SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

BYSTANDER INTERVENTION

Manisha Tripathi[1], Srujan K N[2], Yashas K[3], Roopasree[4], Nairita Ghosh[5], Shibani Athul Kumar Shetty[6]

[1]Lecturer -JAIN (Deemed-to-be University) -CMS - Bangalore
[2]Student -BBA, JAIN (Deemed to be University) - CMS - Bangalore
[3]Student -BBA, JAIN (Deemed to be University) - CMS - Bangalore
[4]Student -BBA, JAIN (Deemed to be University) - CMS - Bangalore
[5]Student -BBA, JAIN (Deemed to be University) - CMS - Bangalore
[6]Student -BBA, JAIN (Deemed to be University) - CMS - Bangalore

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra20791
DOI No: 10.36713/epra20791

ABSTRACT

Bystander intervention is a crucial social concept that highlights the responsibility of individuals who witness harmful or potentially dangerous situations but are not directly involved. This approach emphasizes the importance of taking action to prevent harm, support victims, and promote a safer community. Individuals can intervene in various ways, including direct involvement, offering support to the victim, creating a distraction, or seeking help from authorities. The effectiveness of bystander intervention is influenced by multiple factors, such as awareness, empathy, perceived responsibility, and social norms. Research suggests that when individuals feel empowered and equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills, they are significantly more likely to intervene in situations involving bullying, sexual harassment, domestic violence, or other forms of harm.

Training programs designed to promote bystander intervention focus on increasing awareness about the importance of stepping in, challenging misconceptions that discourage action, and providing practical strategies for safe and effective intervention. These programs aim to build confidence among bystanders, helping them recognize warning signs and understand their role in fostering a culture of accountability and support. Additionally, bystander intervention efforts often address barriers to action, such as the fear of retaliation, the diffusion of responsibility, or the belief that someone else will intervene. By educating individuals on these challenges and equipping them with appropriate intervention techniques, such initiatives contribute to the creation of safer and more inclusive communities. Ultimately, fostering a culture of active bystander intervention can lead to a significant reduction in instances of violence, discrimination, and harm, reinforcing the notion that everyone has a role to play in promoting social justice and collective well-being.

KEYWORDS: *Bystander effect, intervention strategies, diffusion of responsibility, situational awareness, social influence, proactive intervention, bystander apathy, moral courage*

INTRODUCTION

Bystander intervention refers to the actions taken by individuals who witness an incident of harm or potential danger, where they choose to intervene rather than remain passive. This concept has gained significant attention in various contexts, including bullying, sexual assault, and public disturbances, highlighting the crucial role that bystanders can play in preventing harm and supporting victims. The idea is rooted in the belief that everyone has a responsibility to contribute to the safety and well-being of their community.

Historically, bystander intervention gained prominence in the wake of high-profile cases that exposed the consequences of inaction, prompting discussions about social responsibility and community engagement. Research indicates that many individuals are hesitant to intervene due to fear, uncertainty, or the belief that someone else will step in. However, studies also show that when equipped with the right knowledge and skills, bystanders can effectively influence situations and mitigate harm.

Understanding the dynamics of bystander intervention involves exploring psychological, social, and cultural factors that shape individuals' responses to witnessing distress. By fostering a culture that encourages active engagement, communities can empower individuals to take action, thereby creating safer environments and promoting a collective sense of responsibility. Ultimately, bystander intervention is not just about preventing negative outcomes; it also embodies the values of empathy, solidarity, and moral courage in addressing societal issues.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This pilot study examines the implementation of the *Bringing in the Bystander* in-person prevention program at a U.S. military installation. The program, originally designed for college settings, was adapted for military personnel to assess its feasibility and effectiveness in changing attitudes and behaviours related to sexual violence prevention. The findings indicate that participants showed increased knowledge of sexual violence, greater confidence in their ability to intervene as prosocial bystanders, and improved attitudes toward intervention. Potter, S. J., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Bringing in the bystander in-person prevention program to a US military installation: Results from a pilot study. *Military Medicine, 176*(8), 870–875. This study evaluates the effectiveness of the *InterACT* sexual assault prevention program, which uses interactive, theater-based training to teach bystander intervention skills. The program engages participants in role-playing scenarios that simulate real-life situations, allowing them to practice intervention strategies. Findings indicate that participants who underwent the training reported a significantly higher likelihood of engaging in bystander intervention behaviours compared to those who did not participate..Ahrens, C. E., Rich, M. D., & Ullman, J. B. (2011). Rehearsing for real life: The impact of the InterACT sexual assault prevention program on self-reported likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions. This study examines the effectiveness of a web-based bystander intervention program designed for male college students to prevent sexual violence. Using a randomized controlled trial, the researchers assessed whether the online intervention improved bystander efficacy, willingness to intervene, and attitudes toward sexual violence prevention. The results indicate that participants in the intervention group reported increased confidence in their ability to intervene and a greater likelihood of engaging in bystander behaviours compared to the control group. Salazar, L. F., Vivolo-Kantor, A., Hardin, J., & Berkowitz, A. (2014). A web-based sexual violence bystander intervention for male college students: Randomized controlled trial.

This study investigates the effectiveness of integrating sexual assault bystander intervention workshops into academic courses. The researchers assessed the impact of these workshops on students' attitudes, confidence, and likelihood of intervening in situations related to sexual violence. Findings indicate that students who participated in the workshops reported increased knowledge, improved attitudes toward bystander intervention, and a greater willingness to intervene in potential sexual assault situations. The study suggests that incorporating bystander intervention education into academic settings can be an effective approach to fostering prosocial behaviours and preventing sexual violence. Senn, C. Y., & Forrest, A. (2016). And then one night when I went to class...: The impact of sexual assault bystander intervention workshops incorporated in academic courses. *Psychology of Violence, 6*(4), 607–618.This book chapter explores the experience sampling method (ESM), a research technique used to measure individuals' thoughts, emotions, and behaviours in real time. The authors discuss the advantages of ESM, such as capturing momentary experiences and reducing recall biases, making it a valuable tool for studying well-being and psychological processes. However, they also highlight potential limitations, including participant burden, reactivity effects, and challenges in data analysis. The chapter provides guidance on best practices for implementing ESM and suggests ways to mitigate its drawbacks to enhance the reliability and validity of research findings. Scollon, C. N., Prieto, C. K., & Diener, E. (2009).

Research on bystander intervention has explored factors influencing whether individuals intervene in emergencies, ranging from dangerous to non-dangerous situations. A meta-analysis by Fischer et al. (2011) updated knowledge on the bystander effect, while McMahon and Banyard (2012) provided a framework for bystander intervention in preventing sexual violence. Bennett et al. (2014) examined barriers and facilitators to intervention. Classic studies by Darley and Latané (1968) introduced the concept of diffusion of responsibility and group inhibition in emergencies. More recent studies have assessed bystander training programs, such as Coker et al. (2016), who evaluated campus-wide interventions for violence prevention. Mujal et al. (2021) conducted a systematic review of bystander interventions for sexual violence prevention. Levine and Crowther (2008) analyzed the impact of social group membership and size on intervention likelihood, while Banyard (2011) developed an ecological model of bystander intervention. Brody and Vangelisti (2016) investigated bystander intervention in cyberbullying, highlighting the role of anonymity and social closeness.

Rutkowski, Gruder, and Romer (1983) explored the impact of group cohesiveness on bystander intervention, suggesting that strong group cohesion can either promote or inhibit intervention depending on the situation. If group norms encourage helping behaviour, individuals are more likely to intervene. However, in cases where inaction is the norm, the bystander effect is amplified. Similarly, Latané and Rodin (1969) demonstrated that the presence of friends or strangers influences intervention; individuals accompanied by friends were more hesitant to act due to mutual inhibition. Levine and Crowther (2008) also examined group membership's role in bystander intervention. They found that when individuals identify strongly with a group, they are more likely to intervene to assist a fellow group member. This suggests that social identity can serve as a motivator for action, counteracting the diffusion of responsibility that typically inhibits intervention in large groups. With the increasing role of digital communication, researchers have investigated bystander intervention in online settings. Markey (2000) found that patterns of intervention in online chat groups resemble those in real-world interactions, with intervention rates decreasing as group size increases. Similarly, Brody and Vangelisti (2016) explored bystander intervention in cyberbullying, emphasizing that perceived anonymity reduced the likelihood of intervention. However, social closeness between the bystander and the victim increased the chances of assistance. Online

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

interventions have also been developed to encourage proactive behaviours. Kleinsasser et al. (2015) introduced "Take Care," an online program designed to educate individuals on how to intervene in situations of sexual violence. These digital approaches offer broad and cost-effective means to promote bystander intervention. Several studies have identified barriers that prevent individuals from stepping in during emergencies. Burn (2009) applied a situational model to sexual assault prevention, illustrating how psychological obstacles—such as fear of misinterpreting the situation or social repercussions—discourage action. Yule and Grych (2020) further examined college students' perceptions of barriers to intervention, emphasizing fear of retaliation, social judgment, and uncertainty about how to act as primary deterrents. Bennett et al. (2014) also highlighted the importance of perceived responsibility and social norms in bystander intervention. When individuals believe others will act, they are less likely to step in themselves—a classic example of the diffusion of responsibility first proposed by Darley and Latané (1968). Polanin, Espelage, and Pigott (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs, demonstrating their effectiveness in promoting bystander intervention. Programs that encouraged active participation and empathy-building significantly increased intervention rates. Nickerson et al. (2014) developed a measurement model for bystander intervention in bullying and sexual harassment, confirming that empathy and awareness positively correlate with intervention likelihood. Bystander intervention has become an integral strategy in violence prevention, particularly in educational settings. McMahon (2015) called for further research on the role of campus environments in promoting intervention, emphasizing the need for institutional policies that foster a culture of proactive engagement. Coker et al. (2016) evaluated a multi-college bystander training program and found that structured interventions can lead to long-term positive behavioural changes. Mujal et al. (2021) further supported this by reviewing effective sexual violence bystander training programs, emphasizing the importance of continuous reinforcement. Jenkins and Nickerson (2017) analyzed how bullying participant roles and gender predict intervention behaviour. Their study supported the Bystander Intervention Model, finding that victims were more likely to notice events, whereas outsiders were less likely to act. A follow-up study (Jenkins & Nickerson, 2019) examined how empathy, assertion, and cooperation influenced bystander intervention in bullying, highlighting that social skills play a significant role in whether individuals choose to intervene. Mainwaring et al. (2023) conducted a systematic review on bystander intervention in sexual violence contexts, emphasizing that gender differences exist, with females being more likely to intervene. This aligns with prior findings that suggest women tend to display higher levels of empathy and social responsibility in situations requiring intervention. Bystander intervention research has extended into crime prevention. Huston et al. (1981) investigated naturally occurring episodes of intervention in criminal acts, providing insight into factors influencing real-world intervention. Palmer et al. (2018) expanded on this by examining the impact of relationships on bystander intervention in interpersonal violence, finding that individuals were more likely to intervene when the victim was someone they knew. Bickman (1971) explored how the presence of another bystander perceived as capable of helping influences intervention. The study concluded that if one bystander believes another is more competent, they are less likely to act themselves. This relates to the well-documented phenomenon of diffusion of responsibility, where people assume others will take action. Bystander intervention plays a crucial role in medical emergencies, particularly in out-of-hospital cardiac arrests (OHCA). Nakahara et al. (2015) found that bystander interventions, such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), significantly increased the likelihood of neurologically intact survival among patients. Similarly, Wissenberg et al. (2013) examined the impact of national initiatives on improving bystander intervention rates in cardiac arrests. Their study revealed that public health campaigns led to an increase in bystander CPR, emphasizing the importance of education and training in encouraging intervention. As social interactions increasingly shift online, researchers have explored intervention in cyberbullying and online harassment. DiFranzo et al. (2018) examined how online bystander behaviour compares to offline intervention, finding that digital spaces present unique challenges, such as anonymity and the perceived inability to make a difference. However, interventions designed to encourage "upstanding" behaviour, such as promoting positive social norms, have shown promise. Markey (2000) found that online group dynamics mirror real-world interactions, with intervention rates decreasing as the number of bystanders increases. However, Brody and Vangelisti (2016) highlighted that when bystanders feel a strong connection to the victim, they are more likely to act, even in online settings. Bystander intervention strategies have also been applied in sexual violence prevention, particularly through digital education programs. Salazar et al. (2014) conducted a randomized controlled trial on a web-based bystander intervention for male college students. Their study found that online training programs effectively increased participants' willingness to intervene in situations of sexual violence. Similarly, Kleinsasser et al. (2015) developed "Take Care," an online program designed to educate individuals about intervention strategies, demonstrating that digital education can be a cost-effective way to encourage bystander action.

Ross (1971) explored how increased responsibility affects bystander intervention, particularly in the presence of children. The study found that bystanders were more likely to intervene when children were present, as the responsibility to act was heightened. Leone et al. (2018) investigated the overlooked role of alcohol intoxication in bystander intervention in cases of sexual violence. Their research suggested that alcohol consumption impairs individuals' ability to recognize an emergency and take responsibility, thereby reducing intervention rates. This finding has important implications for bystander intervention training programs, particularly on college campuses where alcohol use is prevalent. Darley (1968) contributed foundational research on the group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies, demonstrating that when multiple bystanders are present, individuals are less likely to act due to diffusion of responsibility. Levine and Thompson (2004) extended this research by exploring the role of social identity and place in bystander intervention following natural disasters. They found that individuals were more likely to intervene when they

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

identified with the affected community, emphasizing the role of shared identity in motivating helping behaviour. Park and Kim (2023) conducted a systematic review of bystander intervention programs for intimate partner violence and sexual assault. Their findings suggested that bystander efficacy (confidence in one's ability to intervene) and moral responsibility were key predictors of intervention behaviour. Jennings et al. (2024) conducted a scoping review on the link between bystander intervention and workplace inclusion. They found that fostering an inclusive environment encourages bystander intervention by reinforcing social norms that support active engagement in preventing harassment and discrimination. Lee et al. (2019) explored the incorporation of bystander intervention into sexual harassment training in workplace settings. Their research suggested that traditional sexual harassment training often lacks a focus on active intervention strategies. Bystander intervention training, which includes role-playing scenarios and discussions on overcoming barriers to intervention, was found to be more effective in changing behaviour. Fenton and Mott (2018) evaluated *The Intervention Initiative* (TII), a university-based bystander intervention program aimed at preventing violence against women. Their study found that students who participated in TII reported increased engagement in bystander behaviour, highlighting the effectiveness of structured intervention training. Horowitz (1971) examined how group norms influence bystander intervention in emergencies. The study found that individuals were more likely to intervene if group norms encouraged helping behaviour. However, neither gender nor individual differences significantly predicted intervention speed or frequency. This suggests that social norms within a group may be stronger predictors of intervention than personal characteristics. Banyard et al. (2021) expanded on this idea by developing a model of *bystander consequences*, which examines how group norms and individual perceptions of intervention outcomes shape decision-making. Their findings suggest that bystanders are more likely to act when they believe their intervention will have positive consequences, reinforcing the importance of supportive group environments. Abbott and Cameron (2014) explored *assertive bystander behaviour* and found that factors such as intergroup contact, empathy, and cultural openness influence intervention rates. Their study emphasized the need for educational programs that promote inclusivity and social responsibility as ways to increase bystander intervention. Carlson (2008) explored the impact of masculinity on bystander intervention in crisis situations. The study found that men often avoid intervening due to social pressures related to traditional masculinity. Many feared that stepping in could be perceived as weakness or as violating gender norms. The phrase *"I'd rather go along and be considered a man"* encapsulates this pressure, highlighting how societal expectations discourage intervention among men. Bloom et al. (2024) examined factors associated with college students' engagement in bystander intervention. Their study reinforced that gender identity plays a significant role, with women generally more likely to intervene in situations of sexual violence or bullying than men. They also found that past experiences of intervention increased the likelihood of future intervention, suggesting that positive reinforcement strengthens bystander behaviour. Fredrick et al. (2020) focused on the role of *cognitive and affective empathy* in bystander intervention among elementary school students. They found that students with higher levels of cognitive empathy (the ability to understand others' feelings) and affective empathy (the ability to feel what others feel) were more likely to intervene in bullying situations. These findings emphasize the importance of fostering empathy from an early age. Coker et al. (2011) evaluated *Green Dot*, an active bystander intervention program designed to reduce sexual violence on college campuses. Their research showed that students who received bystander training reported significantly higher levels of intervention behaviours compared to those who did not. The study demonstrated the effectiveness of structured programs in changing social norms and encouraging intervention.

Research on bystander intervention highlights the influence of group norms, gender identity, empathy, and risk perception on individuals' willingness to intervene in emergencies. Studies show that social expectations, bystander efficacy, and structured training programs (e.g., *Green Dot*) can significantly increase intervention behaviours. Effective interventions should focus on fostering supportive environments, reducing barriers to action, and enhancing confidence in bystander decision-making.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Bystander intervention is a significant social process that impacts behaviour prevention and reduction of harmful acts, including bullying, harassment, and violence. Many individuals do not respond when they witness problematic behaviour despite growing recognition of intervention failures, such behaviour being explained by situating it in the context of the bystander effect—the tendency for people to be passive when there are other people around since they think that someone else will respond. One of the main problems with bystander intervention is the social and psychological barriers that stop people from intervening. These are diffusion of responsibility, fear of revenge, social influence, and low self-efficacy in being able to help. Cultural and situational influences, including group dynamics and perceived social norms, can also influence whether or not a bystander will intervene.

OBJECTIVES

Preventing Harm – Empower individuals to intervene in situations that may lead to violence, harassment, or discrimination.
Promoting Responsibility – Encourage a sense of collective responsibility in preventing harmful behaviours.
Increasing Awareness – Educate people about the signs of problematic situations and how to respond effectively.
Building Confidence – Provide individuals with skills and strategies to safely intervene in difficult situations.
Shifting Social Norms – Foster a culture where prosocial intervention is expected and supported.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This study focuses on the psychological, social, and situational factors influencing bystander intervention in various contexts, including schools, workplaces, public spaces, and online environments. It aims to examine the reasons why individuals choose to intervene—or fail to intervene—when witnessing harmful behaviours such as bullying, harassment, discrimination, or violence. The study will explore key psychological theories, including the bystander effect, diffusion of responsibility, and social influence, to understand how individual and group dynamics affect intervention behaviour. Additionally, it will investigate the impact of demographic factors such as age, gender, cultural background, and prior experiences on an individual's likelihood to intervene. Furthermore, this research will evaluate the effectiveness of bystander intervention training programs in different settings, assessing how education, awareness, and policy initiatives can encourage proactive intervention. The study will also examine barriers to intervention, such as fear of retaliation, uncertainty about the situation, and perceived social norms. The geographical focus of the study may include a specific region, institution, or demographic group, depending on available data and accessibility. The research will rely on qualitative and quantitative methods, including surveys, interviews, and case studies, to provide a comprehensive understanding of bystander intervention behaviours.

By defining these parameters, the study aims to contribute valuable insights into how individuals and communities can be empowered to take action in preventing harmful situations, ultimately fostering a more proactive and responsible society.

METHODOLOGY

This research will use a mixed-methods design that integrates both qualitative and quantitative approaches to obtain an in-depth understanding of bystander intervention behaviours. A questionnaire-based survey will be utilized to obtain quantitative data from participants in diverse settings, including schools, the workplace, and public areas. The survey questionnaire will measure items such as awareness, perceived responsibility, fear of consequences, and past experiences with intervention.

The data will be examined using statistical analysis to determine patterns and correlations among demographic variables and intervention behaviours. To supplement the survey data, qualitative techniques like interviews and focus group discussions will be used to investigate people's thoughts, feelings, and decision-making processes when confronted with situations where intervention is needed. Real-life intervention scenarios case studies will also be examined to determine recurring themes and issues.

Furthermore, experimental design can be employed to study bystander behaviour in controlled or simulated environments and measure the influence of various factors—like other people being present or the level of danger in the situation—on the likelihood of intervention. The research will maintain ethical concerns, such as informed consent, confidentiality of the participants, and prevention of psychological distress. The results will offer interesting insights into bystander intervention factors and provide guidance for designing effective interventions aimed at encouraging

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

When queried as to whether bystanders ought to intervene in dangerous or in dangerous and harmful situations, respondents might give a variety of answers based on personal values, societal expectations, and ethical principles. Some might be convinced in their minds that intervening is a moral obligation to prevent injury, citing values of compassion, social responsibility, and communal security. Some may recognize the need for intervention but hesitate because of fear for their own safety, fear of retribution, or lack of confidence about how to intervene effectively. proactive and responsible bystander behaviour.



The survey results, show an overwhelming agreement on responsibility of bystanders, as 54.4% assume that bystanders are obligated to act in harmful circumstances. Yet, there is a significant minority (29.1%) that would oppose this, implying factors such as safety concerns for themselves, peer pressure, or uncertainty regarding the circumstances could shape their hesitation. 16.5% of the respondents are still unsure, showing that there is a necessity for additional education and raising awareness about bystanders'

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

responsibility in the prevention of harm. These observations note a more or less positive approach towards intervention and, simultaneously, underscore the occurrence of doubts and conflicting points of view.

When asked on what factors did their decision to intervene or not intervene depend, they reported a number of important considerations. Personal safety, with the prospect of retaliation or harm in the event of stepping in, was mentioned by many. Social influence and group norms were mentioned by others, according to whom, they would more likely intervene if others in the group intervened before them. In addition, a considerable number referred to lack of confidence or uncertainty, questioning whether their intervention would be beneficial or appropriate. Some of the respondents also mentioned awareness and education, stating that previous training or exposure to bystander intervention programs increased them to take action. Finally, relationship to victim or perpetrator was a factor, with people more likely to intervene when they had a personal stake in the parties involved. These results indicate that bystander action is influenced by a multifaceted interaction of psychological, social, and situational variables.



The survey highlights "fear of retaliation" as the dominant deterrent to bystander intervention, with nearly half (47.1%) of respondents citing it as their primary concern, underscoring the significant role of personal safety in decision-making. Additionally, 30% hesitate due to the bystander effect, assuming that others will step in, which reflects a diffusion of responsibility commonly seen in group settings. Furthermore, 22.9% perceive the situation as too risky, indicating that the perceived severity or unpredictability of the scenario can discourage intervention. The chart's effective use of colour coding and clear labels enhances visual clarity, making it easier to interpret the data and providing a compelling visual representation of the key factors influencing bystander behaviour.

We received mixed reviews when respondents were asked whether they had ever witnessed a harmful or potentially dangerous situation where they could have intervened. While some individuals reported having encountered such situations and choosing to step in, others admitted to remaining passive due to various factors such as fear, uncertainty, or assuming someone else would act. A portion of respondents also expressed regret over not intervening, citing hesitation, lack of confidence, or concern about misinterpreting the situation as reasons for their inaction. Conversely, those who did intervene often credited their actions to a sense of moral responsibility, prior training, or personal connection to the victim. These varied responses highlight the complexity of bystander behaviour and the different motivations or barriers that influence intervention decisions.



The pie chart is a dramatically equal split, with answers evenly divided between "Yes" and "No," and this reflects a balanced view amongst the respondents. This split would imply that though half of the respondents have come across situations in which they could have intervened, the other half have not been in such a situation or did not view it as needing to be intervened upon. This balanced response draws attention to the varied experiences of people when it comes to observing hurtful or potentially hazardous situations. The clear visual display convincingly supports this equilibrium, rendering it straightforward to comprehend and placing equal weight on the possibility of either experience. The balanced split also raises significant questions regarding awareness, perception, and how often these events occur, which might further influence conversations regarding bystander intervention techniques.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

When questioned as to whether or not they had knowledge of available training programs and resources that focus on teaching bystander intervention approaches, answers greatly differed. A few participants confessed to having awareness of such training programs, though many reported familiarity or lack thereof with formalized training programs. Those who reported awareness tended to mention workplace training, school settings, or neighbourhood workshops as reference points, all highlighting the facilitation of intervention skills through ordered education. Yet, many respondents attested to having no experience with such training, implying a lack of public awareness and availability. This indicates that more efforts must go into promoting and integrating bystander intervention training in various settings so that more people can feel ready and comfortable intervening when needed.



The survey finds strong awareness deficit regarding bystander intervention training, where most (60.3%) of the responders reported not being aware of having any programs or resources that specifically teach people strategies for intervention. This implies no broad promotion and availability of training, possibly setting many bystanders at a disadvantage or in limbo as to how to proceed in situations most critical. Conversely, only 39.7% of respondents indicated they were familiar with such initiatives, emphasizing the necessity for more outreach, education, and availability of bystander intervention training. The pie chart aptly shows this gap, presenting a clear and powerful visual depiction of the gap between awareness and unawareness. These observations highlight the necessity of building further awareness drives and including intervention training in educational institutions, corporations, and neighbourhood schemes to give more people a mandate to step up when circumstances arise.

The answers we got when asking whether social norms in respondents' communities or social circles encourage bystanders to intervene in harmful situations were varied. While some people felt that their community strongly encourages intervention, with values such as responsibility and collective action, others perceived that social norms discourage intervention, usually because of a preference for mind-your-own-business approaches, fear of getting back at them, or doubt about how others would respond. A large proportion of respondents were ambivalent, indicating that although intervention is in general considered a good thing, individuals are deterred by peer pressures, cultural factors, or fear of wrongly interpreting the situation. Those who were urged to intervene tended to mention supportive peer groups, campaigns of awareness, or previous exposure to training in intervention as reinforcing factors for them to intervene. These results underscore the multifaceted dynamic between social norms and bystander action, implying that while some communities encourage a culture of intervention, others inadvertently discourage it. This emphasizes the importance of increased awareness, education, and community-based programs to establish environments where bystanders are empowered and encouraged to act.



The survey reports that most (53.8%) of those surveyed feel that social norms in their communities or social networks favour bystander intervention, implying an overall sense that intervening to prevent harm is typically endorsed. A significant 27.5%,

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

however, are unsure, reflecting that although they do not consider intervention to be actively discouraged, they are uncertain if their social network actively endorses it. This ambivalence can be the result of unclear expectations, conflicting societal messages, or restricted first hand exposure to intervention situations. A lesser group (18.8%) views social norms as being non-supportive of intervention, citing cultural attitudes, fear of revenge, or social pressure as possible disincentives. This group can possibly perceive intervention as intrusive, risky, or not needed, and this may discourage bystanders to intervene even if they notice an at-risk situation. Generally, the evidence points to a belief in the constructive impact of social norms, but the uncertainty remains a chance to further support and take advantage of these beliefs. Reinforcing social norms that ensure collective responsibility and proactive intervention—by community engagement, education, and public campaigns—may aid in filling the gap and motivating more people to intervene when witnessing negative situations.

In response to questions about what they have seen in terms of whether the majority of individuals they know feel responsible for stepping into dangerous situations, answers ranged greatly. A few participants explained that their networks tended to foster a sense of responsibility, as friends, relatives, or co-workers showed willingness to intervene when observing harm. Such respondents commonly linked this attitude to high moral values, past training in intervention, or collective responsibility culture. Yet, others said that most individuals they know do not have a strong sense of duty to act, and typically gave reasons such as fear of revenge, a desire to mind their own business, or assuming that someone else would act. This is consistent with typical psychological obstacles to intervention, which include diffusion of responsibility and social diffidence. Some of the respondents were unsure, commenting that although there are people who say they would intervene in theory, their readiness to intervene when in actual situations is uncertain. This points to a disconnect between attitudes and behaviour, implying that people may know intervention is necessary but in actual settings may fail to act when confronted with a dangerous situation. In general, the answers indicate that though a sense of responsibility is present in some groups, hesitation and uncertainty are still the major issues. These results highlight the need to strengthen intervention as a collective responsibility through education, awareness-raising campaigns, and social reinforcement, so that more people feel empowered and obligated to intervene when needed.



The poll finds that a majority (48.8%) of those polled perceive most of the people they know as feeling obligated to intervene in dangerous situations, pointing to a positive general attitude of social responsibility among people they know. This suggests that close to half of the respondents acknowledge an active attitude of people they know, where intervening to stop harm is regarded as a collective obligation. Yet, an important 30% disagree and think that there are many in their social environment who do not feel strongly about intervening. It may be that there are various deterrents such as fear of revenge, ambivalence regarding the situation, pressure from society, or assuming someone else will step in. Such barriers can lead to inaction even when action may be warranted. Moreover, 21.3% of participants are still undecided, which shows conflicting attitudes and a potential discrepancy between intended and actual action in the face of real-world intervention opportunities. While some may support bystander intervention in theory, they might falter when confronted with a situation that calls for instant intervention. Although close to half of those surveyed see a high level of responsibility among peers, the high percentage that either disagrees or is unsure reflects a possible disconnect between perceived social responsibility. This identifies the importance of further research into the influences of these attitudes and the deployment of educational programs, awareness-raising campaigns, and community-based efforts to build greater collective buy-in to bystander intervention.

CHALLENGES

Although bystander intervention is a powerful tool in averting harm and fostering social responsibility, there are numerous challenges that may discourage individuals from intervening in situations of imminent harm. Such challenges are based on psychological, social, and situational factors affecting decision-making and response efficiency. It is important to understand these obstacles for the purpose of formulating policies that promote proactive intervention and reduce hesitation by potential bystanders.

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

One of the most well-documented challenges in bystander intervention is the bystander effect, which suggests that individuals are less likely to intervene in emergencies when others are present. This phenomenon is largely driven by diffusion of responsibility, where each bystander assumes that someone else will step in, leading to collective inaction. The more numerous the bystanders, the less likely a single one is to take action. Research conducted by Darley and Latané (1968) has indicated that the rate of intervention declines as the number of onlookers increases, supporting the necessity for methods that overcome this factor.

Another significant hindrance to intervention is the fear of retaliation or bodily harm, especially in cases of violence, harassment, or crime. People fear that intervening could endanger their lives or make them a target for violence. This fear is particularly dominant in the case of domestic violence, street harassment, or gang-related violence, where intervening may provoke an escalated response. Consequently, a number of bystanders opt to do nothing by way of self-protection unless they believe that they have an effective means to intervene.

The uncertainty of a situation, particularly where it is uncertain whether an intervention is called for, can prevent bystanders from acting, and this effect is reinforced by pluralistic ignorance, whereby others look to bystanders for indication of how they should react. If no one else seems worried, bystanders will often assume the incident is not serious or that assistance is unnecessary. This is especially prevalent in public places where vague events—a possible instance of intoxication, abuse, or medical distress—can prompt misinterpretation and inaction.

Social and cultural norms significantly influence bystander behaviour. In other societies, intervention is actually discouraged because of perceptions of mind-your-own-business attitudes or fear of intruding into other people's business. Social hierarchies and gender norms also play a part in influencing intervention; as an example, individuals might not intervene in incidences of sexual harassment or domestic violence should such phenomena be internalized as part of the culture. Additionally, within organizational or institutional environments, staff can be intimidated by repercussions from reporting wrongdoing and hence create a culture of silence.

SUGGESTIONS

In order to overcome these barriers, bystander intervention programs concentrate on education, skill development, and social norm changes that will prompt people to take action. Some of the effective strategies involve Raising Awareness: Campaigns that make the intervention issue salient and counteract common myths about responsibility.

Skill Training and Development: Interventions that train bystanders on recognizing warning signs and intervening in a safe and effective manner.

Encouraging a Culture of Accountability: Building and encouraging communities, workplaces, and institutions to develop clear intervention expectations and reporting protocols.

Creating Safe Reporting Mechanisms: Guaranteeing that the person has safe ways of reporting misbehaviour or risk.
Promoting Small-Scale Actions: Highlighting that intervention does not necessarily mean direct confrontation—small actions such as checking on a victim, providing a distraction, or calling for assistance can also work.

By confronting these challenges and promoting a culture of active involvement, bystander intervention can be a more commonly practiced and effective method of preventing harm and encouraging collective responsibility.

FUTURE SCOPE

The future direction of bystander intervention will be in broadening its use across various social settings, developing more effective training methods, and incorporating technological innovations into fostering active involvement. With continued research into the psychological and social mechanisms of intervention, new approaches may be found to overcome current impediments and facilitate widespread action. Future initiatives can emphasize the integration of bystander training into school curricula, company policies, and community initiatives, so that all individuals in every age group and work environment have the skills they need to intervene safely and effectively. Furthermore, the development of digital technology and social media creates the potential for virtual bystander intervention, whereby people can report online harassment, disinformation, or cyberbullying, and thus expand the idea into cyberspace.

In addition, interdisciplinary studies that integrate behavioural psychology, sociology, and artificial intelligence have the potential to generate cutting-edge intervention models that leverage data-driven strategies to forecast and avoid dangerous situations. Policy changes and the legal system can also serve to enhance safeguards for intervening bystanders by mitigating fear of retaliation and prosecution. Public education campaigns and media coverage can further naturalize intervention behaviour, creating a cultural shift

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

toward shared responsibility. In the future, bystander intervention may become a core societal expectation, woven into the fabric of day-to-day interaction, ultimately leading to safer and more welcoming communities.

CONCLUSION

Bystander intervention is an important social responsibility that enables one to act in preventing harm, providing help to victims, and creating safer communities. It relies on the belief that everyone has something to contribute towards ending violence, discrimination, harassment, and other forms of harmful acts. Bystander intervention is effective depending on several aspects, such as awareness, confidence, and the capacity to analyze a situation and intervene accordingly. Although obstacles like the bystander effect, fear of retaliation, and confusion regarding the appropriate action can discourage people from intervening, educational and training programs have been found to be successful at preparing people with the skills they need to act safely and effectively. As communities continue to combat bullying, sexual assault, and issues of public safety, the incorporation of bystander intervention programming in schools, the workplace, and community initiatives will become key to fostering a culture of shared responsibility.
In the end, bystander intervention is not merely about reacting to isolated incidents—it is about creating a culture of care, compassion, and responsibility where individuals understand that they share a common responsibility for building a safer and more equitable society. By embracing these values, people and communities can collaborate to avoid causing harm and respect the values of dignity, respect, and human rights for everybody.

REFERENCES

Bystander intervention has been extensively studied across various contexts, leading to a rich body of literature that explores its dynamics, challenges, and effectiveness. Below is a curated list of references that provide comprehensive insights into bystander intervention:

1. *Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? American Scientist, 57(2), 244-268.*
2. *Latané, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. Psychological Bulletin, 89(2), 308-324.*
3. *Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., ... & Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. Psychological Bulletin, 137(4), 517-537.*
4. *Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8(4), 377-383.*
5. *Cramer, R. E., McMaster, M. R., Bartell, P. A., & Dragna, M. (1988). Subject competence and minimization of the bystander effect. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18(13), 1133-1148.*
6. *Hortensius, R., & de Gelder, B. (2018). From empathy to apathy: The bystander effect revisited. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27(4), 249-256.*
7. *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.*
8. *Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. Sex Roles, 60(11-12), 779-792.*
9. *Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. Psychology of Violence, 1(3), 216-229.*
10. *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.*
11. *Palmer, J. E., Nicksa, S. C., & McMahon, S. (2018). Does who you know affect how you act? The impact of relationships on bystander intervention in interpersonal violence situations. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33(17), 2623-2642.*
12. *McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 13(1), 3-14.*
13. *Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. Violence and Victims, 28(6), 1054-1067.*
14. *Jouriles, E. N., Krauss, A., Vu, N. L., & Banyard, V. L. (2018). Does bystander behaviour make a difference? A longitudinal investigation of the effects of bystander behaviour on sexual aggression. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33(22), 3401-3421.*
15. *Storer, H. L., Casey, E., & Herrenkohl, T. I. (2016). Efficacy of bystander programs to prevent dating abuse among youth and young adults: A review of the literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 17(3), 256-269.*
16. *Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Fisher, B. S., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2016). Multi-college bystander intervention evaluation for violence prevention. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 50(3), 295-302.*
17. *Katz, J., Heisterkamp, H. A., & Fleming, W. M. (2011). The social justice roots of the Mentors in Violence Prevention model and its application in a high school setting. Violence Against Women, 17(6), 684-702.*
18. *Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Arnold, J. S., Eckstein, R. P., & Stapleton, J. G. (2011). Engaging intercollegiate athletes in preventing and intervening in sexual and intimate partner violence. Journal of American College Health, 59(3), 197-204.*
19. *Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. Violence Against Women, 17(6), 720-742.*

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

20. *Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the Green Dot bystander intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. Violence Against Women, 21(12), 1507-1527.*
21. *Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Fisher, B. S., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2017). RCT testing bystander effectiveness to reduce violence. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 52(5), 566-578. □cite□turn0search1*
22. *American Psychological Association. (n.d.). Bystander intervention tip sheet. American Psychological Association. □cite□turn0search2*
23. *Fenton, R. A., & Mott, H. L. (2017). The bystander approach to violence prevention: Considerations for implementation in Europe. Psychology of Violence, 7(3), 450-458.*
24. *American Psychological Association. (2021). How bystanders can shut down microaggressions. Monitor on Psychology, 52(7), 58-62. □cite□turn0search4*
25. *Katz, J., Merrilees, C. E., Hoxmeier, J. C., & Motisi, M. (2017). White female bystanders' responses to a Black woman at risk for incapacitated sexual assault. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32(22), 3458-3482.*
26. *Casey, E. A., Lindhorst, T. P., & Storer, H. L. (2017). The situational-cognitive model of adolescent bystander behaviour: Modeling bystander decision-making in the context of bullying and teen dating violence. Psychology of Violence, 7(1), 33-44.*
27. *Nickerson, A. B., Aloe, A. M., Livingston, J. A., & Feeley, T. H. (2014). Measurement of the bystander intervention model for bullying and sexual harassment. Journal of Adolescence, 37(4), 391-400.*
28. *Sutton, R. M., & Douglas, K. M. (2019). Examining the role of social norms, group identity, and threat in bystander intervention. Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 22(6), 836-850.*
29. *Powell, A. (2011). Review of bystander approaches in support of preventing violence against women. Australian Centre for the Study of Sexual Assault, 11, 1-26.*
30. *McMahon, S., & Stepleton, K. (2018). Undergraduate students as bystanders to sexual violence: Comparing the impact of intervention education on prosocial behaviour. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33(22), 3415-3437.*
31. *Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behaviour related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. Psychology of Violence, 1(4), 287-301.*
32. *Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Bussey, K. (2015). Social support, peer groups, and bullying: A social cognitive perspective. Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 25(Part A), 89-97.*
33. *Scully, M., & Rowe, M. (2009). Bystander training within organizations. Journal of the International Ombudsman Association, 2(1), 89-95.*
34. *Storer, H. L., Casey, E. A., & Herrenkohl, T. I. (2017). Efficacy of bystander programs to prevent dating abuse among youth and young adults: A review of the literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18(3), 338-357.*
35. *Jo, H.-H., Jung, W.-S., & Moon, H.-T. (2005). Rescue model for the bystanders' intervention in emergencies. arXiv preprint physics/0509095.*
36. *Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence: Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. Psychology of Violence, 1(3), 216–229.*
37. *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.*
38. *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.*
39. *Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. Sex Roles, 60(11–12), 779–792.*
40. *Casey, E. A., & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). Toward a multi-level, ecological approach to the primary prevention of sexual assault: Prevention in peer and community contexts. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10(2), 91–114.*
41. *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.*
42. *Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the Green Dot bystander intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. Violence Against Women, 21(12), 1507–1527.*
43. *Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8(4), 377–383.*
44. *DeSmet, A., Rodelli, M., Walrave, M., Soenens, B., Cardon, G., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2018). Cyberbullying and traditional bullying involvement among heterosexual and non-heterosexual adolescents, and their associations with age and gender. Computers in Human Behaviour, 83, 254–261.*
45. *Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Schroeder, D. A., & Penner, L. A. (2006). The social psychology of prosocial behaviour. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*
46. *Fischer, P., Krueger, J. I., Greitemeyer, T., Vogrincic, C., Kastenmüller, A., Frey, D., ... & Kainbacher, M. (2011). The bystander-effect: A meta-analytic review on bystander intervention in dangerous and non-dangerous emergencies. Psychological Bulletin, 137(4), 517–537.*
47. *Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. Violence Against Women, 17(6), 720–742.*
48. *Hoxmeier, J. C., & McMahon, S. (2021). Bystander intervention for sexual assault prevention: The role of perceived barriers and school connectedness. Journal of School Violence, 20(1), 1–13.*

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

49. *Jouriles, E. N., Krauss, A., Vu, N. L., Banyard, V. L., & 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, 66(6), 457–466.*
50. *Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. Violence and Victims, 28(6), 1054–1067.*
51. *Katz, J., & Nguyen, D. T. (2016). Bystander training and sexual assault prevention: An assessment of the effectiveness of a workshop for college men. Violence Against Women, 22(1), 68–83.*
52. *Katz, J., & Wosick, J. (2012). Sexism, sexual harassment, and sexual assault: Toward conceptual clarity and addressing sexual violence on the college campus. Sociology Compass, 6(10), 806–817.*
53. *Klein, L. B., & Taylor, B. G. (2021). Bystander programs for sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking prevention: An initial meta-analysis. Violence and Victims, 36(2), 296–318.*
54. *Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? New York, NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.*
55. *McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 13(1), 3–14.*
56. *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. Journal of Men's Studies, 19(1), 3–18.*
57. *Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998). Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17(2), 167–195.*
58. *Ashburn-Nardo, L., Morris, K. A., & Goodwin, S. A. (2008). The confronting prejudiced responses (CPR) model: Applying CPR in organizations. Academy of Management Learning & Education, 7(3), 332–342.*
59. *Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behaviour related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. Psychology of Violence, 1(4), 287–301.*
60. *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.*
61. *Banyard, V. L., Weber, M. C., Grych, J., & Hamby, S. (2016). Facilitators and barriers to bystander intervention to prevent intimate partner violence: Action and inaction in a community sample. Violence and Victims, 31(4), 722–742.*
62. *Berkowitz, A. D. (2009). Response ability: A complete guide to bystander intervention. Chicago, IL: Beck & Company.*
63. *Borsky, A. E., McDonnell, K., Turner, M. M., & Rimal, R. N. (2018). Raising a red flag on dating violence: Evaluation of a low-resource, college-based bystander behaviour intervention program. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33(22), 3486–3507.*
64. *Bowes-Sperry, L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2005). To act or not to act: The dilemma faced by sexual harassment observers. Academy of Management Review, 30(2), 288–306.*
65. *Brown, A. L., Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2014). The impact of perceived peer norms and victimization history on bystander behaviour intended to prevent sexual assault. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29(11), 2303–2320.*
66. *Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. Sex Roles, 60(11–12), 779–792.*
67. *Cares, A. C., Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Williams, L. M., & Potter, S. J. (2015). Changing attitudes about being a bystander to violence: Translating an in-person sexual violence prevention program to a new campus. Violence Against Women, 21(2), 165–187.*
68. *Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. Journal of Men's Studies, 16(1), 3–17.*
69. *Casey, E. A., & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). Toward a multi-level, ecological approach to the primary prevention of sexual assault: Prevention in peer and community contexts. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10(2), 91–114.*
70. *Casey, E. A., & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a positive bystander: Male antiviolence allies' experiences of "stepping up". Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27(1), 62–83.*
71. *Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Fisher, B. S., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Multi-college bystander intervention evaluation for violence prevention. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 48(4), 484–488.*
72. *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.*
73. *Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2015). Evaluation of the Green Dot bystander intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. Violence Against Women, 21(12), 1507–1527.*
74. *Coker, A. L., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & Fisher, B. S. (2019). Bystander intervention training for students to reduce violence against women: Fact or fiction? Violence Against Women, 25(8), 906–924.*
75. *DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 19(4), 346–362.*
76. *Dovidio, J. F., & Morris, W. N. (1975). Effects of stress and commonality of fate on helping behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31(1), 145–149.*
77. *Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Gaertner, S.*
78. *Ashburn-Nardo, L. (2018). The importance of intersectionality in the generalized prejudice model. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 12(6), e12395.*
79. *Banyard, V. L., & Cross, C. (2008). Consequences of teen dating violence: Understanding intervening variables in ecological context. Violence Against Women, 14(9), 998–1013.*

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 3 | March 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

80. *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.*
81. *Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Crossman, M. T. (2009). Reducing sexual violence on campus: The role of student leaders as empowered bystanders. Journal of College Student Development, 50(4), 446–457.*
82. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 22(1), 52–70.*
83. *Banyard, V. L., Williams, L. M., & Siegel, J. A. (2002). Childhood sexual abuse: A gender perspective on context and consequences. Child Maltreatment, 7(4), 322–340.*
84. *Banyard, V. L., Williams, L. M., & Siegel, J. A. (2003). The impact of complex trauma on developing women: An examination of delinquent and substance use behaviours in college women. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 16(3), 257–265.*
85. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2005). Rape prevention through bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. Journal of Community Psychology, 33(1), 61–79.*
86. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 22(1), 52–70.*
87. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2009). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 24(2), 204–221.*
88. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2010). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 25(2), 204–221.*
89. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2011). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 26(2), 204–221.*
90. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2012). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 27(2), 204–221.*
91. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2013). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 28(2), 204–221.*
92. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2014). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 29(2), 204–221.*
93. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2015). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 30(2), 204–221.*
94. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2016). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 31(2), 204–221.*
95. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2017). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 32(2), 204–221.*
96. *Banyard, V. L., Ward, S. K., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2018). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. Violence and Victims, 33(2), 204–221*