

Title Registration for a Systematic Review:

Effects of Bystander Programs on the Prevention of Sexual Assault among Adolescents and College Students: A Systematic Review

Heather Hensman Kettrey and Emily Tanner-Smith

Submitted to the Coordinating Group of:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Crime and Justice
<input type="checkbox"/>	Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Disability
<input type="checkbox"/>	International Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nutrition
<input type="checkbox"/>	Social Welfare
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other:

Plans to co-register:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Cochrane	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maybe		

Date Submitted: 29 March 2016

Date Revision Submitted: 1 July 2016

Approval Date:

Publication Date: 01 September 2016

TITLE OF THE REVIEW

Effects of Bystander Programs on the Prevention of Sexual Assault among Adolescents and College Students: A Systematic Review

BACKGROUND

Sexual assault is a significant problem among adolescents and college students in the United States. Findings from the Campus Sexual Assault study indicated that 15.9% of responding college women had experienced attempted or completed sexual assault (i.e., unwanted sexual contact that could include sexual touching, oral sex, intercourse, anal sex, or penetration with a finger or object) prior to entering college and 19% had experienced attempted or completed sexual assault since entering college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009). These rates are problematic, as sexual assault in adolescence and/or young adulthood is associated with adverse outcomes, such as repeated victimization, depressive symptomology, heavy drinking, and suicidal ideation (Cortens, Eckenrode, & Rothman, 2013; Cui, Ueno, Gordon, & Fincham, 2013; Halpern, Spriggs, Martin, & Kupper, 2009). Importantly, there is evidence indicating experiences of sexual assault during these two life phases are related, as victimization and perpetration during adolescence are, respectively, associated with increased risk of victimization and perpetration during young adulthood (Cui, Ueno, Gordon, & Fincham, 2013). Thus, early prevention efforts are of paramount importance.

Reviews of research on the effectiveness of programs designed to prevent sexual assault among adolescents and college students have noted both a dearth of quality studies, such as randomized controlled trials (RCTs), and minimal evidence that these prevention programs have meaningful effects on young people's behavior (DeGue, Valle, Holt, Massetti, Matjasko, & Tharp, 2014; De Koker, Mathews, Zuch, Bastien, & Mason-Jones, 2014). Concerning the latter point, evaluations of such programs tend to measure attitudinal outcomes (e.g., rape supportive attitudes, rape myth acceptance) more frequently than behavioral outcomes (e.g., perpetration or victimization) (Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Cornelius & Resseguie, 2007; DeGue et al., 2014). Additionally, findings from a meta-analysis of studies assessing outcomes of college sexual assault prevention programs have suggested effects are larger for attitudinal outcomes than for the actual incidence of sexual assault (Anderson & Whiston, 2005).

Given this paucity of evidence of behavior change, it is imperative that researchers identify effective strategies for preventing sexual assault among adolescents and young adults. One promising strategy is the implementation of bystander programs, which encourage young people to intervene when witnessing incidents or warning signs of sexual assault. The strength of the bystander model is its emphasis on the role of peers in the prevention of

violence. Peers are a salient influence on young people's intimate relationships (Adelman & Kil, 2007; Giordano, 2003). In some respects, this can be detrimental, as having friends involved in violent intimate relationships (i.e., characterized by sexual or physical violence) is a risk factor for becoming both a perpetrator and victim of violence (Arriaga & Foshee, 2004; Foshee, Benefield, Ennett, Bauman, & Suchindran, 2004; Foshee, Linder, MacDougall, & Bangdiwala, 2001; Foshee, Reyes, & Ennett, 2010; McCauley et al., 2013). However, peers can also have a positive impact on intimate relationships.

Young victims and perpetrators of violence are often reluctant to divulge their experience or to seek help (especially from adults), but when they do seek help they often seek it from their peers (Ashley & Foshee, 2005; Black, Tolman, Callahan, Saunders, & Weisz, 2008; Molidor & Tolman, 1998; Weisz, Tolman, Callahan, Saunders, & Black, 2007). This indicates that victims trust their peers to provide a valuable source of support after an assault has occurred. Importantly, it also suggests that peers have the potential to play a pivotal role in the prevention of sexual assault by intervening when they witness its warning signs. In fact, in a contemporary "hookup culture" adolescents and young adults are more likely to meet and socialize in groups than they are to date in pairs and, thus, warning signs of assault are frequently exhibited in communal spaces (Bogle, 2007; 2008; Molidor & Tolman, 1998). Thus, the social nature of intimate relationships during these life stages can make peers pivotal actors in the prevention of sexual assault.

However, the potential for peer intervention can be undermined by a general "bystander effect" that diffuses responsibility for action in group settings (Darley & Latane, 1968). In order to intervene as a witness to sexual assault, individuals must notice the event (or its warning signs), define the event as warranting action/intervention, take responsibility for acting (i.e., feel a sense of personal duty), and demonstrate a sufficient level of self-efficacy (i.e., perceived competence to successfully intervene) (Latané & Darley, 1969). Studies have indicated that, as witnesses to sexual assault, young people often fail to meet these criteria (Banyard, 2008; Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2014; Burn, 2009; Casey & Ohler, 2012; Exner & Cummings, 2011; McCauley et al., 2013; McMahan, 2010; Noonan & Charles, 2009), with males being less likely than females to intervene (Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Edwards, Rodenhizer-Stampfli, & Eckstein, 2015; Exner & Cummings, 2011; McMahan, 2010). Thus, bystander programs seek to sensitize young people to warning signs of sexual assault, create attitudinal change that fosters bystander responsibility for intervening (e.g., creating empathy for victims), and build requisite skills/tactics for taking action (Banyard, 2011; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; McMahan & Banyard, 2012).

Illustrating the perceived benefits of such programs, the 2013 Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act requires post-secondary educational institutions participating in Title IV financial aid programs to provide incoming college students with primary prevention and awareness programs addressing sexual violence. Importantly, the Campus SaVE Act mandates that these programs include a component on bystander intervention. Currently, there is no comparable legislation regarding sexual assault among adolescents (e.g.,

mandating bystander programs in secondary schools). This is an unfortunate oversight, as adolescents who experience sexual assault are at an increased risk of repeated victimization in young adulthood (Cui et al., 2013). Thus, the implementation of bystander programs in secondary schools not only has the potential to reduce sexual assault among adolescents, but may also have the long-term potential to reduce sexual assault on college campuses.

Findings of a 2013 meta-analysis of studies published/reported through 2011 indicated that bystander programs have meaningful effects on the prevention of sexual assault on college campuses ([Jennifer] Katz & Moore, 2013). Katz and Moore found moderate effects of bystander programs on participants' efficacy and intentions to intervene and small (but significant) effects on bystander behavior, rape-supportive attitudes, and rape proclivity (but not perpetration). Effects were generally stronger among younger samples and samples containing a higher percentage of males. The stronger effect for younger participants (i.e., younger college students) suggests such programs may be particularly effective with adolescents.

There are currently no existing meta-analyses examining the effects of bystander programs on attitudes and behaviors regarding sexual assault among adolescents. Furthermore, there are no studies that account for variability in content across bystander programs. This is significant, as bystander programs exhibit a great deal of content variability, most notably in framing sexual assault as a gendered or gender-neutral problem (Storer, Casey, & Herrenkohl, 2015).

Research has indicated that, relative to males, females are overwhelmingly the victims of sexual assault (Foshee, 1996; Gressard, Swahn, & Tharp, 2015; Harned, 2001; Howard, Wang, & Yan, 2007). Thus, the earliest bystander programs tended to apply a gendered perspective to the prevention of sexual assault among adolescents and college students. For example, [Jackson] Katz (1995) developed the Mentors in Violence Prevention Program (MVP) with the goal of inspiring male college athletes to challenge sociocultural definitions of masculinity that equate men's strength with dominance over women. At the time of its inception, MVP was unique in its explicit focus on masculinity as well as its nonthreatening "bystander" approach that encouraged young men to intervene when witnessing acts (or warning signs) of violence against women. As Katz explained, MVP reduces young men's defensiveness to violence prevention efforts by focusing on men as potential *bystanders to violence*, rather than potential *perpetrators of violence*. In addition to reducing men's defensiveness to intervention efforts, this bystander approach emphasizes the point that "when men don't speak up or take action in the face of other men's abusive behavior toward women, that constitutes implicit consent of such behavior" (Katz, 1995, p. 168).

Since the inception of MVP a number of programs have emerged to address barriers to bystander intervention among adolescents and college students. While they all share the common goal of inspiring bystanders to act in ways that prevent sexual assault, these programs exhibit a great deal of variation in scope pertaining to their target bystander

populations (i.e., males and/or females, secondary school or college students), sex of victims, and gendered versus gender-neutral approach. For example, some programs use a gendered approach by (1) critiquing gender norms that can promote violence against women and (2) encouraging males to intervene on behalf of female victims (e.g., MVP, see Katz, 1995). Others use a gender-neutral approach to build a sense of community responsibility to intervene on behalf of both male and female victims of sexual assault (e.g., Bringing in the Bystander, see Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009; Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). One of the major differences between gendered and gender-neutral bystander programs is that the former places socio-cultural forces, such as gender norms, at the center of discussions of violence whereas the latter places the bystander, and his/her individual cognitive processes when encountering violence, at the center of discussions of violence ([Jackson] Katz, Hesiterkamp, & Fleming, 2011; Messner, 2015).

Comparing the effects of gendered and gender-neutral programs has the potential to identify important determinants of the success of bystander programs. Although there is no empirical examination of the different effects of these programs, there are theoretical reasons to believe that each has the potential to be successful under certain conditions. Specifically, gendered approaches to bystander education programs may be better suited to target socio-cultural facilitators of sexual assault against women and address different patterns of bystander behaviors exhibited by males and females (Banyard, 2008; Burn, 2009; Exner & Cummings, 2011; Katz et al., 2011; [Jennifer] Katz, 2015; [Jennifer] Katz, Colbert, & Colangelo, 2015; McCauley et al., 2013; McMahan, 2010; Messner, 2015). On the other hand, gender-neutral programs have the benefit of deflecting the criticism that prevention programs utilizing a gendered approach are inherently anti-male (Katz et al., 2011; Messner, 2015). Avoidance of such criticism is paramount to the success of sexual assault prevention programs. This is because adolescents and young adults who are coming of age in a “post-feminist” era are likely to reject gendered explanations of sexual assault and, instead, respond more positively to gender-neutral programs that use inclusive language that can be applied to a broad range of victims and perpetrators (Barreto & Ellemers, 2005; Kettrey, in press; Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter, 1995).

The proposed Campbell Review will examine the effects of bystander programs on attitudes (i.e., perceptions of violence/victims, self-efficacy to intervene, intentions to intervene) and behaviors (i.e., actual intervention behavior, perpetration) regarding sexual assault among adolescents and college students. Importantly, it will present meta-analytic findings to assess the influence of moderators (e.g., gender composition of sample, age/educational level of sample, gendered content of program) on the effects of bystander programs. Given that the 2013 Campus SaVE Act mandates bystander education as a component of primary prevention of sexual assault on college campuses, findings will provide vital assessment of legislation outcomes. Specifically, findings will (1) provide an updated analysis of the effects of bystander programs, (2) examine previously unanalyzed moderators of the effectiveness of bystander programs (e.g., content), and (3) evaluate the effects of bystander programs among adolescents. This latter contribution has the potential to inform directions for future

policy and/or legislation pertinent to prevention efforts in secondary schools. This is of vital importance in breaking patterns of sexual assault, considering that victimization and perpetration in adolescence are associated with victimization and perpetration in young adulthood (Cui et al., 2013).

Preliminary scoping searches of journal articles, research reports, conference proceedings, and theses/dissertations suggest that the final review and meta-analysis will likely include 20-30 studies that meet all eligibility criteria (as outlined below). Importantly, preliminary searches suggested an increased accumulation of research assessing outcomes of bystander programs since the enactment of the Campus SaVE Act – and after the publication of Katz and Moore’s (2013) meta-analysis, which only included studies published through 2011.

OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to examine what effects bystander programs have on sexual assault among adolescents and college students. More specifically, and given the study designs used in the current evidence base, this systematic review will address three objectives:

The first objective is to assess the overall effects, and the variability of the effects, of bystander programs on adolescents’ and college students’ attitudes and behaviors regarding sexual assault. This includes general attitudes toward violence and victims, self-efficacy to intervene, intentions/willingness to intervene when witnessing signs of sexual assault, actual intervention behavior, and perpetration of sexual assault.

The second objective is to explore the comparative effectiveness of bystander programs for different profiles of participants (e.g., mean age or education level of sample, proportion of males/females in sample).

The third objective is to explore the comparative effectiveness of different bystander programs in terms of gendered content (e.g., conceptualizing sexual assault as a gendered or gender-neutral problem) in order to identify characteristics of the most effective programs.

EXISTING REVIEWS

Currently, there are no Cochrane or Campbell Reviews evaluating the effects of bystander programs on sexual assault among adolescents and/or college students. Of modest relevance to the proposed review, the Cochrane and Campbell libraries include meta-analyses of the effects of more general programs (not bystander programs) designed to prevent or reduce relationship/dating violence among adolescents and/or young adults (De La Rue, Polanin,

Espelage, & Pigott, 2014; Fellmeth, Heffernan, Nurse, Habibula, & Sethi, 2013). Both of these reviews reported violence outcomes as aggregate measures that do not distinguish sexual violence from other forms of violence. Although they each found some evidence of significant effects on knowledge or attitudes pertinent to violence, neither found evidence of significant effects on young people's behavior (i.e., rates of perpetration/victimization).

Two reviews published outside of the Campbell and Cochrane libraries are of closer relevance to the proposed review. These include a meta-analysis of the effects of bystander programs on sexual assault on college campuses (Katz & Moore, 2013) and a narrative review of studies examining the effects of bystander programs on dating and sexual violence among adolescents and young adults (Storer et al., 2015).

In what they called an "initial" meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies (published through 2011), Katz & Moore (2013) found moderate effects of bystander programs on participants' self-efficacy and intentions to intervene and small (but significant) effects on bystander behavior, rape-supportive attitudes, and rape proclivity (but not perpetration). Effects were generally stronger among younger samples and samples containing a higher percentage of males.

In a narrative review of studies examining the effects of bystander programs on dating violence and sexual assault among adolescents and young adults Storer et al. (2015) highlighted positive effects on bystander self-efficacy and intentions, but noted less evidence of positive effects on actual bystander behavior or of effects on perpetration of violence.

While informative, each of these reviews has limitations. Katz & Moore's (2013) meta-analysis focused exclusively on sexual assault on college campuses and did not examine effects of such programs among adolescents. Although Storer et al. (2015) focused on studies examining violence among both adolescents and young adults, their sample was limited in that it was exclusively composed of peer-reviewed articles (i.e., the sample explicitly excluded theses, dissertations, and other gray literature) and the authors specified no research design criteria for inclusion (i.e., the sample included low-quality studies such as those utilizing single group pre-post-test designs). Importantly, Storer et al. reported no meta-analytic findings. Thus, there are currently no existing meta-analyses examining the effects of bystander programs on attitudes and behaviors regarding sexual assault among both college students and adolescents. Additionally, Katz & Moore's early meta-analysis only included studies published/reported through 2011 (two years prior to the 2013 Campus SaVE Act) and did not evaluate program content as a moderator.

INTERVENTION

Eligible programs are those that approach participants as allies in preventing and/or alleviating sexual assault among adolescents and/or college students. Some part of the

program must focus on ways that cultivate a willingness for a person to respond to others who are at risk for sexual assault. All delivery formats are eligible for inclusion (e.g., in-person training sessions, video programs, web-based training, ad/poster campaigns). There are no treatment duration criteria for inclusion.

Studies that report bystander outcomes but do not meet the aforementioned program criteria are not eligible for inclusion. Additionally, studies that assess outcomes of programs that aim to facilitate pro-social bystander behavior, but that do not explicitly include a component addressing sexual assault (e.g., programs to prevent bullying) are not eligible.

Eligible comparison groups receive no treatment targeting bystander attitudes/behavior or sexual assault. Thus, treatment-treatment studies that compare individuals assigned to complete a bystander program with individuals assigned to complete a general sexual assault prevention program that does not meet the above definition of a bystander program are not eligible. However, eligible comparison groups may receive a sham treatment that is expected to have no effect on bystander outcomes or attitudes/behaviors regarding sexual assault.

POPULATION

The review will focus on studies that examine outcomes of bystander programs that target sexual assault and are implemented with adolescents and/or college students in educational settings. Eligible educational settings include secondary schools (i.e., grades 7-12) and colleges or universities.

OUTCOMES

The proposed review will include studies that measure the effects of bystander programs on one or more of the following outcomes:

1. General attitudes toward sexual assault and victims (e.g., victim empathy, rape myth acceptance, etc.).
2. Intentions to intervene (including self-efficacy) when witnessing instances or warning signs of sexual assault.
3. Actual intervention behavior when witnessing instances or warning signs of sexual assault.
4. Perpetration of sexual assault.

Depending on directionality, these outcomes capture both intended and adverse effects (e.g., increases or decreases in victim empathy, pro-social bystander behavior, etc.) that are important to adolescents, college students, and decision-makers alike. If sufficient data exist the review will also include an indirect analysis of resource use by comparing outcomes between resource-intensive programs (e.g., in-person sessions) and less-resource intensive programs (e.g., video programs, web-based training, ad/poster campaigns).

STUDY DESIGNS

To be eligible for inclusion in the review, studies must use an experimental or controlled quasi-experimental research design to compare an intervention group (e.g., students assigned to complete a bystander program) with a comparison group (e.g., students not assigned to complete a bystander program). Specifically, we plan to include the following designs:

1. Randomized controlled trials: Studies in which individuals, classrooms, or schools are randomly assigned to intervention and comparison conditions.
2. Quasi-randomized controlled trials: Studies where assignment is quasi-random, for example, by birth date, date of week, student identification number, month, or some other alternation method.
3. Controlled quasi-experimental designs: Studies where participants are not assigned to conditions randomly or quasi-randomly (e.g., participants self-select into groups). Given the potential selection biases inherent in these controlled quasi-experimental design, we will only include those that also meet one of the following criteria:
 - a. Regression discontinuity designs: Studies that use a cut-score to assign participants to intervention and comparison groups, and assess program impacts around the cut-score.
 - b. Studies that use propensity score or other matching methods to create a matched sample of participants in the intervention and comparison groups. To be eligible for inclusion, these studies must also provide enough statistical information to permit estimation of baseline equivalence effect sizes for the matched groups.
 - c. For studies where participants in the intervention and comparison groups are not matched, enough statistical information must be reported that will permit us to estimate baseline equivalence effect sizes for at least one outcome measure.

Consistent with Campbell policies and procedures, studies using experimental and quasi-experimental research designs will be synthesized separately in the meta-analyses. Furthermore, we plan to collect extensive data on the risk of bias and study quality of all eligible studies, which we will attend to carefully when interpreting the findings from the systematic review and meta-analyses. We plan to conduct extensive sensitivity analyses related to possible selection biases inherent in the primary studies, and how those biases may be related to the observed effects of bystander programs.

REFERENCES

- Adelman, M. & Kil, S. H. (2007). Dating conflicts: Rethinking dating violence and youth conflict. *Violence Against Women, 13*, 1296-1318. doi: 10.1177/1077801207310800
- Anderson, L. A., & Whiston, S. C. (2005). Sexual assault education programs: A meta-analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 374-388.
- Arriaga, X. B. & Foshee, V. A. (2004). Adolescent dating violence: Do adolescents follow in their friends', or their parents', footsteps? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 162-184. doi: 10.1177/0886260503260247
- Ashley, O. S., & Foshee, V. A. (2005). Adolescent help-seeking for dating violence: Prevalence, sociodemographic correlates, and sources of help. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 36*, 25-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2003.12.014>
- Banyard, V. L. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 83-97. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.83>
- Banyard, V. L. (2011). Who will help prevent sexual violence? Creating an ecological model of bystander intervention. *Psychology of Violence, 1*, 216-229. <http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0023739>
- 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*, 446-457. doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0083
- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*, 463-481. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20159

- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32, 61-79. doi: 10.1002/jcop.10078
- Barreto, M. & Ellemers, N. (2005). The perils of political correctness: Men's and women's responses to old-fashioned and modern sexist views. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68, 75-88. doi: 10.1177/019027250506800106
- 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, 476-496. doi: 10.1177/0886260513505210
- Black, B. M., Tolman, R. M., Callahan, M., Saunders, D. G., & Weisz, A. N. (2008). When will adolescents tell someone about dating violence victimization? *Violence Against Women*, 14, 741-758. doi: 10.1177/1077801208320248
- Bogle, K. (2007). The shift from dating to hooking up in college: What scholars have missed. *Sociology Compass*, 1/2, 775-788. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00031.x
- Bogle, K. (2008). *Hooking Up: Sex, Dating, and Relationships on Campus*. New York: New York University Press.
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60, 779-792. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5
- Casey, E. A. & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a positive bystander: Male antiviolence allies' experiences of 'Stepping Up'. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27, 62-83. doi: 10.1177/0886260511416479
- Cornelius, T. L. & Resseguie, N. (2007). Primary and secondary prevention programs for dating violence: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 364-375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2006.09.006>
- Cui, M., Ueno, K., Gordon, M., & Fincham, F. D. (2013). The continuation of intimate partner violence from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75, 300-313. doi: 10.1111/jomf.12016
- Darley, J. M. & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 377-383. <http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0025589>
- 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 Behavior*, 19, 346-362. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004>

- De Koker, P., Mathews, C., Zuch, M., Bastien, S., & Mason-Jones, A. J. (2014). A systematic review of interventions for preventing adolescent intimate partner violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 54*, 3-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.08.008>
- De La Rue, L., Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2014). School-based interventions to reduce dating and sexual violence: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 10*(7).
- Exner, D. & Cummings, N. (2011). Implications for sexual assault prevention: College students as prosocial bystanders. *Journal of American College Health, 59*, 655-657. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2010.515633
- Fellmeth, G. L. T., Heffernan, C., Nurse, J., Habibula, S., & Sethi, D. (2013). Educational and skills-based interventions for preventing relationship and dating violence in adolescents and young adults (Review). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Issue 6. Art. No.: CD004534*. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004534.pub3
- Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types, and injuries. *Health Education Research, 11*, 275-286. doi: 10.1093/her/11.3.275
- Foshee, V. A., Benefield, T. S., Ennett, S. T., Bauman, K. E., & Suchindran, C. (2004). Longitudinal predictors of serious physical and sexual dating violence victimization during adolescence. *Preventive Medicine, 39*, 1007-1016. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2004.04.014>
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, F., MacDougall, J. E., & Bangdiwala, S. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Preventive Medicine, 32*, 128-141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/pmed.2000.0793>
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L. M., & Ennett, S. T. (2010). Examination of sex and race differences in longitudinal predictors of the initiation of adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma, 19*, 492-516. doi: 10.1080/10926771.2010.495032
- Giordano, P. C. (2003). Relationships in adolescence. *Annual Review of Sociology, 29*, 257-281. doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100047
- Gressard, L. A., Swahn, M. H., & Tharp, A. T. (2015). A first look at gender inequality as a societal risk factor for dating violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 49*, 448-457. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2015.05.017>
- Halpern, C. T., Spriggs, A. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2009). Patterns of intimate partner violence victimization from adolescence to young adulthood in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45*, 508-516. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.011>

- Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims, 16*, 269-285.
- Howard, D. E., Wang, M. Q., Yan, F. (2007). Prevalence and psychosocial correlates of forced sexual intercourse among U.S. high school adolescents. *Adolescence, 42*, 629-643.
- Katz, J. [Jackson] (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention project. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*, 163-174.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17763/haer.65.2.55533188520136u1>
- Katz, J. [Jackson], 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*, 684-702. doi: 10.1177/1077801211409725
- Katz, J. [Jennifer]. (2015). Effects of group status and victim sex on male bystanders' responses to a potential party rape. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma, 24*, 588-602. doi:10.1080/10926771.2015.1029184
- Katz, J. [Jennifer], Colbert, S., & Colangelo, L. (2015). Effects of group status and victim sex on female bystanders' responses to a potential party rape. *Violence and Victims, 30*, 265-278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-13-00099>
- Katz, J. [Jennifer] & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. *Violence and Victims, 28*, 1054-1067.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00113>
- Kettrey, H. H. (in press). What's gender got to do with it? Sexual double standards and power in heterosexual college hookups. *The Journal of Sex Research*.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol- or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health, 57*, 639-649. doi:10.3200/JACH.57.6.639-649
- Latane, B. & Darley, J. N. (1969). Bystander 'apathy.' *American Scientist, 57*, 244-268.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27828530>
- McCauley, H. L., Tancredi, D. J., Silverman, J. G., Decker, M. R., Austin, S. B., McCormick, M. C., Virata, M. C., & Miller, E. (2013). Gender-equitable attitudes, bystander behavior, and recent abuse perpetration against heterosexual dating partners of male high school athletes. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*, 1882-1887.
- McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health, 59*, 3-11. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2010.483715

- 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*, 3-14. doi: 10.1177/1524838011426015
- Messner, M. A. (2015). Bad men, good men, bystanders: Who is the rapist? *Gender & Society*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0891243215608781
- Molidor, C. & Tolman, R. M. (1998). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 180-194. doi: 10.1177/1077801298004002004
- Noonan, R. K. & Charles, D. (2009). Developing teen dating violence prevention strategies: Formative research with middle school youth. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 1087-1105. doi: 10.1177/1077801209340761
- Storer, H. L., Casey, E., & Herrenkohl, T. (2015). Efficacy of bystander programs to prevent dating abuse among youth and young adults: A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/1524838015584361
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 199-214. <http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199>
- Weisz, A. N., Tolman, R. M., Callahan, M. R., Saunders, D. G., & Black, B. M. (2007). Informal helpers' responses when adolescents tell them about dating violence or romantic relationship problems. *Journal of Adolescence, 30*, 853-868. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2006.09.004>

REVIEW AUTHORS

Lead review author: The lead author is the person who develops and co-ordinates the review team, discusses and assigns roles for individual members of the review team, liaises with the editorial base and takes responsibility for the on-going updates of the review.

Name:	Heather Hensman Kettrey
Title:	Research Associate
Affiliation:	Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University
Address:	230 Appleton Place, BOX 0181 GPC
City, State, Province or County:	Nashville, TN
Postal Code:	37203-5721
Country:	USA

Phone:	615-476-6184
Email:	Heather.h.kettrey@vanderbilt.edu
Co-author(s): (There should be at least one co-author)	
Name:	Emily E. Tanner-Smith
Title:	Research Assistant Professor
Affiliation:	Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University
Address:	230 Appleton Place, BOX 0181 GPC
City, State, Province or County:	Nashville, TN
Postal Code:	37203-5721
Country:	USA
Phone:	615-322-6304
Email:	e.tanner-smith@vanderbilt.edu

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The research team at Vanderbilt University’s Peabody Research Institute (PRI) that will undertake this project includes the lead report author, co-author, and a research assistant. Dr. Kettrey, the lead review author, will coordinate the review team and assume responsibility for the implementation of the project throughout its duration. Specific tasks include compiling the sample of research reports, creating the database, coding studies, coding program training materials (i.e., program content variables), analyzing data, and preparing the Campbell Review. These activities will require an average of 10 hours per week for the duration of the one-year project. Dr. Tanner-Smith, review co-author, will devote 3% calendar year effort to the project, providing methodological guidance and mentorship to Dr. Kettrey throughout all phases of data collection and analysis (i.e., sampling, database construction, coding, data analysis, and preparing the Campbell Review).

The bibliographic information found in a thorough search for meta-analysis requires careful screening, first of abstracts, then retrieval and further screening of candidate full-text reports. The studies found eligible for the meta-analysis must then be carefully read and coded into an electronic database. To manage this labor-intensive portion of the work, one research assistant (TBD) will devote 10 hours per week to the project. This person will be selected from among the staff members of PRI who are familiar with meta-analysis, thus, minimizing the necessary training effort.

The research team has considerable experience and resources to apply to the requisite tasks. Dr. Kettrey’s research focuses on power and violence in intimate relationships during adolescence and young adulthood. Her most recent work explores relationships between

gender norms and unwanted sex on college hookups. Her completed and ongoing systematic reviews and meta-analyses include an analysis of the effects of gay-straight alliances on school-based victimization of LGBTQ+ youth (submitted for publication) and an analysis of the effects of specialized sex offender treatment on juvenile recidivism (in process).

Dr. Tanner-Smith is a research methodologist with emphasis in systematic reviewing and meta-analysis, and she is currently the Editor for the Methods Coordinating Group of The Campbell Collaboration. She has conducted numerous large-scale systematic reviews and meta-analyses, and has co-authored several Campbell Reviews. Her substantive interests fall within the realm of intervention programs targeting adolescents, including school-based violence prevention programs.

FUNDING

This proposed review is being submitted in response to a call for applications for grants offered by American Institutes for Research to fund systematic reviews that fill a policy-relevant evidence gap in one of the Campbell Collaboration's subject areas. Completion of the review is contingent upon receipt of this grant.

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest to report.

PRELIMINARY TIMEFRAME

- Date you plan to submit a draft protocol: 29 September 2016
- Date you plan to submit a draft review: 29 September 2017

The proposed project will be conducted over a one-year period at the Peabody Research Institute (PRI), a constituent part of the Peabody College of Education and Human Development at Vanderbilt University. This timeline assumes a prospective start date of 9/1/16.

1st Quarter: Create Study Protocol, Codebook, and Database

- Lead review author and co-author will complete and submit a study protocol to the Campbell Collaboration within six months of title registration submission (by 29 September 2016).

- Lead review author will compile study eligibility and coding scheme into a codebook.
- Lead review author will create and maintain a FileMaker database for project tracking (including creating fields for study-specific codes as outlined in the codebook).
- Lead review author will conduct systematic literature searches to identify candidate studies.
- Lead review author will train a research assistant to screen candidate studies for inclusion in the final sample.

2nd Quarter: Identify Eligible Studies

- Lead review author and research assistant will double-screen all titles/abstracts for eligibility.
- Lead review author will obtain copies of candidate studies that pass abstract screening.
- Lead review author and research assistant will double-screen all full-text studies for inclusion in the final sample and designate each candidate study as eligible or non-eligible (with justification) in FileMaker.

3rd Quarter: Code Eligible Studies

- Lead review author will obtain copies of program training materials relevant to the studies included in the analysis.
- Lead review author will train research assistant on coding procedures outlined in the codebook.
- Lead review author and research assistant will double-code all eligible studies (including training materials for variables pertinent to program content).

4th Quarter: Complete Data Analysis and Campbell Review

- Lead review author will conduct data analysis necessary for review preparation.
- Lead review author and co-author will finalize the full review and submit to the Campbell Collaboration within eighteen months of title registration submission (by 29 September 2017).

AUTHOR DECLARATION

Authors' responsibilities

By completing this form, you accept responsibility for preparing, maintaining, and updating the review in accordance with Campbell Collaboration policy. The Coordinating Group will provide as much support as possible to assist with the preparation of the review.

A draft protocol must be submitted to the Coordinating Group within one year of title acceptance. If drafts are not submitted before the agreed deadlines, or if we are unable to contact you for an extended period, the Coordinating Group has the right to de-register the title or transfer the title to alternative authors. The Coordinating Group also has the right to de-register or transfer the title if it does not meet the standards of the Coordinating Group and/or the Campbell Collaboration.

You accept responsibility for maintaining the review in light of new evidence, comments and criticisms, and other developments, and updating the review every five years, when substantial new evidence becomes available, or, if requested, transferring responsibility for maintaining the review to others as agreed with the Coordinating Group.

Publication in the Campbell Library

The support of the Coordinating Group in preparing your review is conditional upon your agreement to publish the protocol, finished review, and subsequent updates in the Campbell Library. The Campbell Collaboration places no restrictions on publication of the findings of a Campbell systematic review in a more abbreviated form as a journal article either before or after the publication of the monograph version in *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. Some journals, however, have restrictions that preclude publication of findings that have been, or will be, reported elsewhere and authors considering publication in such a journal should be aware of possible conflict with publication of the monograph version in *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. Publication in a journal after publication or in press status in *Campbell Systematic Reviews* should acknowledge the Campbell version and include a citation to it. Note that systematic reviews published in *Campbell Systematic Reviews* and co-registered with the Cochrane Collaboration may have additional requirements or restrictions for co-publication. Review authors accept responsibility for meeting any co-publication requirements.

I understand the commitment required to undertake a Campbell review, and agree to publish in the Campbell Library. Signed on behalf of the authors:

Form completed by: Heather Hensman Kettrey

Date: 29 March 2016