Evaluation of the UNK "Green Dot Program" and Safe Bars: Spring and Fall 2025

October 20, 2025

Dr. Tara N. Richards, Professor
Emilie Whitehouse, M.S., Graduate Research Assistant
School of Criminology and Criminal Justice
Victimology and Victim Studies Research Lab
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Background

Green Dot is a community-based bystander intervention program that empowers individuals to prevent violence before it occurs. At the University of Nebraska at Kearney (UNK), Green Dot equips students, faculty, and staff with the skills to recognize warning signs and take small, safe actions—known as *Green Dots*—that contribute to a culture of safety. As part of the larger Kearney community, UNK plays a key role in promoting these prevention efforts, reinforcing that everyone has a part in building a community where power-based violence is not tolerated.

Survey, Data, and Sample

In 2025, SAFE Center adopted a pre/post intervention survey for participants in the Green Dot Program at University of Nebraska Kearney (UNK). Participants complete a pre- test survey (i.e., before beginning the program) which aims to develop baseline scores for participants' attitudes on (1) unhealthy relationship behaviors, (2) violence prevention, and (3) likelihood to act to respond to and prevent relationship violence. The post-intervention survey repeats the same questions as the pre-intervention survey to measure change in participant's knowledge, attitudes, and behavior related to participation in the intervention.

From March to September, 2025, n = 179 students participated in the Green Dot Program; n = 163 students completed the pre-intervention survey (91% response rate), n = 111 completed the post-intervention survey (62% response rate), and n = 104 participants completed both a pre- and post-intervention survey (58% response rate). Across all three surveys, most participants were 18-24 years old, female and White (See Table 1). These demographics align with the overall population of students at UNK.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics from Pre-, Post-, and Both Pre- and Post- Intervention Surveys

Variable	Pre-Intervention Survey (*n* = 163)	Post-Intervention Survey (*n* = 111)	Pre- and Post- Intervention Survey (*n* = 104)
	n (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)
Age			
under 18	2 (1.2)	1 (0.90)	1 (0.96)
18-24	160 (98.2)	102 (91.9)	102 (98.1)
25-34	1 (0.6)	1 (0.90)	1 (0.96)
Unknown	-	7 (6.3)	-
Gender			
Male	67 (41.4)	38 (34.2)	38 (36.5)
Female	94 (57.7)	64 (57.7)	64 (61.5)
Female & Non Binary	1 (0.6)	-	1 (0.96)
Unknown	1 (0.6)	9 (8.1)	1 (0.96)
Race/Ethnicity			
White/Caucasian	102 (63.0)	53 (47.8)	53 (51.0)
Hispanic/Latino	43 (26.4)	36 (32.4)	32 (34.6)
Black/African American	6 (3.7)	5 (4.5)	(4.81)
Asian	1 (0.6)		
Multiracial	9 (5.5)	8 (7.2)	8 (7.7)
Other/Unknown	2 (1.2)	7 (6.3)	2 (1.9)

Survey Findings

To begin, the pre-intervention survey asks participants to rate how serious it is when an individual engages in a series of unhealthy relationship behaviors (i.e., *1 = not serious to 4 = very serious*). Table 2 below presents the average (mean) scores and standard deviations for each unhealthy relationship behavior. Results show that on average participants identified all behaviors as serious to very serious (*M* = 3+); participants rated physical violence as more serious than coercive, controlling behaviors. For example, participants' average rating for "physically hurts the person they are dating (e.g., hitting, punching, shoving)" was a 3.93 (out of 4) compared to a 3.08 for "tells the person they are dating they cannot talk to certain people" and a 3.12 for "Tells the person they are dating that they cannot do certain things". Regarding digital abuse, participants rated "Pressures the person they are dating into sending nude photos" as 3.85 (out of 4) and "Sends unwelcome nude photos to the person they are dating" as 3.71.

Table 2. Mean Scores on Attitudes on Relationship Behaviors Questions for Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre-Intervention (*N* = 162).

How serious is it when a person... *(1 = not serious and 4 = very serious)*	Pre-intervention	
	M	*SD*
Physically hurts the person they are dating (e.g., hitting, punching, shoving).	3.93	0.36
Threatens to hurt the person they are dating.	3.80	0.50
Insults, puts down, or calls the person they are dating names.	3.43	0.69
Threatens to hurt themselves if the person they are dating does not do what they want.	3.83	0.48
Tells the person they are dating that they cannot talk to certain people.	3.08	0.85
Tells the person they are dating that they cannot do certain things.	3.12	0.82
Prevents the person they are dating from leaving places when they want to.	3.50	0.67
Pressures the person they are dating into sharing their passwords.	3.23	0.85
Pressures the person they are dating into sending nude photos.	3.85	0.51
Pressures the person they are dating into sharing their private digital conversations (e.g., text messages).	3.44	0.76
Sends unwelcome nude photos to the person they are dating.	3.71	0.68

Tables 3 to 5 present the average (mean) scores and standard deviations for the sample pre-intervention and post-intervention surveys as well as *t*-tests to examine any significant changes in average scores over the course of the intervention (i.e., changes from pre to post survey). Alpha was set at *p* < .05 for *t*- tests: any pair of mean scores with a corresponding *p*-value of *p* = .05 or smaller represents a statistically significant difference in the mean scores with a confidence level of 95% or greater.

First the survey asks about participants' attitudes about violence prevention *(1 = strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree*). Table 3 presents the average score on each survey question for the sample pre-intervention and post-intervention as well as the *t*-score and *p*-value; values that changed significantly from pre- to post-intervention are in bold. Notably, pre-intervention, the majority of the sample agreed (*M* = 4) to strongly agreed (*M* = 4.8+) with all of statements (e.g., "dating/partner violence is an important issue to address on this campus," "it is possible to prevent sexual violence on this campus," and "I have a role in preventing stalking on this campus". Even so, when mean scores pre- and post-intervention were compared, there were significant changes in participants' average attitudinal scores across all statements, and each change was in the intended direction given the intervention. In other words, participant's agreement with all statements regarding violence prevention significantly *increased from pre to post intervention*.

Table 3. Mean Scores for Attitudes about Violence Prevention Questions for Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre- and Post-Intervention and T-tests (*N* = 104).

How much do you agree or disagree with the following… *(1 = strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree)*	Pre-intervention		Post-intervention			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Sexual violence is an important issue to address on this campus.	4.76	0.45	4.92	0.27	4.20	<.001
Dating/partner violence is an important issue to address on this campus.	4.73	0.51	4.91	0.32	4.28	<.001
Stalking is an important issue to address on this campus.	4.74	0.48	4.92	0.27	3.90	<.001
It is possible to prevent sexual violence on this campus.	4.58	0.66	4.84	0.52	3.41	.001
It is possible to prevent dating violence on this campus.	4.45	0.79	4.88	0.36	5.78	<.001
It is possible to prevent stalking on this campus.	4.40	0.84	4.86	0.38	5.60	<.001
I have a role in preventing sexual violence on this campus.	4.39	0.76	4.85	0.44	6.26	<.001
I have a role in preventing dating/partner violence on this campus.	4.36	0.79	4.83	0.45	6.20	<.001
I have a role in preventing stalking on this campus.	4.35	0.77	4.82	0.46	6.10	<.001

Next, the survey asks participants about their likelihood of reactive intervention regarding relationship violence (i.e., *1 = very unlikely to 5 = very likely*). Table 4 presents the average score on each survey question for the sample pre-intervention and post-intervention as well as the *t*-score and *p*-value; values that changed significantly from pre- to post-intervention are in bold. Pre-intervention, respondents' average scores regarding their likelihood of reactive intervention were all 4+ indicating respondents were likely to very likely to intervene. Even so, post- intervention, *scores across all questions significantly increased,* indicating a greater likelihood of intervention. For example, pre-intervention participants' average score for "talk to a friend who was being physically hurt by a partner" was 4.61 (out of 5), post-intervention, participants' average score was 4.84. Likewise, pre-intervention, participants' average score for "find a way to distract or de-escalate a high-risk situation between two people (e.g. talk loudly on cell phone, spill a drink, change the subject, etc.)" was 4.39 compared to 4.79 post-intervention.

Table 4. Mean Scores for Reactive Intention to Act Questions for Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre-and Post-Intervention and T-tests (*N* = 104).

How likely are you to… (1 = very unlikely to 5 = very likely)	Pre-intervention		Post-intervention			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Talk to a friend who was being physically hurt by their partner.	4.61	0.69	4.84	0.40	3.76	<.001
Ask someone who looked very upset at a party/dance/sports event if they were ok or needed help.	4.38	0.74	4.73	0.51	5.11	<.001
Speak up to someone who was bragging or making excuses for forcing someone to have sex with them.	4.54	0.71	4.77	0.53	3.30	.001
Get help for a friend because they had been forced to have sex or were physically hurt by a partner.	4.68	0.61	4.83	0.41	2.78	.006
Find someone else to help if you see a couple arguing loudly and you're worried the fight might turn physical (e.g. call 911, get other friends or peers involved, etc.).	4.41	0.82	4.77	0.47	4.76	<.001
Find a way to distract or de-escalate a high-risk situation between two people (e.g. talk loudly on cell phone, spill a drink, change the subject, etc.).	4.39	0.80	4.79	0.43	5.74	<.001
Do something to help a very drunk person who is being brought upstairs to a bedroom by someone at a party.	4.64	0.62	4.84	0.40	3.41	0.001
Speak up to someone who is calling their dating partner names or swearing at them.	4.35	0.85	4.76	0.49	5.56	<.001

In addition, the survey asks participants about their likelihood of proactive intervention regarding relationship violence (i.e., 1 = very unlikely to 5 = very likely). Table 5 presents the average score on each survey question for the sample pre-intervention and post-intervention as well as the *t*-score and *p*-value; values that changed significantly from pre- to post-intervention are in bold. Pre-intervention, respondents' average scores regarding their likelihood of proactive intervention were all 3.7+ indicating respondents were likely to intervene. Even so, post- intervention, *scores across all questions significantly increased* to 4.5+, indicating a greater likelihood of intervention. For example, pre-intervention participants' average score for "Post on social media in support of victims of violence or violence prevention" was 3.78 (out of 5), post-intervention, participants' average score was 4.54. Likewise, pre-intervention, participants' average score for "Talk with your friends or co-workers about activities you could do individually or together to help prevent dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking on campus or in your community" was 4.33 compared to 4.72 post-intervention.

Table 5. Mean Scores for Proactive Intention to Act Questions for Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre-and Post-Intervention and T-tests (*N* = 104).

How likely are you to… (1 = very unlikely to 5 = very likely)	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Post on social media in support of victims of violence or violence prevention.	3.78	1.09	4.54	0.78	8.07	<.001
Let a friend, classmate or co-worker know that you support them for stepping in as a bystander, helping someone or intervening (e.g. say something directly, nod, smile, affirm in some other way).	4.61	0.63	4.81	0.44	3.36	0.001
Talk with your friends about what you can do to keep yourself or others safe from dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking.	4.33	0.83	4.72	0.60	5.32	<.001
Talk with your friends or co-workers about activities you could do individually or together to help prevent dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking on campus or in your community.	4.27	0.92	4.72	0.65	5.86	<.001
Attend a training, class or talk about dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking and/or violence prevention that is NOT mandatory.	3.83	1.14	4.54	0.79	7.24	<.001

Comparisons Between Male and Female Respondents

Next, we examined survey responses separately for female and male respondents. Table 6 presents mean scores on the attitudes about violence prevention questions with findings showing high mean scores (*M* = 4.3 +) for all questions before the intervention for both female and male participants as well as significant increases from pre-to-post intervention on all questions for females and all but one question for males. Specifically, for the statement, "it is possible to prevent sexual violence on this campus," male participants strongly agreed with this statement before the intervention (*M* = 4.50) and their agreement increased after the intervention (*M* = 4.76); however, the increase was not statistically significant.

Table 6. Mean Scores for Attitudes about Violence Prevention Questions for Female and Male Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre-and Post-Intervention and T-tests (*N* = 102[1]).

How much do you agree or disagree with the following… (1 = strong disagree to 5 strongly agree)	Females (*n* = 58)						Males (*n* = 34)					
	Pre-intervention		Post-intervention				Pre-intervention		Post-intervention			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Sexual violence is an important issue to address on this campus.	4.75	0.47	4.91	0.29	3.07	.003	4.76	0.43	4.95	0.23	2.89	.006
Dating/partner violence is an important issue to address on this campus.	4.70	0.55	4.89	0.36	3.21	.002	4.76	0.43	4.95	0.23	2.89	.006
Stalking is an important issue to address on this campus.	4.75	0.50	4.91	0.29	2.61	.011	4.71	0.46	4.95	0.23	2.98	.005
It is possible to prevent sexual violence on this campus.	4.63	0.63	4.88	0.38	3.38	0.001	4.50	0.73	4.76	0.71	1.57	.124
It is possible to prevent dating violence on this campus.	4.45	0.78	4.89	0.36	4.78	<.001	4.45	0.83	4.84	0.37	3.08	.004
It is possible to prevent stalking on this campus.	4.47	0.73	4.88	0.38	4.60	<.001	4.29	1.01	4.82	0.39	3.22	.003
I have a role in preventing sexual violence on this campus.	4.44	0.77	4.89	0.36	4.81	<.001	4.32	0.74	4.79	0.53	4.03	<.001
I have a role in preventing dating/partner violence on this campus.	4.41	0.79	4.88	0.38	4.83	<.001	4.26	0.80	4.76	0.54	3.87	<.001
I have a role in preventing stalking on this campus.	4.33	0.82	4.88	0.38	5.37	<.001	4.37	0.71	4.74	0.55	3.03	.004

Note: [1] The *n* = 2 participants identified as female/non-binary and non-binary and were excluded here.

Table 7 presents mean scores on the reactive intention to act questions with findings showing high mean scores (M = 4.2 +) for all questions before the intervention for both female and male participants as well as significant increases from pre-to-post intervention on all questions for females and 7 of 8 question for males. Specifically, for the statement, "get help for a friend because they had been forced to have sex or were physically hurt by a partner" male participants were likely to very likely to intervene before participating in the Green Dot Program (M = 4.58) and their likelihood increased after the Program (M = 4.76, respectively); however, the increase was not statistically significant.

Table 7. Mean Scores for Reactive Intention to Act Questions for Female and Male Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre-and Post-Intervention and T-tests (N = 102[1]).

How likely are you to… (1 = very unlikely to 5 = very likely)	Females (n = 58)						Males (n = 34)					
	Pre-intervention		Post-intervention				Pre-intervention		Post-intervention			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
Talk to a friend who was being physically hurt by their partner.	4.69	0.64	4.84	0.41	2.20	.03	4.45	0.76	4.82	0.39	3.18	.003
Ask someone who looked very upset at a party/dance/sports event if they were ok or needed help.	4.48	0.73	4.77	0.50	3.21	.002	4.16	0.72	4.66	0.53	4.25	<.001
Speak up to someone who was bragging or making excuses for forcing someone to have sex with them.	4.58	0.73	4.81	0.43	2.95	.004	4.47	0.69	4.76	0.49	2.32	.03
Get help for a friend because they had been forced to have sex or were physically hurt by a partner.	4.73	0.62	4.86	0.35	2.05	.045	4.58	0.60	4.76	0.49	1.87	.07
Find someone else to help if you see a couple arguing loudly and you're worried the fight might turn physical (e.g. call 911, get other friends or peers involved, etc.).	4.48	0.85	4.84	0.41	3.77	<.001	4.26	0.76	4.63	0.54	2.89	.01
Find a way to distract or de-escalate a high-risk situation between two people (e.g. talk loudly on cell phone, spill a drink, change the subject, etc.).	4.44	0.83	4.86	0.39	4.62	<.001	4.29	0.77	4.68	0.47	3.39	.002
Do something to help a very drunk person who is being brought upstairs to a bedroom by someone at a party.	4.72	0.58	4.88	0.33	2.61	.01	4.53	0.69	4.76	0.49	2.04	.048
Speak up to someone who is calling their dating partner names or swearing at them.	4.45	0.78	4.83	0.46	4.58	<.001	4.13	0.94	4.66	0.53	3.64	.001

Note: [1] The n = 2 participants identified as female/non-binary and non-binary and were excluded here.

Finally, Table 8 presents mean scores on the proactive intention to act questions with findings showing moderate to high mean scores (M = 3.3 +) for all questions before the intervention for both female and male participants as well as significant increases from pre-to-post intervention on all questions for females and males. For female participants, the greatest average change was seen for "attend a training, class or talk about dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking and/or violence prevention that is not mandatory" with an average score of 3.98 (out of 5) before the Green Dot program and 4.67 after the program. For male participants, the greatest average change was seen for "post on social media in support of victims of violence or violence prevention" with an average score of 3.37 before the Green Dot program and 4.26 after the program.

Table 8. Mean Scores for Proactive Intention to Act Questions for Female and Male Participants in the UNK Green Dot Program Pre-and Post-Intervention and T-tests (*N* = 94).

How likely are you to… (1 = very unlikely to 5 = very likely)	Females (*n* = 58)						Males (*n* = 34)					
	Pre-intervention		Post-intervention				Pre-intervention		Post-intervention			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Post on social media in support of victims of violence or violence prevention.	3.98	0.97	4.69	0.61	6.23	<.001	3.37	1.17	4.26	0.95	5.20	<.001
Let a friend, classmate or co-worker know that you support them for stepping in as a bystander, helping someone or intervening (e.g. say something directly, nod, smile, affirm in some other way).	4.66	0.67	4.84	0.41	2.26	.03	4.50	0.56	4.74	0.50	2.69	.01
Talk with your friends about what you can do to keep yourself or others safe from dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking.	4.44	0.83	4.84	0.44	4.46	<.001	4.11	0.80	4.50	0.76	2.96	.005
Talk with your friends or co-workers about activities you could do individually or together to help prevent dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking on campus or in your community.	4.31	0.94	4.81	0.47	5.02	<.001	4.16	0.89	4.55	0.86	3.08	.004
Attend a training, class or talk about dating violence, sexual violence, or stalking and/or violence prevention that is NOT mandatory.	3.98	1.09	4.67	0.64	6.32	<.001	3.53	1.20	4.29	0.96	3.86	<.001

Summary of Green Dot Survey Findings

Taken together, these findings show significant, positive changes in Green Dot program participants' attitudes on (1) unhealthy relationship behaviors, (2) violence prevention, and (3) likelihood to act to prevent and respond to relationship violence from pre-to post-intervention. Regarding analyses by sex, male participants on average showed more increases in mean scores from pre-to-post intervention compared to female students. These data also suggest that participants hold moderate/ high levels of knowledge regarding unhealthy relationships and violence prevention and likelihood to respond to and prevent violence prior to the intervention with many students having little "room to grow" regarding positive change in their scores.

Safe Bars Background

The SAFE Center also provides local restaurants and bars with the "Safe Bars" program which "trains staff at bars, restaurants, breweries, and clubs to recognize and respond to sexual harassment and assault among staff and patrons" (Safe Bars, 2023, p. 11). More specifically, Safe Bars works to:

- Increase staff understanding of the scope and causes of unwanted sexual aggression;
- Increase staff recognition of inappropriate behavior along the continuum of sexual and relationship violence;
- Provide staff with the skills to respond to such behavior safely and appropriately, whether by stepping up or when asked for help;
- Actively promote establishments that adopt safety standards (p.11).

Safe Bars Survey

From April to October 2025, 25 participants completed Safe Bars training; 25 participants (100%) completed a pre-training survey, and 20 of these participants (80% response rate) also completed a post- training survey (i.e., *n* = 20 completed both the pre-and post- training surveys). Regarding the pre-training survey, 64% of participants were female, 60% were White, and 60% were ages 18 to 34. The highest concentration of respondents - 36% - reported being in the service industry from 1-5 years or more than 10 years, respectively, while 12% reported less than one year experience in the service industry and 16% 6-10 years.

Survey Findings

First, the pre-training survey asked respondents about their experiences witnessing guests and/or staff being bothered or harassed as well as how big of a problem harassment was at the establishment where they worked. As see in Table 9, most respondents had encountered sexual harassment against guests or staff at the establishment where they worked (i.e., once a shift, once a week, or once a month); however, most respondents reported that sexual harassment *was not a problem* at the establishment where they worked (see Table 10).

Table 9. Safe Bar Trainees' Observation of Harassment against Guests and Staff (*N* = 25)

	Many times on my shifts n (%)	At least once on my shifts n (%)	Once a week n (%)	Once a month n (%)	Never n (%)	Other n (%)
How often do you see **guests** being bothered or harassed by other guests or staff members?	0 (0.0)	3 (12.0)	5 (20.0)	9 (45.5)	4 (9.1)	4 (9.1)
How often do you see **staff** being bothered or harassed by other guests or staff members?	0 (0.0)	1 (4.0)	5 (20.0)	8 (32.0)	6 (24.0)	5 (20.0)

Table 10. Safe Bars Trainees' Perception of Harassment in their Current Workplace (*N* = 25)

	Not a Problem 1 n (%)	2 n (%)	3 n (%)	4 n (%)	A Big Problem 5 n (%)
How big of a problem would you say harassment is at your current workplace?	13 (52.0)	7 (28.0)	4 (16.0)	1 (4.0)	0 (0.0)

Next, the survey asked respondents how well they understood the direct, distract, delegate, document, and delay bystander techniques, respectively on a scale of 1 = not very well to 5 = very well). Table 11 presents the average (mean) scores and standard deviations for the sample pre-training and post-training as well as t-tests to examine any significant changes in average scores over the course of the intervention (i.e., changes from pre to post survey). Alpha was set at $p < .05$ for t- tests: any pair of mean scores with a corresponding p-value of $p = .05$ or smaller represents a statistically significant difference in the mean scores with a confidence level of 95% or greater. Pre-training, respondents reported average scores of 2.90 to 3.40 out of 5 on each of the bystander techniques representing low to neutral levels of understanding (See Table 3). Post-training, respondents reported significant increases in their average scores with means increasing to 4.65 to 4.74 representing high levels of understanding of the direct, distract, delegate, document, and delay bystander techniques, respectively.

Table 11. Safe Bars Trainees' Understanding of Bystander Techniques Pre-and Post-Training and T-tests (N = 20)

How well do you understand the… *(1 = not well to 5 = very well)*	Pre-intervention		Post-intervention			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Direct active bystander technique?	2.90	1.12	4.65	.59	-6.25	<.001
Distract active bystander technique?	3.05	1.10	4.75	.55	-6.24	<.001
Delegate active bystander technique?	3.40	1.14	4.70	.57	-4.65	<.001
Document active bystander technique?	3.10	1.25	4.70	.57	-5.45	.001
Delay active bystander technique?	3.11	1.15	4.74	.56	-5.66	<.001

As seen in Table 12, before the training most respondents reported that they had previously utilized 6 of the 8 bystander behaviors in situations where a guest or staff member was being harassed: speaking directly to the person being harassed or the person harassing others, telling a joke or story to diffuse the situation, asking a co-worker for help, telling a manager on duty, and responding another way. Fewer respondents (32%) reported documenting the situation, while 40% of respondents reported having encountered harassment but not responding.

Table 12. Safe Bars Trainees' Utilization of Bystander Behaviors Pre-Training (*N* = 25)

	Yes	No	No opportunity
	n (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)
Spoken directly to the person being harassed about the harassment (e.g., asked them if they were ok, needed help, etc.).	21 (84.0)	-	4 (16.0)
Spoken directly to the person bothering or harassing others about the harassment (e.g., asked them to stop, asked them to leave, etc.).	21 (84.0)	1 (4.0)	3 (12.0)
Told a joke or story to one or more parties involved to diffuse the situation.	17 (68.0)	3 (12.0)	5 (20.0)
Asked a co-worker for help.	20 (80.0)	1 (4.0)	4 (16.0)
Told a manager on duty.	20 (80.0)	1 (4.0)	4 (16.0)
Documented the situation.	8 (32.0)	10 (40.0)	7 (28.0)
Responded in another way.	16 (64.0)	3 (12.0)	6 (24.0)
Encountered harassment but did not respond.	10 (40.0)	9 (36.0)	6 (24.0)

Post-training, most respondents reported that they were extremely likely to utilize each of the bystander behaviors if they encountered a guest or staff member being harassed in the future (See Table 13). In addition, 45% noted that they were extremely unlikely to "encounter harassment but not respond" (i.e., a score of 1 or 2).

Table 13. Safe Bars Trainees' Perceived Future Utilization of Bystander Behaviors (*N* = 20)

	Extremely Unlikely 1	2	3	4	Extremely Likely 5
	n (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)
Speak directly to the person being harassed about the harassment (e.g., asked them if they were ok, needed help, etc.).	-	-	2 (10.0)	5 (25.0)	13 (65.0)
Speak directly to the person bothering or harassing others about the harassment (e.g., asked them to stop, asked them to leave, etc.).	-	-	3 (15.0)	7 (35.0)	10 (50.0)
Tell a joke or story to one or more parties involved to diffuse the situation.	-	-	2 (10.0)	6 (30.0)	12 (60.0)
Ask a co-worker for help.	-	-	3 (15.0)	2 (10.0)	15 (75.0)
Tell a manager on duty.	-	-	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	18 (90.0)
Document the situation.	-	1 (5.0)	2 (10.0)	3 (15.0)	14 (70.0)
Respond in another way.	-	-	7 (35.0)	4 (20.0)	9 (45.0)
Encounter harassment but not respond.	6 (30.0)	3 (15.0)	4 (20.0)	-	7 (35.0)

Finally, the post-training survey asked respondents about the quality of the presenters and the training. Most respondents who completed the post-training survey found the Safe Bars' presenter to be knowledgeable (i.e., 95% reported a score of 4 or 5) and all respondents reported the training was relevant to their workplace and that they learned new information about bystander techniques (See Table 14).

Table 14. Safe Bars Trainees' Perceptions of Safe Bars Training (*N* = 20)

	Not Well 1	2	3	4	Very Well 5
	n (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)	*n* (%)
The presenter was knowledgeable about the topic.	-	-	1 (5.0)	1 (5.0)	18 (90.0)
The training was relevant to my workplace.	-	-	-	3 (15.0)	17 (85.0)
I learned new information about active bystander techniques.	-	-	-	2 (10.0)	18 (90.0)

Summary of Safe Bars Survey Findings

Respondents reported observing harassment of guests and staff at the establishments where they worked, but most respondents also reported that such behavior was "not a problem" where they worked. Further, most respondents reported using bystander behaviors before the training and plans to use them in the future. Comparisons of pre- and post-training scores show significant, positive changes in participants' perceived knowledge of the direct, distract, delegate, document, and delay bystander techniques. In addition, most participants reported positively in regard to the presenters and training materials and that they learned something new at the training.