

Last reviewed: February 2023

Intervention website: <https://alteristic.org/services/green-dot/>

GUIDEBOOK INTERVENTION INFORMATION SHEET

Green Dot

Please note that in the ‘Intervention Summary’ table below ‘child age’, ‘level of need’, and ‘race and ethnicities’ information is **as evaluated in studies**. Information in other fields describes the intervention as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.

Intervention summary	
Description	Green Dot is a school-based, gender violence prevention intervention for young people aged between 14 and 18 years. 12 to 15% of the student body attend four five-hour training sessions occurring throughout the school years. These students then act as opinion leaders to encourage safer sexual attitudes and behaviours with their friends and school peers. Green Dot educators also provide motivational speeches to the entire school population on an annual basis.
Evidence rating	2+
Cost rating	N/A
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preventing crime, violence and antisocial behaviour - Reduced sexual violence
Child age (population characteristic)	14 to 18 years
Level of need (population characteristic)	Universal

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Intervention summary	
Race and ethnicities (population characteristic)	White American
Type (model characteristic)	School-based
Setting (model characteristic)	Secondary School
Workforce (model characteristic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Green Dot Educators• Teachers• School Leaders.
UK available?	Yes
UK tested?	No

Model description

Green Dot is a school-based intervention aimed at reducing the incidence of sexual violence in students attending secondary and sixth-form schools.

Green Dot educators provide motivational speeches to the entire school population at regular intervals throughout the school year. This is augmented by more intensive training offered to 12 to 15% of the student body through four five-hour sessions provided at regular intervals throughout the school year. The expectation is that the trained students will act as opinion leaders to help disseminate and normalise the idea that sexual violence should not be tolerated and that everyone has a role in preventing it.

During the training sessions, students learn pro-social behaviours aimed at establishing two school norms: (1) dating violence, sexual assault, and bullying will not be tolerated, and (2) everyone is expected to do their part.

Specifically, student leaders are introduced to the concept of red and green dots that bystanders can use to identify precursors of sexual violence and intervene. Red dots are evidence of sexual violence or known warning signs. Examples of red dots include acts of sexual violence (rape, assault), stalking behaviours, sexual coercion, and intimidation, with the aim of inducing fear. A red dot is also an individual choice to do nothing in the face of a potentially high-risk situation.

Foundations Guidebook – Intervention information sheet

Visit the Foundations Guidebook | www.foundations.org.uk/guidebook

Green dots are strategies that bystanders can use to identify the red dots and intervene. Examples of reactive green dots include:

- Directly confronting a situation that might lead to sexual violence or unhealthy dating behaviour
- Distracting the situation by interrupting it, or diverting the participants from potentially dangerous situations
- Delegating responsibility for fixing or preventing the problem by finding someone with agency for changing the situation (teacher, parent, other friends, police officer, etc.).

Throughout their training, students are also helped to implement proactive green dots through campaigns, events, and fundraisers. Examples of proactive green dots include increasing awareness about the signs of sexual violence, encouraging peers to take a stance against sexually violent behaviours, or posting a bystander intervention story on social media.

Target population

Age of child	14 to 18 years
Target population	All students attending secondary school and sixth form.

Please note that the information in this section on target population is as **offered/supported by the intervention provider**.



Theory of change

Why		Who	How	What		
Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Science-based assumption	Intervention	Short-term outcomes	Medium-term outcomes	Long-term outcomes
Sexual violence during adolescence is common and increases the risk of poor mental health, repeat victimisation and other poor outcomes in adulthood.	Sexual violence in adolescence is encouraged and discouraged by social norms.	Students attending secondary school and sixth form can shift social norms by reducing the acceptance of interpersonal violence, and reporting sexual violence when it does occur.	Students learn about the 'red dots' or warning signs associated with sexual violence so they can prevent or respond to them through effective 'green dot' behaviours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased recognition of warning signs for interpersonal violence including sexual assault and dating violence • Increased bystander intervention behaviours • Reduced acceptance of sexual violence or intimidating behaviours amongst peers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer young people commit or experience sexual violence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increased likelihood of healthy sexual and dating behaviours in adulthood.



Implementation requirements

Who is eligible?	Students in a school setting aged 14 to 18.
How is it delivered?	Green Dot is delivered in multiple sessions of one to six hours' duration across multiple years to groups of 25 to 35 young people.
What happens during the intervention?	<p>The intervention is delivered through two components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An annual 50-minute Green Dot speech delivered schoolwide for four years • Four five-hour training sessions delivered to 'student leaders' throughout the school year. School leaders are identified by the educators and school staff.
Who can deliver it?	Green Dot educators, teachers and student leaders.
What are the training requirements?	N/A
How are practitioners supervised?	N/A
What are the systems for maintaining fidelity?	N/A
Is there a licensing requirement?	N/A
*Contact details	<p>Contact person: Kristen Parks</p> <p>Organisation: Alteristic</p> <p>Email address: Parks@alteristic.org</p> <p>Website/s: https://alteristic.org/services/green-dot/</p> <p>*Please note that this information may not be up to date. In this case, please visit the listed intervention website for up to date contact details.</p>



Evidence summary

Green Dot's most rigorous evidence comes from a cluster RCT conducted in the United States, consistent with Foundations' Level 2+ evidence strength threshold.

This study identified statistically significant reductions in reports of sexual violence, sexual harassment, and stalking.

Green Dot has preliminary evidence of improving a child outcome, but we cannot be confident that the programme caused the improvement.

Search and review

	Number of studies
Identified in search	18
Studies reviewed	1
Meeting the L2 threshold	1
Meeting the L3 threshold	0
Contributing to the L4 threshold	0
Ineligible	17



Individual study summary: Study 1

Study 1	
Study design	RCT
Country	United States
Sample characteristics	Over 20,000 students living in the US state of Kentucky attending grades 9–12 in US high schools. The gender distribution was evenly balanced.
Race, ethnicities, and nationalities	85% White American. Other ethnicities not reported.
Population risk factors	A significant portion of the sample came from lower socioeconomic backgrounds and 45% were eligible for reduced-price school meals.
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Post-test (Year 1) • Post-test (Year 2) • Post-test (Year 3) • Post-test (Year 4).
Child outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual violence perpetration rates (Child self-report and administrative data) • Sexual violence victimisation rates (Child self-report and administrative data).
Other outcomes	None
Study Rating	2+
Citation	Coker, A.L., Bush, H.M., Cook-Craig, P.G., DeGue, S., Clear, E.R., Brancato, C.J., Fisher, B.S. & Recktenwald, E.A. (2017) RCT testing bystander effectiveness to reduce violence. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> . 52 (5), 566–578.



Brief summary

Population characteristics

This study involved 26 high schools in the US state of Kentucky, reaching over 20,00 students between 14 and 18 years over a four-year period. 85% of the students were White American and 45% were eligible for free school meals.

Study design

This cluster-randomised controlled trial evaluated the effectiveness of the Green Dot bystander intervention across 26 high schools. Schools were paired based on demographic similarities and randomly assigned to implement the Green Dot (13) or no intervention (13).

Control schools were wait-listed and did not receive any bystander intervention during the trial period.

Measurement

School-level counts of sexual violence and sexually related harm were captured through students' responses to questions from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, adapted for use in high schools. The survey was repeated annually by all students during the four years of the study.

Study retention

Two schools dropped out of the study over the four-year period, the first from the control group during year one and the second during year three, after data had been collected for the year.

Survey response rates averaged 83.9% from baseline through Year 4, representing a gradual decline in response rates over time.

Results

Data-analytic strategy

Annual school sums of student responses compared the impact of Green Dot to no intervention in reducing sexual violence in schools. Linear mixed models were also used to evaluate condition-time (CxT) interactions and provide mean estimates by condition year. Missing data was imputed using single imputation (last observation carried forward), enabling intent-to-treat analysis with complete data sets from all 26 schools.

Findings

The study observed 17–21% reductions in sexual violence perpetration in Green Dot schools during the third and fourth years of the trial. Statistically significant reductions were also observed in Green Dot students' reports of sexual harassment, sexual harassment, stalking, and dating violence perpetration and victimisation.



Limitations

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are limited by methodological issues pertaining to a lack of clarity about study attrition and baseline equivalence, hence why a higher rating is not achieved.

Study 1: Outcomes table

Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Child outcomes					
Sexual violence perpetration	Adapted from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (Child self-report)	–	Yes	26	Post-test: Years 1–4
Sexual violence victimisation	Adapted from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (Child self-report)	–	Yes	26	Post-test: Years 1–4
Sexual Harassment Perpetration	Adapted from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) (Child self-report)	–	Yes	26	Post-test: Years 1–4
Stalking Perpetration	Adapted from the National Violence Against Women Survey (Child self-report)	–	Yes	26	Post-test: Years 1–4



Outcome	Measure	Effect size	Statistical significance	Number of participants	Measurement time point
Psychological Dating Violence Perpetration	Adapted from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (Child self-report)	–	Yes	26	Post-test: Years 1–4

Other studies

The following studies were identified for this intervention but did not count towards the intervention's overall evidence rating. An intervention receives the same rating as its most robust study or studies:

Azam, M. T., Bush, H. M., Coker, A. L. & Westgate, P. M. (2021) Effect sizes and intra-cluster correlation coefficients measured from the Green Dot High School study for guiding sample size calculations when designing future violence prevention cluster randomized trials in school settings. *Contemporary Clinical Trials Communications*. 23, 100831.

Banyard, V., Edwards, K. & Rizzo, A. (2019) 'What would the neighbors do?' Measuring sexual and domestic violence prevention social norms among youth and adults. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 47 (8), 1817–1833

Banyard, V. L., Edwards, K. M., Rizzo, A. J., Rothman, E. F., Greenberg, P. & Kearns, M. C. (2020) Improving social norms and actions to prevent sexual and intimate partner violence: A pilot study of the impact of green dot community on youth. *Journal of Prevention and Health Promotion*. 1 (2), 183–211.

Coker, A. L., Heather M. Bush, Zhengyan Huang, Candace J. Brancato, Emily R. Clear & Diane R. Follingstad (2021) How does Green Dot bystander training in high school and beyond impact attitudes toward violence and sexism in a prospective cohort? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 37 (15–16).

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.

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.

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.



Cooper, C. (2018) *Bystander intervention: Examining recognition and response to sexual violence on a college campus* [Dissertation, Auburn University].

Cristofano, J. (2014) Bystander behaviors and attitudes in college students before and after Green Dot bystander intervention training. *Psychology Honors Papers*. 47.

Davidov, D. M., Hill, K., Bush, H. M. & Coker, A. L. (2020) The green light for Green Dot: A qualitative study of factors influencing adoption of an efficacious violence prevention program in high school settings. *Violence Against Women*. 26 (12–13), 1701–1726.

Hollis, B. F. (2018) *A single campus study of the Green Dot bystander intervention program* [Dissertation, Old Dominion University].

Kelly, M. & Wilkinson, L. (2018) *Implementing the Green Dot bystander intervention program to promote respectful workplaces in the construction trades in Oregon* (No. NITC-RR-1078). National Institute for Transportation and Communities (NITC).

Mennicke, A., Bush, H. M., Brancato, C. J. & Coker, A. L. (2021) Bystander intervention efficacy to reduce teen dating violence among high school youth who did and did not witness parental partner violence: A path analysis of a cluster RCT. *Journal of Family Violence*. 36 (7), 755–771.

Starnes, C. P. (2016) Evaluating a bystander intervention program on reproductive coercion: Using quasi-experimental design strategies to address methodologic issues in randomized community prevention trials. *Theses and Dissertations – Epidemiology and Biostatistics*. 10.

Yaakoby, N. R. (2018) *Reducing power based personal violence with the implementation of the Green Dot initiative at Kalamazoo College* [Dissertation, Kalamazoo College].

—

Note on provider involvement: This provider has agreed to Foundations’ terms of reference (or the Early Intervention Foundation’s terms of reference), and the assessment has been conducted and published with the full cooperation of the intervention provider.