response from men in this theme was

12

that they would report their friend to the police. For instance, an 18 year-old-male stated "*I would report them to the police. I would also be disappointed in their very existence and would have them sentenced to the maximum amount of time in prison for rape*." Another 25-year old male state, "*I'd tell him he better not do it again or he is going to get turned into the cops.*"

Aside from calling the police, men suggested they would respond with physical violence toward their friend. One 30-year-male stated, "*I would beat their ass and tell them to respect women more.*" Another 19-year old male stated "*I would tell him that's rape dude, and punch him in the face*."

Finally, a common trend in this sub-theme was men to report using verbally aggressive language toward their friend. A 21-year old male stated, "*I'd tell them that they date raped/sexually assaulted the person and that they're a piece of shit and to fuck off."* Another participant, age 21, said *"Tell him he's a disgusting piece of shit and never talk to him again."*

Direct Intervention

Approximately, 54.5% (*n* = 223) of bystanding responses indicated a direct or moderate level of intervention. Within this sub-theme, there were trends in responses from men. The first trend was men using language commonly discussed in SAPI, such as *no means no* and *think about consent*. For instance, one 28-year-old participant said, "*I'd tell him no means no and you should stop before you find yourself being accused of something you wouldn't like*." Another 27-year-old man said, "*I would think and say that's wrong sex should only happen between two consenting adults not just one that consented that's wrong*."

The second example of direct intervention was telling the friend they were wrong. One 25-year-old participant wrote, "*I would listen to everything he says waiting for him to ask me for a response. I would then say that it is clear she didn't want sex in the beginning and that he was*

13

wrong for getting her in the predicament." Another 25-year-old participant noted something similar, saying "*I would tell them that it was wrong. If a person says no then they shouldn't continue. It borders on assault I think*."

Indirect Intervention

About 22.2% of respondents (*n* = 91) who indicated a bystanding behavior reported an indirect level of intervention. There were several examples of indirect intervention that surfaced during our analysis. The first example was disengagement with the friend. Many responses indicated that they would walk away from the friend or end the friendship. For example, one 20-year-old participant said, "*I would walk away and never talk to that friend*." A 22-year-old man responded with "*I would be horrified, tell my "friend" that he had engaged in rape, and break off the friendship....*"

The second example was giving warnings to the friend that their behavior may get them in trouble. A 30-year-old participant said, "*Be careful*." Another example of a warning came from another 30-year-old who said "*That's not right bro, watch your back*."

The third example of indirect intervention was using indeterminate language. Language that is indeterminate can be defined as words or phrases that seem passive given the situation. An example of a response using indeterminate language would be from this 23-year-old man who said "*They need to chill with that immediately*. Another example would be how this 22-year-old man responded: "*I'd tell them to never do that again it's not cool without consent bro*."

Clarifying Behaviors

Approximately 13.4% (*n* = 55) of responses received the last overarching theme of clarifying behaviors. The predominant type of clarifying behavior mentioned was asking questions to the friend to get more information about the situation. There were several responses that asked for

14

more details, whether consent was present in the situation, what the victim in the vignette said or did, or several other questions. For example, a 27-year-old man responded with "*I would ask [he] if she forced it or clearly she changed her mind that is the first thing to know*." Another example is from a 29-year-old who asked, "*I would ask my friend what the end result was as in how did she act after their sexual encounter was over*."

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess how men would bystand in a hypothetical sexual assault situation. A majority of men in our study responded to the vignette with an intervention behavior (64.5%, *n* = 409). Intervention behaviors were categorized into four different types of behaviors: exaggerated, direct, indirect, and clarifying behaviors. Our study contributes to the current understanding of men's bystander behavior by highlighting unique intervention behaviors not seen in previous studies. An important factor of our study that separates it from others is that our sample had varying education levels. About 80% of the sample reported that they either have a high-school diploma or an associate's degree as their highest level of education. Thus, the majority of our sample did not attend a traditional, four-year university. This unique factor about our sample is important when considering the implications of our study.

Exaggerated Intervention

Nearly one in five responses to our vignette were categorized as exaggerated intervention behaviors (e.g., responses that were considered inappropriate given the vignette). Men may have reported exaggerated intervention behaviors for several reasons: (1) lack of knowledge, (2) conforming to social norms, and (3) male aggression.

Lack of knowledge. Men may have responded with exaggerated intervention behaviors because they are unsure how to properly intervene. Without appropriate education on sexual assault risk factors, intervention techniques, and cultural norms, men may not know how to appropriately intervene during a sexual assault situation. Indeed, nearly 80% of the sample reported they have either a high-school diploma or associate degree. Therefore, it is unlikely that some of the men in our study have been exposed to SAPI, which are more common at the collegiate level. Further, the K-12 school system in the U.S. does not provide consistent nor comprehensive sex education (Lashof-Sullivan, 2015). Because of this lack of training and education, men may not fully understand how to appropriately intervene on a sexual assault situation and respond with exaggerated behaviors.

Conforming to social norms. Despite a lack of formal sexual assault prevention training, men may have had some exposure over the past several years to SAPI via media coverage. Indeed, the current #MeToo movement and the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014) have brought sexual assault to the forefront of some discourse in the United States. With increasing media coverage over the last few years, including celebrities and everyday people tweeting and posting about sexual assault and their own experiences (e.g., Me Too, 2018; Leskin, 2017), it is likely that men in this study have had some exposure to this media phenomenon. Their exposure may make men feel that they should speak out or stand up against sexual assault. Additionally, this media discourse may help encourage men to challenge the male peer norms that suggest intervention is the equivalent to "cockblocking", as discussed in the introduction. Men may believe that, given the current epidemic with sexual assault, it is appropriate to respond with exaggerated behaviors to match the #MeToo movement's tenacity.

Male aggression. A third reason that men may have reported they would respond with exaggerated and aggressive behaviors is because men are taught to default to violence and aggression to solve problems. Current research suggests that male sexual aggression is likely to occur in social environments (Gidcyz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011). It is possible that this aggression is present in situations of sexual violence *and* during the intervention of those situations. Therefore, men in our study may have responded with exaggerated intervention techniques because of this tendency to act aggressively in social environments.

Direct Intervention

With over half of men in our study reporting some form of direct intervention, our findings suggest that men understand bystanding in a classical manner; that is, men who report direct intervention have some understanding that these are appropriate and common intervention techniques to use. With only a small minority of men from the study receiving a bachelor's degree or higher (22.1%), it is unlikely that these men had exposure to SAPI. Instead, men may have reported direct intervention because it is becoming more socially acceptable to bystand.

Most men in this study appeared to understand that the vignette included inappropriate behaviors from the male friend toward his partner (the victim). Men chose to tell the friend that they were wrong, and often how they were wrong and what they should do to fix the situation. These men are effectively disregarding peer norms set in place by society and challenging social norms. Similar to the exaggerated intervention explanation of media coverage, the increasing amount of sexual assault discourse may lead more and more men to bystand, challenging their own friends and male peers in favor of the victim. This finding is promising for BIP, and should be highly encouraged in BIP, schools, and workplace environments.

Indirect Intervention

17

Direct intervention potentially challenges social norms within male peer groups, whereas indirect intervention behaviors may be in line with those male peer norms. Male peer norms, in this case, are that men should not intervene during a sexual assault. Men have reported it is not their place to intervene during a potential sexual assault situation (Pugh, Ningard, Vander, & Butler, 2015). Further, larger cultural norms exist that perpetuate the idea that men should not intervene (Carlson, 2008). The male peer norm that men should not intervene exists because of patterns of power and control that men maintain over women in our culture; specifically, within this control is the idea that men should support other men, thereby assisting other men in obtaining sex (Jozkowski & Wiersma-Mosley, 2017). This may explain why some men in our sample reported an indirect intervention as this behavior aligns with perceived male peer norms.

Further, indirect intervention responses can and should be considered appropriate means for intervention, although these behaviors may not be the recommended bystanding behaviors suggested by SAPI. Indeterminate language and subtle warnings may be effective ways of intervening because they challenge male peer norms such as the one mentioned above. Men's place of power over women helps to perpetrate this norm. In the event that another man challenges the norm, even with subtle comments, this may be effective in helping a perpetrator rethink their own sexually coercive or violent behavior.

Clarifying Behaviors

There were a considerable number of men who reported an intervention behavior that did not align with the other three themes; predominantly, this included asking questions of clarification. Although we do not have information on if these participants would bystand after receiving clarification, asking questions may be an important step according to the bystanding model (Latané and Darley, 1968). This model first requires that someone recognize risk prior to

18

taking action. By asking questions, these participants may be attempting to recognize any risk that may be present in the situation. Moving forward, researchers should follow up with men who use clarifying behaviors by asking them what they would do following any kind of clarification.

Limitations

As with any research study, there are several limitations that may have some effect on our findings. During our study, we had to adjust our codebook to reflect a new theme that was emerging in the responses. Adjusting themes and operational definitions is common when conducting content analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). However, even after adjusting our definitions, the coding team had difficulty with some responses, specifically those that would be categorized as indirect. Many times, men's responses were brief in nature and deciding what type of intervention the response was became difficult without contextual clues (e.g., pitch or tone of voice). Moving forward, analyzing this research question through qualitative interviews may allow researchers to glean more detailed information on men's intended bystanding behaviors.

One limitation to note are the low K-values in this particular subsample. Ideally, an appropriate K- value should be over the .6 range, and an excellent K-value would be in the .7-.8 range. Our subsample of responses had varying K-values. The exaggerated intervention and direct intervention K-values were high at .722 and .781, respectively. The indirect intervention and clarifying behaviors K-values were lower at .591 and .592, respectively. In the future, K-values in this study should be revisited and recoded after more training sessions to raise the K-values.

Another limitation is that our sexual assault vignette was brief and somewhat vague. The vignette's purpose was to portray a situation of sexual coercion and ask men how they would

19

Commented [JDM1]: Make a note about low K values (and indicate the range is should be) in your 4 types.

respond to the situation. Little background information was given regarding the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim and what happened after he continued touching and kissing the victim. This may have been a reason why there were a considerable number of indirect intervention behaviors and clarifying behaviors reported. A future study should look at using a more sexually explicit vignette.

A third limitation to this study is social desirability associated with bystanding. Men that took this survey may have assumed that the research team was looking for a certain type of intervention behavior. In this case, participants may have responded with what they believed the research team wanted to hear versus what they would actually do in the situation. Further, this may account for the number of exaggerated responses, as well. Additional studies should ask this research question by couching it around different questions unrelated to sexual assault. This may help to eliminate some responses related to social desirability.

The online survey method is also a limitation to this study. Online surveys allow researchers to collect large samples; however, this type of research study is not completely generalizable to the public. The Qualtrics sample may not be representative of the population of US men. In the future, probability-based sampling would allow better representation of the population of men in the US and their intended bystanding behaviors.

<center>**Conclusion**</center>

Despite our limitations, our findings have implications for BIP geared toward men. Understanding what men intend to do when bystanding in situations of sexual assault is valuable and could be used to better inform BIP. Current BIP focus on broad tactics that can be used in any bystanding situation. Our findings provide more detailed behaviors men may do in a sexual

<center>20</center>

assault scenario. Programmers can then use these behaviors to educate men about effective ways to intervene.

Further, our findings highlight the need to inform men on when to use certain behavioral tactics in different sexual assault scenarios. Our sexual assault vignette does not inherently warrant physical violence; however, some men did view that as the appropriate action to take. As such, BIP should note different bystander tactics and explain how each one could be effective in certain situations. BIP should emphasize that not all tactics are appropriate when bystanding. With these research results implemented in BIP, men who intervene may be able to do so more effectively.

<div align="center">References</div>

Angelone, D., Marcantonio, T., & Melillo, J. (2017). An evaluation of adolescent and young adult (re)victimization experiences: Problematic substance use and negative consequences.

Banyard, V. (2008). Measurements and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence.

Banyard, V. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence*, 216-229.

Banyard, V., Moynihan, M., & Plante, E. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 463-481.

Banyard, V., Plante, E., & Moynihan, M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention.

Beeble, M., Post, L., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. (2008). Factors related to willingness to help survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1713-1729.

Berkowitz, A., & Perkins, H. (1986). Problem drinking among college students: A review of recent research. *Journal of American College Health*, 21-28.

Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S., Walters, M., Merrick, M., & Stevens, M. (2010). *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report.* Atlanta: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 77-101.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). Making human beings human: bioecological perspectives on human development.

Burn, S. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct.* The Association of American Universities.

Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 3-17.

Clay-Warner, J. (2002). Avoiding Rape: The Effects of Protective Actions and Situational Factors on Rape Outcome. *Violence and Victims*, 691-705.

Exner, D., & Cummings, N. (2011). Implications for sexual assault prevention: college students as prosocial bystanders. *Journal of American College Health*, 655-657.

Feldblum, C., & Lipnic, V. (2016). *Select Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace.* U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Foubert, J. (2010). *The Men's and Women's Programs; Ending Rape Through Peer Education.*
Routledge.

Foubert, J., Godin, E., & Tatum, J. (2009). In Their Own Words: Sophomore College Men
Describe Attitude and Behavior Changes Resulting From a Rape Prevention Program 2
Years After Their Participation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2237–2257.

Gidcyz, C., Orchowski, L., & Berkowitz, A. (2011). Preventing Sexual Aggression Among
College Men: An Evaluation of a Social Norms and Bystander Intervention Program.
Violence Against Women, 720–742.

Jouriles, E., Krauss, A., Vu, N., Banyard, V., & McDonald, R. (2018). Bystander programs
addressing sexual violence on college campuses: A systematic review and meta-analysis
of program outcomes and delivery methods. *Journal of American College Health*, 457-
466.

Jozkowski, K., & Sanders, S. (2012). Health and sexual outcomes of women who have
experienced forced or coercive sex. *Women & Health*, 101-118.

Jozkowski, K., & Wiersma-Mosley. (2017). The Greek System: How Gender Inequality and
Class Privilege Perpetrate Rape Culture. *Family Relations*, 89-103.

Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander Education Training for Campus Sexual Assault
Prevention: An Initial Meta-Analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 1054-1067.

Lashof-Sullivan, M. (2015). Sex education in schools. *Georgetown Journal of Gender and the
Law* , 263-294.

Latane, B., & Darley, J. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 215-221.

Leskin, P. (2017, October 16). *20 of the Half Million (and Counting) #MeToo Stories of Sexual Assault*. Retrieved from Inverse: https://www.inverse.com/article/37439-me-too-stories-social-media-sexual-assault

Lipari, R., & Lancaster, A. (2002). *Sexual Harassment Survey.* Arlington: Defense Manpower Data Center.

Lottes, I. (1991). The relationship between nontraditional gender roles and sexual coercion. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 89-109.

Me Too. (2018). *Survivor Story Series*. Retrieved from Me Too Movement: https://metoomvmt.org/survivor-story-series/

Middlestadt, S., Bhattacharyya, K., Rosenbaum, J., Fishbein, M., & Shepherd, M. (1996). The use of theory based semistructured elicitation questionnaires: formative research for CDC's Prevention Marketing Initiative. *Public Health Reports*, 18-27.

Najdowski, C., & Ullman, S. (2011). The effects of revictimization on coping in women sexual assault victims. . *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 218-221.

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, D. o. (2019). *Preventing Sexual Violence.* Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control.

O'Sullivan, L., Byers, E., & Finkelman, L. (1998). A comparison of male and female college students' experiences of sexual coercion. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 177-195.

Planty, M. (2002). *Third Party Involvement in Violent Crime 1993-1999.* Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.

Potter, S., Moynihan, M., Stapleton, J., & Banyard, V. (2009). Empowering Bystanders to Prevent Campus Violence Against Women: A Preliminary Evaluation of a Poster Campaign. *Violence Against Women*, 106–121.

Pugh, B., Ningard, H., Vander, T. V., & Butler, L. (2015). Victim Ambiguity: Bystander

      Intervention and Sexual Assault in the College Drinking Scene. *Journal of Deviant*

      Behavior, 401-418.

Strang, E., Peterson, Z., Hill, Y., & Heiman, J. (2013). Discrepant Responding across Self-

      Report Measures of Men's Coercive and Aggressive Sexual Strategies. *Journal of Sex*

      Research, 458-469.

Ullman, S., & Peter-Hagene, L. (2014). Social Reactions to Sexual Assault Disclosure, Coping,

      Perceived Control and PTSD Symptoms in Sexual Assault Victims. *Journal of*

      Community Psychology, 495-508.

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014, April). *Not Alone*

      Report. Retrieved from The National Center for Campus Public Safety:

      https://www.nccpsafety.org/assets/files/library/NOT_ALONE_Report.pdf

Table 1. Demographics*

Measure	N (%)
Age	
18-25	473 (52.7)
26-35	405 (45.1)
36-45	4 (0.5)
46-55	1 (0.1)
56+	4 (0.5)
Race	
White/Caucasian	495 (57.7)
Black or African American	154 (17.9)
Latinx	82 (9.6)
Native American or American Indian	14 (1.6)
Asian or Asian American	59 (6.9)
Middle Eastern or Middle Eastern American	10 (1.2)
Bi-racial or multi-racial	36 (4.2)
Other	8 (0.9)
Sexual orientation	
Heterosexual/straight	750 (87.4)
Homosexual/gay	43 (5.0)
Bisexual	35 (4.1)
Unsure/Questioning	10 (1.2)
Queer	5 (0.6)
Other	15 (1.7)
Education	
Less than middle school	7 (0.8)
Middle school	4 (0.5)
Some high school	59 (6.9)
High school or GED	310 (36.2)
Some college	214 (25.0)
Associates degree	73 (8.5)
Bachelors degree	141 (16.5)
Masters degree	37 (4.3)
Doctoral degree JD, MD	11 (1.3)
Relationship status	
Single	486 (57.4)
Dating	86 (10.2)
Serious relationship	133 (15.7)
Married	131 (15.5)
Separated	3 (0.4)
Divorced	5 (0.6)
Other	2 (0.2)
Household income	
Less than $30,000	274 (32.4)

$30,001-$50,000	187 (22.1)
$50,001-$75,000	136 (16.1)
$75,001-$100,000	87 (10.3)
$100,000-$120,000	41 (4.8)
$120,001-$150,000	21 (2.5)
More than $150,001	26 (3.1)
Prefer not to answer	74 (8.7)

*Some of the participants that did not answer the survey question answered these demographics; the demographics were out of 898 valid responses.

Commented [JDM2]: Confusing sentence

Commented [JDM3]: Confused about the 898 – not your subsample or the larger one?

Commented [ED4R3]: Basically, I analyzed the demographics that were given from the subsample; not everybody that gave demographic information answered the vignette, and vice versa.

I felt that it would be inappropriate if I didn't mention the discrepancy.