ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation:	MEN WHO INTERVENE: A GROUNDED THEORY STUDY ON THE ROLE OF MASCULINITY IN BYSTANDER INTERVENTION
	Aylin Esra Kaya, Doctor of Philosophy, 2019
Dissertation directed by:	Professor Derek Iwamoto, Department of Psychology

Sexual violence is a significant public health problem, particularly on college campuses, and disproportionately impacts women. Bystander intervention training has been identified as a promising intervention against sexual assault, as a third party is present in approximately one in three incidents of sexual assault. However, research has found that men report greater barriers to intervention and less efficacy and intention to intervene, thus require further attention. Theorists suggest that men's masculine norm socialization may contribute to reluctance to intervene, but there is little understanding on the role that masculinity may play in facilitating intervention. The purpose of this study was to identify an outlier population of college men (N = 15) who have intervened against sexual assault, and to qualitatively examine the social and gender-relevant factors that influenced their intervention. Through a grounded theory analysis, the results indicated that the core category of "bystander intervention" was comprised of direct, indirect, and passive bystander behaviors.

These behaviors were influenced by five key categories, which included: 1) exposure to training, 2) the role of alcohol, 3) social factors, 4) individual characteristics, and 5) masculine norms. These categories were salient for all participants, and differentially influenced and facilitated bystander intervention. Participants described their development and navigation of masculine norms, which in turn shaped their individual characteristics, exposure to training, and the ways in which they navigated the high-risk environments where they noticed potential assaults. Participants also described their decision-making process around intervening, and the strategies they used to intervene. These results offer a model for understanding college men's bystander intervention against sexual assault, which incorporates both individual and social factors, as well as the complex role of masculine norms.

MEN WHO INTERVENE: A GROUNDED THEORY STUDY ON THE ROLE OF MASCULINITY IN BYSTANDER INTERVENTION

by

Aylin Esra Kaya

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2019

Advisory Committee:
Professor Derek Iwamoto, Chair
Professor Richard Shin
Professor Karen O'Brien
Professor Jennifer Wessel
Professor Matthew Miller

© Copyright by
Aylin Esra Kaya
2019

Acknowledgements

I would like to foremost thank the individuals who participated in this interview; they were selected on the basis that they had intervened against sexual assault. In addition to being active bystanders, they all expressed interest in contributing to this body of research, and I am incredibly grateful that they offered their time, knowledge, and experiences. This research would not be possible without their contribution.

I would also like to acknowledge the guidance of my advisor and mentor, Dr. Derek Iwamoto, as well as the help, encouragement, and support of my fellow graduate students, Jennifer Brady and Thomas Le. Both dedicated countless hours in helping conceptualize this research, forming interview questions, reviewing the manuscript, transcribing, sitting through dozens of meetings to complete data analysis, helping construct the emerging theory. This dissertation was a group effort, and I am indebted to their patience and support.

Finally, I am grateful for my family's encouragement through this difficult and time-consuming research.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iii
Table of Contents iii
Chapter 1: Introduction 1
Introduction 1
Bystander Model 3
The Role of Masculinity in Bystander Intervention 4
Purpose of the Study 8
Summary 12
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature 14
Introduction 14
Masculinity 15
Masculinity and Sexual Assault 26
Positive Masculinity 30
Bystander Intervention 33
Summary of Study Purpose 47
Chapter 3: Methodology 50
Participants 50
Research Team 52
Procedure 54
Grounded Theory 57
Summary 65
Chapter 4: Results 67
Overview of Emerging Theory 67
Types of Bystander Behaviors 67
Key Category: Exposure to Training 72
Key Category: Role of Alcohol 75
Key Category: Social Factors 81
Key Category: Individual Characteristics 87
Key Category: Masculine Norms 92
Model of Bystander Intervention 99
Chapter 5: Discussion 103
Discussion Introduction 103
Discussion of Emerging Theory 104
Implications 112
Strengths and Limitations 116
Appendices 120
Bibliography 123

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Sexual violence is a significant public health problem, particularly on college campuses, and disproportionately affects women. Surveys estimate that as many as 25% to 50% of women experience some form of sexual aggression while they are in college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009; Messman-Moore & Brown, 2006), and victims of sexual violence may experience trauma symptoms, be more vulnerable to drug and alcohol abuse, and report poorer health and social outcomes (Banyard & Cross, 2008). Accordingly, college campuses have created educational programs to help prevent sexual violence, with many of these programs including information on gender socialization, safer dating behaviors, as well as challenging rape myths and rape supportive behaviors (Bachar & Koss, 2001; Sochting et al., 2004). However, the ability of these programs to truly reduce the high prevalence of sexual violence has been called into question (Casey & Nurius, 2006). Although these educational programs may be effective for changing attitudes about rape, these attitude changes often revert to previous levels within a short period of time, and may only have a small effect on the actual incidence of sexual assault (Breitenbecher, 2000; Rozee & Koss, 2001; Sochting et al., 2004). Indeed, a meta-analysis examining the efficacy of sexual assault prevention education programs concluded that these programs could not be deemed truly effective in decreasing the prevalence of sexual assault (Anderson & Whiston, 2005).

Theorists suggest that these educational approaches, which target students as either perpetrators or potential victims of sexual violence, may lead to greater defensiveness (Berkowitz, 2002). Furthermore, most acts of sexual violence are perpetrated by a small number of serial perpetrators, whose behaviors and motivations are more difficult to target and change (Lisak & Miller, 2002). Thus there has been a movement toward preventing sexual assault by focusing on bystander behaviors, and empowering students to become active bystanders (Banyard et al., 2004; Schewe, 2002). Bystander intervention programs use a variety of techniques, including psychoeducation, social marketing, and efficacy-building interventions that aim to empower men and women to intervene to prevent sexual violence. This is a promising tool for rape prevention, given that a third party is present in approximately one in three events of sexual assault, meaning that bystanders can play a significant role in reducing the frequency of these assaults (Planty, 2002). Additionally, research suggests that bystander intervention programs may be particularly relevant for men, as these approaches address the fact that most men do not perpetrate rape, but are positioned to prevent perpetrations that do occur (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011).

Bystander engagement programs have shown promising results in increasing students' preparation and intent to intervene. For example, a program by Banyard and colleagues (2007) was effective in increasing prosocial bystander attitudes and confidence to intervene in threatening situations, as well as decreasing rape myths while increasing knowledge of sexual assault. The participants in this program were also more likely than a control group to continue to engage in prosocial bystander

behavior through a 2-month follow-up. A separate study by Moynihan and Banyard (2008) found that a pilot bystander intervention program was effective at changing bystander efficacy among college athletes and fraternity members, both of which are groups at high risk of sexual violence perpetration. A recent meta-analysis by Katz and Moore (2013) found that data from 12 studies of college students suggested moderate effects of bystander intervention education on bystander efficacy and intent to help others at risk, as well as significant effects on self-reported bystander helping behaviors and decreased rape-supportive attitudes. Given the promising outcomes of existing bystander intervention models, it is important to understand the social factors that lead to increased or decreased bystander intervention. The purpose of this study was to qualitatively explore the role of masculinity and male gender role socialization on bystander behaviors among men who have acted as bystanders against sexual assault. This research has the potential to advance the literature by identifying an outlier population of men who have intervened against sexual assault, and identifying the social and gender-relevant factors that contributed to their decision to intervene.

Bystander Model

Bystanders are individuals who witness illegal, dangerous, or inappropriate activity, and are positioned to intervene, observe passively, or contribute to the activity. The seminal model of bystander intervention was created by Latané and Darley (1970) and describes five stages. Bystanders must: 1) notice the event, 2) interpret it as an emergency, 3) take responsibility for intervening, 4) decide on a course of action, and 5) choose to act. Barriers to intervention may be present at each

of these five stages, however. For instance, a large body of literature has explored the diffusion of responsibility, wherein individuals may notice an event and perceive it as an emergency, but fail to take responsibility to intervene when they are in the presence of multiple other bystanders (Latané & Nida, 1981). Significantly, in the last step of *acting to intervene*, major barriers include bystanders' fears relating to the social context (Latané & Darley, 1970), as well as apprehension related to concern about potentially being negatively evaluated by others. This is referred to as *audience inhibition*, or the notion that individuals may not intervene due to social consequences such as social rejection, embarrassment, or ostracism (Latané & Darley, 1970). This can be particularly prevalent for people who are newcomers to a social unit, such as new students or new members of Greek organizations (Burn, 2009; Rutkowski et al., 1983). Similarly, a process that may interfere with intervention is *evaluation apprehension*, where individuals fear being judged by others when they act publicly, and thus demonstrate greater reluctance to intervene in critical situations (Latané & Darley, 1970). These are important to note given that research suggests that audience inhibition is a significant factor in reducing bystander intervention behaviors unless there are salient social norms that encourage intervention (Burn, 2009). Emerging research suggests that in understanding social norms that prohibit bystander intervention, it may be particularly significant to understand norms related to gender conformity.

The Role of Masculinity in Bystander Intervention

Gender norms are relevant for understanding men's bystander intervention behaviors, or lack thereof. Research has consistently reported that men indicate less

willingness and intent to intervene in sexual assault situations in comparison to women (Banyard, 2008; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Hoxmeier et al., 2015; McMahon, 2010), thus there is a need to pay attention to men in particular. Burn (2009) suggested that women report greater intent to intervene because they are better able to identify with potential victims, given their own vulnerability to sexual assault. This implies that men's diminished willingness to intervene may be due to a lack of identification with potential victims. However, several empirical studies suggest that male gender role socialization and gendered expectations may further explain why men often refrain from intervening in events of sexual assault (Casey & Ohler, 2012). Men's adherence to traditional notions of masculinity, which are born out of patriarchy (hooks, 2004), and promote anti-femininity and dominance and power over women, is a significant barrier that undercuts men's willingness, confidence, and perceived ability to intervene (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Indeed, intervening against sexual aggression is often viewed as an unmasculine act (Carlson, 2008; Fabiano et al., 2003).

It is particularly important to acknowledge not only personal adherence to masculinity, but also how it is expressed in social contexts. For instance, in contexts where misogynistic discourse is accepted, such as at bars or parties (Anderson, 2008; Harford, Wechsler, & Muthen, 2003), men are more likely to engage in sexual aggression. Furthermore, within these contexts, men may underestimate their male peers' discomfort with misogynistic behavior, which can in turn prevent men from intervening (Berkowitz, 2003; Fabiano et al., 2003). Similarly, men report believing that intervening will publicly diminish their masculinity, as it may result in them

losing respect among their male peers, appearing weak, or being perceived as gay or feminine (Carlson, 2008; Katz, 2006). This can be particularly threatening because a salient aspect of masculinity is anti-femininity, or aversion to acting in stereotypically feminine ways (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Additionally, male peer groups play an important role in men's personal attitudes regarding sexual assault and potential intervention behaviors. Brown and Messman-Moore (2010) reported that perceived peer attitudes (i.e. perceiving that peers have attitudes supporting sexual assault) were a more significant factor than men's own personal attitudes regarding sexual aggression, in influencing their willingness to intervene against sexual aggression.

Although men's bystander behaviors can be viewed as heroic or chivalrous (Eagly & Crowley, 1986), male peer groups instead view interference with another man's "sexual conquest" very negatively (Carlson, 2008; Fabiano et al., 2003). And while men often view protecting women as a masculine duty, this often only applies to socially close women such as wives, mothers, and sisters (Good, Sanchez, & Moss-Racusin, 2016). Fleming and Mosley (2015) reported that gender role stereotypes surrounding "male chivalry" might encourage men to intervene in situations concerning *physical* violence against women, but these men would still not intervene in situations of sexual violence. Perhaps this is because for men who endorse notions of male chivalry, physical aggression by men against women is less tolerable than infringing on "sexual conquests" by other men. Similarly, a qualitative study by Carlson (2008) found that men made a distinction between women being physically abused in public and women being raped in a private setting, such that men were more likely to waive on potentially intervening to help the latter. Participants

empathized with real-life bystanders who would not intervene in gang-rape scenarios, and often believed that the need to preserve their masculinity outweighed a rape victim's needs. These findings collectively indicate that for some men, avoiding looking weak or sensitive in front of male peers is an important component in understanding the relationship between masculinity and bystander behavior. Indeed, while many bystander intervention programs call on men to show disapproval toward male peers' misogynistic behaviors (Katz, 1995), this in itself may be too threatening.

Threat to masculinity is an important barrier for men given the precarious nature of manhood (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). The precariousness around manhood creates psychological and emotional strain regarding one's ability to meet gender-relevant standards. This construct is captured in the framework of masculine gender role stress (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). Men who exhibit greater MGRS may experience heightened stress after experiencing situations that threaten masculinity (Leone et al., 2016; Vandello & Bosson, 2013). For these men, situations that call on them to intervene may be particularly unpalatable. Additionally, Murnen and Kohlman (2007) report that some men seek comfort in male-dominated spaces, such as fraternities, as a means of gaining social acceptance and mitigating the insecurity and anxiety surrounding masculinity. Thus, intervening to prevent sexual assault within these hypermasculine environments may be particularly threatening, as these men risk becoming ostracized. Other research suggests that an important factor in influencing men's willingness to intervene in sexual assault situations is men's perception of male peers' willingness to intervene (Fabiano et al., 2003). Thus it may

be true that in hypermasculine environments where sexual assault is normalized, intervention may be discouraged by the existing social norms.

Purpose of the Study

Research demonstrates the significant role that masculinity plays in men's lack of bystander behaviors. Given that men are less likely than women to intervene against sexual violence (Banyard, 2008; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Hoxmeier et al., 2015; McMahon, 2010), there is a need to not only understand the factors that contribute to men's decreased willingness to intervene, but also which factors can potentially contribute to men's *increased* willingness to intervene. Bystander intervention approaches that focus on social norms suggest that men can become better allies in preventing sexual violence against women when rape-supportive environments and norms are challenged – and particularly when they perceive that other men are willing to intervene as well (Fabiano et al., 2003; Mabry & Turner, 2016). Thus, it is important to understand men who have already developed the efficacy and intent to intervene given that these men are situated to influence their male peers' decision to act as bystanders.

Many studies have examined masculinity as a factor that may inhibit bystander intervention, but there has been a call to better understand aspects of masculinity that might contribute to men's commitment to being responsible and accountable (Thompson & Bennett, 2015; Wong et al., 2011), and there is a gap in the literature regarding the role that masculinity may play in encouraging bystander intervention. Masculinities change as social hegemonies become questioned, and men increasingly reject sexism, thus there is a need to better understand men's subjective

views of masculinity, as well as how masculinity can be used to encourage socially responsible behaviors. Indeed, the majority of men does not perpetrate sexual violence and disapprove of sexual violence (Barone et al., 2007; Kilmartin et al., 2008), and different and non-dominant forms of masculinity can play an important role in sexual assault intervention (Stewart, 2014). Furthermore, it is important to deepen understanding of how members of dominant and privileged social groups can become more actively involved in ending oppression. Given men's privileged position in society, it is important to better understand how men can work to end a significant form of oppression such as sexual assault (Casey, 2010).

A recent experimental study found that while men did not individually impose an unwanted sexual experience (i.e. a pornographic film) onto a woman, when these men were in the presence of misogynistic and sexually aggressive male peers, they were highly unlikely to intervene (Leone, Parrott, & Swartout, 2016). Among these men, those who were higher in masculine gender role stress were quicker to intervene when they were among misogynistic male peers. This may be because for these men, intervening was a way of displaying heroism or chivalry (Eagly & Steffen, 1986) and thus had the potential to elevate them socially among their peers. The authors suggest that benevolent sexism may help explain this, such that men may have more chivalrous attitudes towards women who they deem fit gender stereotypes (Glick & Fiske, 1996, 1997). This is in line with research suggesting that men might promote anti-sexist behavior out of a sense of honor or paternalistic masculinity, implying that masculinity can be harnessed to protect women and reduce sexist behavior (Good, Sanchez, & Moss-Racusin, 2016). However, given the mixed findings regarding the

role of benevolent sexism and/or chivalry on sexual assault intervention (Carlson, 2008), there may be other factors pertaining to individual masculinity that can help explain men's increased bystander intervention. For instance, Good, Sanchez, and Moss-Racusin (2016) suggest that men may be more likely to confront misogyny if they themselves can identify with women through their own experiences of discrimination (i.e. if their masculinity intersects with another identity), or if they experience situational disadvantages, and thus empathize with women who experience sexism.

Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to use a grounded theory approach (Charmaz, 2006; 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967) in order to explore men's masculinity in acting as bystanders in situations of sexual violence. Grounded theory was used given it is a method of generating theory (Corbin & Strauss, 1990), which was important because there is little understanding on the role that masculinity may play in sexual assault bystander intervention. Grounded theory also allows for the data analysis to be grounded in the complex, lived experiences of the participants who represent the phenomena of interest (Fassinger, 2005). This study also utilized a constructivist lens, which understands gender as socially constructed, as well as a social justice lens, which acknowledges the intersection and context of gender with other facets of identity (Charmaz, 2000; Shields, 2008).

Given the important social position through which male bystanders can positively influence other men, this study identified men who have engaged in bystander behaviors in order to explore their construction and understanding of masculinity, and particularly how this construction related to their decision to

intervene. This study used a qualitative approach given the exploratory nature of the research questions. Many existing quantitative measures of masculinity have been critiqued for being limiting, and focusing exclusively on attitudes such as dominance and anti-femininity – yet, men often disagree that these constructs alone encapsulate masculinity (Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Furthermore, numerical measures of masculinity largely focus on masculine norms that predispose risk (i.e. the Gender Role Conflict Scale; O'Neil et al., 1986), or masculine norms independent of context or outcomes (i.e. the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory; Mahalik et al., 2003). While these measures have contributed significantly to our understanding of masculinity, they may not fully capture the construction of gender, or the social contexts in which gendered behaviors emerge. A qualitative approach has the potential to more fully understand men's subjective experiences and understanding of masculinity, not only as it is socially constructed, but also how it emerges, changes, and is expressed within specific social contexts. This approach can also elicit greater detail regarding multiple factors on the decision to intervene, such as the social context and relationships within the situation wherein men intervened. Overall, this approach has the potential to not only allow for a subjective exploration of these men's masculinities, but to also meaningfully explore facets of masculinity that encourage bystander intervention, and its interaction with other contextual and individual factors. This study has the potential to contribute to the emerging body of literature that addresses aspects of masculinity in relation to sexual assault bystander intervention.

In sum, research consistently suggests that men are generally less willing to intervene against sexual assault, likely because of gender socialization – thus, by identifying men who have intervened, this study has the potential to uncover positive aspects of masculinity that can inform bystander intervention programming. This study aimed to: 1) explore the social context in which the intervention occurred, including factors such as the social situation, and the individuals' relationship with the perpetrator and victim, and important social dynamics within; 2) delineate aspects of masculinity that contributed to men's efficacy and willingness to engage in bystander behaviors, and 3) develop a theory that encapsulates the role of masculinity in men's bystander intervention in situations of sexual violence. The overarching question that guided data collection and analysis was: "What are the social and gender relevant factors that influence college men's decisions to act as bystanders against sexual assault?"

Summary

Bystander intervention can help address the significant and persistent problem of sexual violence against women (Banyard et al., 2007). Research demonstrates that men are generally less likely to act as bystanders in comparison to women, thus warrant further attention (Banyard, 2008; Bennett et al., 2014; Burn, 2009; Hoxmeier et al., 2015; McMahon, 2010). Men's gender socialization may inhibit bystander intervention, such that men may be afraid of being ostracized by their male peers, or may believe that intervening will diminish their masculinity (Carlson, 2008; Katz, 2006). Indeed, intervening against sexual violence is often met with negative

judgment from male peers (Burn, 2009), given the negative connotation of interfering with another man's "sexual conquest" (Carlson, 2008). While research has examined facets of masculinity that inhibit intervention, there has been little focus on aspects of masculinity that may encourage intervention. This is an important direction of research, given that men have begun to increasingly reject aspects of masculinity that position them to dominate and degrade women (Stewart, 2014; Wong et al., 2011).

This study identified men who have intervened against sexual violence, and qualitatively examined the factors – particularly those related to masculinity – that contributed to their decision to intervene. The findings have the potential to make theoretical and practical contributions to the literature, and to present aspects of masculinity that may encourage sexual assault bystander intervention. This study fills a gap within this literature, which has not only frequently examined masculinity from a deficit model (i.e. how masculinity contributes to stress and negative outcomes), but has largely explored how masculinity contributes to barriers to intervention (Carlson, 2008). Finally, this study may also identify specific aspects of bystander intervention programming that are particularly relevant or effective in encouraging college men to intervene.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

This study on men's experiences as active bystanders in events of sexual assault, as it relates to their masculinity, was informed by the literature on the social construction of gender, specifically masculinity. This study drew from the vast area of research which has understood masculinity as a precarious state, one that often requires public evidence, dominance over women, and distance from femininity (Mahalik et al., 2003; Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Furthermore, this study drew from the literature on sexual assault and bystander intervention, in order to better position this investigation to understand the role of masculinity in sexual assault bystander intervention. Accordingly, this section will review the relevant literature, and will first examine the social construction of masculinity, the phenomenon of sexual assault, and finally bystander intervention generally and intervention specific to sexual assault and the role of masculinity therein. This review will conclude with an examination of the importance of social determinants in influencing bystander intervention, and argue that masculinity plays an important role in the decision to intervene.

It is important to acknowledge that within grounded theory research, the researcher must be careful not to be limited by the literature in a way which clouds judgment when interpreting data gathered through the study (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). However, qualitative research also cannot be conducted in a vacuum, or

without theoretical underpinnings that guide theory, questions of interest, and conclusions (Broido & Manning, 2002). Strauss and Corbin (1998) assert that previous research must inform the researcher and help them develop theoretical sensitivity to the data – while it must not "stand between the researcher and the data," it is an important tool that can foster conceptualization (p. 53). The present review of the literature informed how this study was theoretically conceptualized, and how data were collected, analyzed, and reported.

Masculinity

Gender Socialization. In order to understand the development of masculinity and masculine gender norm conformity, it is important to understand gender socialization. Gender socialization is the process through which individuals learn and internalize values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors regarding femininity or masculinity (O'Neil, 1981). This socialization begins early in life and progresses throughout the lifespan; individuals are socialized to behave in ways that are appropriate for them as males or females. Gender norms function similarly to social norms in that they influence how people act, think, and feel, and in that they are often taught and reinforced through social interaction and observation, and are modeled and transmitted through social learning (Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Mahalik et al., 2003). For instance, boys learn from a young age that they should not cry or wear pink, and they observe prominent male figures such as film heroes and sports stars who are tough and resort to violence when challenged (Mahalik et al., 2003). Specific gender roles shift based on time, culture, and larger social, political, and economic contexts, yet the need to enact gender has remained constant in American society (Kimmel,

2006). Gender conformity has a number of costs and benefits. While certain gender norms are inherently dysfunctional, such as emotional repression among men, there are often harsh social consequences for gender role transgressions (Sirin, McCreary, & Mahalik, 2004). An important aspect of theorizing gender is the acknowledgment that gender is performative and arises from everyday practices (Butler, 1993). Through engagement in gendered behaviors and practices, gender becomes an innately social process such that it is assessed and witnessed by others, therefore the gender identity of the performer becomes socially legitimated (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Masculinity and masculine role socialization in particular has captured researchers' interests, given its precariousness and rigidity. Gender theorists argue that achieving masculinity is a difficult process and requires constant reaffirmation throughout the lifespan (Pleck, 1981). Furthermore, men who do not stringently enact masculinity face severe punishments, and boys are often punished more harshly for gender-deviant behaviors than girls (Levy et al., 1995). This trend continues into adulthood, as both men and women face social and economic backlash for gender-atypical behaviors (Rudman & Fairchild, 2004), yet men experience particularly severe consequences. Even upon gaining the elusive status of manhood, it is a status that is tenuous and can be easily lost (Gilmore, 1990; Vandello & Bosson, 2013), whereas womanhood is generally understood as a status that is earned through natural, biological development and remains stable throughout the lifespan.

The uncertainty around the development and maintenance of masculinity can often lead men to experience gender role strain, or the anxiety surrounding the

inability to live up to gendered expectations, which are often contradictory (O'Neil et al., 1986). This is in turn associated with a number of negative outcomes including greater anxiety and more frequent displays of aggression and risk-taking, as well as less help-seeking (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). However, it is not necessarily true that masculinity is only an anxiety-provoking construct. Some researchers have called for greater understanding of positive masculinity, noting that men are beginning to renegotiate their masculinity and define it in terms of being responsible and accountable (Wong et al., 2011). This may be attributed to larger social forces that are calling for more progressive attitudes in society, as well as people increasingly questioning hegemonic and heteronormative masculinities (Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Researchers have begun to more carefully examine the lived experiences of men as gendered beings, in order to understand both the positive and debilitating roles of masculinity. While normative, or hegemonic, masculinity may be seen as more precarious, there is a burgeoning field of research examining positive masculinity that can beget better personal and social outcomes.

Hegemonic Masculinity. In contemporary American society, the normative or idealized enactment of masculinity is one that is hegemonic, such that it privileges men above women, and also places some men (White, able-bodied, cisgender, heterosexual, middle or upper class) above other men (men of color, men with disabilities, transgender, gay or bisexual men, low-income men). Hegemonic masculinity allows men to remain dominant in society through the subordination of women and other marginalized groups (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Mankowski & Maton, 2010). This definition of masculinity is bolstered by misogyny and

homophobia, which allow hegemonic masculinity to enforce rigid and limiting gender norms onto all men (Connell, 2005; O'Neil et al., 1986). There are individual differences in men's gender role socialization, as well as variations in masculinity based on intersections with other identities, but hegemonic masculinity remains the ideal version of masculinity that all men are socialized to achieve (Beasley, 2008; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005).

The ideals of hegemonic masculinity consist of the expectations that men exercise power over women, readily engage in physical aggression, prioritize winning at all costs, demonstrate emotional control, engage in risky behaviors, and prioritize work and money (Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory; Mahalik et al., 2003). Other theorists have also posited that the bedrock of hegemonic masculinity is in its avoidance of femininity through showing toughness, aggression, and restricted emotionality (Murnen et al., 2002), as well as other norms such as self-reliance through mechanical skills, placing importance on sex, displaying dominance, and showing negativity toward sexual minorities (Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised; Levant et al., 2010). While adhering to rigid masculinity may be inherently anxiety-provoking (O'Neil et al., 1986), the reward for adhering to hegemonic masculinity is that men maintain power in society, and reap a number of social, cultural, and economic benefits (Harris & Edwards, 2010).

To "be a man" requires constantly demonstrating traditional masculine behaviors – however, the status of manhood is precarious, such that it is hard-won and easily lost. This is captured in the precarious manhood theory, which was proposed by Vandello and Bosson (2013), and posits that men face a great deal of

pressure to prove that they are "real men," and will often go to great lengths to demonstrate their manhood. Notably, displays of masculinity are often done to impress other men, because true manhood is bestowed on men only by other men. Furthermore, a study by Bosson and colleagues (2009) found that men react readily with aggression when their masculinity is threatened. In this experimental study, the researchers threatened men's gender status by asking them to perform a public, stereotypically feminine mask (braiding a female mannequin's wig), whereas men in the control condition were given a mechanically similar, yet gender neutral task (tying a piece of rope). Following the task, men were given a choice of follow-up tasks, which included a puzzle task or a punching task; men who were assigned to braid the mannequin's hair were twice as likely to choose the punching task compared to the men in the control group. The punching task also reduced men's anxiety, compared to conditions that did not allow them the opportunity to reassert their manhood. That is, upon completing a stereotypically feminine task, men would reassert their masculinity through a physically aggressive act, and when they did not have the opportunity to act out such aggression, they experienced greater anxiety. The authors note that physical aggression is often viewed as an effective demonstration of masculinity, and that risk-taking behaviors as well as hypercompetitive behaviors are avenues that similarly represent masculinity (Vandello & Bosson, 2013).

Another important aspect of hegemonic masculinity is in demonstrating heterosexuality, and showing disdain for homosexuality (Mahalik et al., 2003). With regard to heterosexual relationships with women, men are expected to be dominant and to value women for their sexual appeal. As such, salient masculine norms such as

risk-taking and displaying dominance, can be understood as being an effective way of out-competing other men and appearing attractive to women (Courtenay, 2000; Gilmore, 1990). Men are also expected to persistently pursue sex, prioritize sexual pleasure, never turn down the opportunity for sex, and avoid being perceived as gay (Sanchez, Feterolf, & Rudman, 2012; Simon & Gagnon, 1986). Frequent, heterosexual sex is a means for men to prove that they are "real" men (Seabrook, Ward, & Giaccardi, 2016) – and while men who have several sexual partners are lauded, men who fail to adhere to this traditional masculine norm are bullied and have their manhood questioned (Toomey, Card, & Casper, 2014; Vandello & Bosson, 2013). A grounded theory study conducted by Harris and Edwards (2010) on college men's gendered experiences examined the consequences of hegemonic masculinity and found that one of the major consequences experienced by men was the expectation that they express degrading attitudes toward women. The men in this study stated that these attitudes did not always necessarily reflect their genuine feelings, but that they were compelled to behave this way in front of their male peers out of fear of losing their status and acceptance within the group. As a result of this, the men found it difficult to have genuine, intimate relationships with women.

Gender role conflict. Researchers have long posited that hegemonic masculinity is difficult to attain and maintain, which in turn confers stress (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). The seminal theory of gender role conflict was developed by O'Neil and colleagues (1986) and is defined as the psychological state in which gender roles have negative consequences and ultimately restrict a person's ability to actualize their human potential. O'Neil and colleagues stated that gender role conflict

encompasses 6 patterns, which were hypothesized to be: 1) restrictive emotionality, 2) health care problems, 3) obsession with achievement and success, 4) restrictive sexual and affectionate behavior, 5) socialized control, power, and competition issues, and 6) homophobia. They further hypothesized that these patterns are produced by larger institutional sexism, and are a result of male gender role socialization as well as men's learned fear of femininity. In a separate article, O'Neil (1981) describes several assumptions about gender role conflict, indicating that both gender role conflict and sexism produce psychological stress for men and women, and also cause men and women to devalue one another in an effort to solidify their own gender identities. He further argues that men and women contribute to the maintenance of restrictive gender roles, and that rigid gender role socialization allows people to cope with the complexities of adult life, despite these gender roles being limiting. O'Neil (2008) later noted that through understanding gender role conflict, men could begin to understand how their gender roles may limit their emotional and interpersonal lives – that is, the process of overcoming gender role conflict is one that inherently involves understanding and challenging restrictive gender role socialization.

Researchers have investigated the effects of gender role conflict on health and psychological well-being, and found that men who endorsed the need to be powerful, successful, and competitive had decreased well-being, and reported more anger and increased alcohol use, while men who endorsed restricted emotionality reported lower well-being, greater trait anger and anxiety, and negative attitudes toward help-seeking (Blazina & Watkins, 1996). Increased endorsement of restrictive emotionality and restricted affectionate behavior between men has been associated with an increased

endorsement of mental health stigma, and thus a decreased willingness among men to refer male friends to seek psychological help (Vogel, Wester, Hammer, & Downing-Matibag, 2014). The strain of having to maintain hegemonic masculinity can also manifest in strained interpersonal relationships and limited connectivity with friends and family members (Harris & Edwards, 2010).

Gender role conflict and gender role strain require careful attention because of how they influence the ways in which men interact with women. O'Neil (1981) noted that a particularly salient feature of masculinity is its aversion to femininity, and the inherent understanding that men have the right to devalue women. The aversion to femininity is described in two ways: 1) the consideration of feminine values, behaviors, and attitudes as inferior, and 2) the belief that women, men, and children who display feminine characteristics are inferior, inappropriate, and immature. The devaluation of femininity allows men to solidify their masculinity and to prove the superiority of their masculinity. It is noted that the devaluation of femininity varies based on men's socialization, as well as other identities such as age, race, and social class. Additionally, O'Neil argues that many men fear their own femininity, given that traits associated with femininity are so devalued, and also that men are often cognizant of the devaluation that other women face, but may avoid situations where they may too be devalued. This could be because promoting anti-sexism can beget negative social consequences such as emasculation. Furthermore, the strain related to needing to uphold masculinity can contribute to the use of physical and sexual aggression as a means of responding to threats toward masculinity.

Masculinity and intersections of identities. As described above, the hegemonic ideal of masculinity is embedded within a White, heterosexual, middle-to-upper class status, and all men are socialized to strive for this demonstration of masculinity (Mahalik et al., 2003). This idealized form of masculinity is both an ideology and a set of normative constraints (Coston & Kimmel, 2012). In turn, hegemonic masculinity marginalizes men who do not hold these other privileged identities. As Connell (1995) writes, hegemonic masculinity posits that masculinity is defined in relation to femininity, but that there are also competing masculinities including subordinate, complicit, and marginal masculinities that are based in identities including class, race, and sexuality. Hopkins and Noble (2009) further add that masculinities are strategic, and understood as performative and emerging within particular contexts, while drawing on specific capacities and resources (McDowell, 2003). In addition, masculinities have been understood as relational, and masculinity is connected to the system of gender relationships in which it exists (Berg & Longhurst, 2003), which allows for a richer sense of understanding the lived experiences of men by examining the various ways in which men confirm to gender.

Men's conformity to gender is inevitably tied to other social identities, and must be examined through an intersectional lens. An intersectionality approach suggests that identities are inextricably linked and experienced simultaneously, and gender must be understood as it is embedded in social identities (Collins, 1990; 2000). This approach was born out of a need to more inclusively view the experiences of women based in the intersections of gender with other social identities, most

notably race (e.g. Moraga & Anzaldua, 1981; Shields, 2008). The field of intersectionality research has grown to better understand the experiences, behaviors, and health outcomes among men, as well (Griffith, 2012). While all men are socialized for conform to dominant ideals of masculinity, it is important to consider the intersections between masculinity and other identities, especially those that are marginalized. Intersectionality theory has often been used to understand the unique gendered and racialized experiences of men of color. For instance, researchers have noted how Black men are often viewed as hypermasculine and hypersexual, which in turn represents them as inferior to White men (Collins, 2004), whereas Asian-American men's autonomy has historically been diminished by constructions of effeminacy (Espiritu, 1997).

Goffman's (1963) research on stigma has been used by masculinity researchers to examine how marginalized men "respond to the problematization of their masculinity" based on marginalized identities such as race, class, sexuality, and (dis)ability (Coston & Kimmel, 2012; p. 99). According to Goffman, people with stigmatized identities attempt to alleviate the strain of stigmatization through three main strategies: Minstrelization (over-conforming to stereotypes and exaggerating differences between the stigmatized and dominant groups), Normification (minimizing the differences between the stigmatized and dominant groups through exaggerating similarities), and Militant Chauvinism (maximizing differences with the dominant group). For instance, research on men with disabilities has found that some of these men use hypermasculinity as a strategy in the face of others' diminishing their masculinity (Wedgwood, 2011), whereas others reject hegemonic masculinity

and form their own standards of masculinity (Gerschick & Miller, 1995). Similarly, some gay men may over-rely on hegemonic ideals by adopting heterosexual masculine roles in subordinating women and effeminate gay men, where other gay men may rely on the coping strategy of reformulating their ideals of masculinity that resists over-conforming to hegemonic masculinity (Gerschick & Miller, 1995; Goodwin, 1989; Messner, 1997). In turn, men who are marginalized based on their class status may engage in minstrelization by over-emphasizing adherence to rigid gender roles (Gagnon & Simon, 1973; Sanders & Mahalingam, 2012). Notably, these marginalized identities must be understood as they intersect with one another, as well as how they intersect with privileged identities. For example, White working class men benefit from both White and male privilege, while still experiencing stigma based in their class identity. In turn, straight men of color may still receive heterosexual and male privilege while experiencing racism.

It is important to consider how men's intersecting identities can contribute to their allyship of women toward ending forms of oppression such as sexual assault. Given coping strategies like normification, some men may conform to hegemonic ideas and further perpetuate the marginalization of women (Gerschick & Miller, 1995; Goffman, 1963). However, men may instead be prompted to act as allies for women given their own experiences with stigmatization and increased empathy for the misogyny that women experience (Good, Sanchez, & Moss-Racusin, 2016), especially if these men also adhere to non-dominant ideals of masculinity (Stewart, 2014).

Masculinity and Sexual Assault

Sexual assault is defined as nonconsensual sexual contact through force or threat of force, lack of consent, incapacitation, or nonphysical threats. Researchers have focused on predictors and characteristics of victimization (i.e. intoxication, nonheterosexual identity; Cantor et al., 2015), as well as predictors and characteristics of perpetrators such as alcohol use, rape supportive attitudes, hostility towards women, sexual activity that focuses more on "sexual conquests" as opposed to sexual intimacy, and prior perpetration (Abbey, McAuslan, & Ross, 1998; Cantor et al., 2015; Forbes, Adams-Curtis, & White, 2004; Loh et al., 2005; Malamuth et al., 1995). Sexual assault has largely been understood as a form of gendered violence, such that it disproportionately targets women and is largely perpetuated by men (Black et al., 2011; Walters, Chen, & Breiding, 2013). Researchers have even asserted that gang-rape is a male-bonding activity, or a "test of manhood," and a way for men to demonstrate their "manliness" to other men (Messerschmidt, 1993; O'Sullivan, 1998). Researchers have also noted that "rape-prone" societies are those with greater gender separation and the devaluation of one gender by another (Sanday, 1990).

Endorsement of traditional masculine norms may partially explain men's acceptance and perpetration of sexual violence, given that two of the most prominent masculine norms are engaging in aggression and being dominant over women (Mahalik et al., 2003). Smith, Parrott, Swartout, and Tharp (2015) theorized that

sexual aggression is a tactic of maintaining dominance over women, and is a particularly useful tactic in situations where men felt that their dominance was threatened. In a cross-sectional study, where participants completed self-report measures of hegemonic masculinity, which included dimensions such as antifemininity and sexual dominance, as well as masculine gender role stress and sexual aggression perpetration in the last year, men who strongly endorsed hegemonic masculine norms had more sexual violence perpetration as a way of maintaining dominance within their relationships. Specifically, men who reported higher levels of antifemininity and stress related to subordination to women, were more likely to report sexual dominance, which in turn led to an increased frequency of sexual aggression. This is consistent with a theory posited by Zurbriggen (2010), which states that men's sexual aggression toward women is motivated by a desire to maintain power over women.

Empirical evidence from several other studies consistently indicates that traditional masculinity and the internalization of hegemonic masculinity are also associated with acceptance of sexual violence (Corpew & Mitchell, 2014; Eaton & Matamala, 2014), stronger endorsement of rape myths (Lutz-Zois et al., 2015), and increased sexual violence perpetration (Thompson, Swartout, & Koss, 2013, Zurbriggen, 2010). A meta-analysis conducted by Murnen and colleagues (2002) found that out of 11 different measures of masculinity, 10 of them showed a significant effect size in predicting perpetration of sexual aggression, with effect sizes being greater for hypermasculinity measures. A longitudinal study among college men also found that men who endorsed higher levels of hostile masculinity, or

attitudes pertaining to wanting to control women, were more likely to perpetrate sexual aggression (Thompson et al., 2013).

Another important aspect of masculinity that relates to sexual assault perpetration is the socialization of men to view women as passive in relationships, as well as the tendency to view women as sexual objects (Sanchez, Feterolf, & Rudman, 2012). This is theorized to contribute to sexual violence because objectification makes it so that women are cognitively perceived as objects that are void of feelings or humanity (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Empirical studies have supported this relationship, such that they have found that objectification of women is associated with greater perpetration and acceptance of sexual violence (Aubrey et al., 2011; Rudman & Mescher, 2012), and men who had recently perpetrated sexual aggression generated more objectifying statements about women, and were also more comfortable with their peers making objectifying statements, in comparison to non-perpetrators (Jacques-Tiura et al., 2015). In line with this, research has suggested that men are more likely to engage in sexual aggression at bars, parties, and other contexts where misogynistic discourse is accepted (Anderson, 2008).

Studies have also consistently found that all-male organizations such as fraternities have a tendency to create a culture that endorses violence against women (Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). Fraternity membership has been associated with more accepting attitudes toward sexual violence (Corprew & Mitchell, 2014; McMahon, 2010), as well as greater perpetration of sexual violence (Franklin, Bouffard, & Pratt, 2012; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). Because masculinity is performed by men, for the approval of other men (Vandello & Bosson, 2013), the pressure from male peers in

male-dominated organizations to have multiple sexual partners may also contribute to sexual assault perpetration. For instance, a separate longitudinal study among fraternity men reported that members received greater approval from their friends to engage in forced sex (e.g. through getting a girl drunk), and that this approval in turn predicted greater perpetration of sexual assault (Kingree & Thompson, 2013). In order to better understand *why* fraternity membership encourages sexual violence, Seabrook, Ward, and Giaccardi (2016) used structural equation modeling to examine the role of masculinity. Their study was theoretically informed by scripting theory, which suggests that men and women follow culturally sanctioned scripts in their romantic relationships, and that sexual scripts vary by gender such that men are expected to be dominant, and women are expected to be passive (Sanchez, Feterolf, & Rudman, 2012; Simon & Gagnon, 1986). The results of this study indicated that men in fraternities were more accepting of sexual violence toward women because they more strongly endorsed traditional masculine norms, felt greater pressure to conform to those norms, and more readily viewed women as sexual objects (Seabrook, Ward, & Giaccardi, 2016).

Finally, researchers have consistently found that another risk factor that is prominent among male perpetrators of sexual assault is alcohol consumption (Wiersma, Cleveland, Herrera, & Fischer, 2010). This requires attention given that alcohol abuse is normative on college campuses, and ritualistic in certain subcultures (i.e. fraternities), which coincides with the disproportionately high number of sexual assaults that occur among college populations (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Notably, alcohol use itself is a heavily gendered activity, is associated with traditional

masculinity, and often even used as a marker of masculinity (Lyons, 2009), such that it is considered manly to be able to drink a large amount of alcohol without vomiting or passing out. In turn, research suggests that men who engage in sexually coercive behaviors (Abbey et al., 1996; Abbey et al., 2001) are more likely to consume alcohol, have a higher volume of alcohol consumed, and have more positive alcohol expectancies, or anticipated positive effects of alcohol use. Additionally, a study by Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, and Alvi (2001) reported that men who drank, and who had male peers who supported coercive behaviors toward women, were 9 times more likely to report committing acts of sexual violence. Heavy alcohol consumption facilitates men's sexual aggression not only because college men will use it in order to reduce women's resistances to sexual coercion (Lisak & Miller, 2002), but also because it mitigates the responsibility placed on the perpetrator, and increases blame placed upon the victim (Walsh, Banyard, Moynihan, Ward, & Cohn, 2010).

Positive Masculinity

While a significant portion of the discourse around masculinity has examined gender norm adherence from a deficit model, wherein researchers have focused on the negative outcomes (e.g., poor mental health, decreased self-compassion, less help-seeking) associated with adhering to strict gender roles (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Englar-Carlson, 2006; Hammer & Good, 2010; Reilly, Rochlen, & Award, 2014), as well as other negative outcomes (i.e. perpetration of sexual assault; Murnen et al., 2002) there is also significant value in taking a strengths-based approach to delineate factors that are associated with positive well-being and positive masculinity (Seligman, 2008). Taking a strengths-based approach may be particularly important

when evaluating masculinity, as adherence to distinct masculine norms may be adaptive and healthy depending on the context and situation, whereas strict non-conformity may beget social consequences. Indeed, several scholars suggest that more research is needed to better understand how gendered, and particularly masculine ideologies, can promote healthy behaviors and overall greater well-being (Levant, & Wimer, 2014; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Recent strength-based masculinity research has noted that young adult men appear to define their manhood by prosocial behaviors including being responsible and accountable (Wong et al., 2011), while also underscoring how certain traditionally negative masculine norms, including risk-taking, may contribute to positive traits and behaviors, such as personal courage, resilience, and physical fitness (Hammer & Good, 2010). Specifically, Hammer and Good (2010) found that men who endorsed traditional masculine norms such as risk-taking, dominance, and pursuit of status, had higher levels of courage, physical endurance, and fitness. Similarly, Kiselica and Englar-Carlson (2010) have stated that there are a number of positive aspects of masculinity including male heroism, courage and risk-taking, group orientation, and fatherhood. They emphasize that these behaviors are strengths, and also encourage researchers to continue focusing on the positive aspects of male socialization and mentorship.

It is also important to acknowledge that men experience a great deal of variation in their masculinities, and that many men strive to transcend expectations of hegemonic masculinity and express their gender in more authentic ways. For instance, the men who participated in the grounded theory studies by Harris and Edwards (2010) noted that they were able to transcend hegemonic masculinity

through having meaningful and cross-cultural interactions with other men who represented diverse backgrounds (i.e. men of racial/ethnic or sexual minorities). Being able to interact meaningfully with these groups allowed the men to expand their own ideas and concepts of masculinity by challenging long-held stereotypes about other groups. Participants also cited their own critical reflections about gender and masculinity as being a means for positive change. Some noted that this was a difficult process, given the pervasive nature of hegemonic masculinity, thus there were often few opportunities to reflect critically about masculinity. Men also attributed their own process of critical consciousness building to participating in activities such as intergroup dialogue, while one participant noted that he began his reflection after he learned about several rapes that occurred within his fraternity, and helped have the male perpetrators removed from the house. The findings from this study suggest that young men's growth and development can be fostered through critical self-reflection, male figures who model a well-rounded conceptualization of masculinity, courses in gender and ethnic studies that encourage the development of a critical conscious, and encouragement to be authentic (Harris & Edwards, 2010). This provides evidence that while hegemonic masculinity is pervasive and idealized, it can also be challenged and overcome.

Elliott (2016) emphasized the emerging theory surrounding "caring masculinities," which consist of masculine identities that reject domination and instead embrace values such as engagement and critical consciousness building in order to create social change and strive toward gender equality. Striving toward gender equality in turn requires the rejection of hegemonic masculinity. Caring

masculinities perceive traditional male gender values such as protection and providing as being more relational and interdependent (Morrell & Jewkes, 2011). The notion of caring masculinities is similar to a proposition by hooks (2004), who wrote that men should not relinquish their maleness, but instead find a way for their masculinity to no longer be synonymous with violence and domination.

The body of literature on positive masculinity is one that is in its early stages, and researchers have called for greater attention in order to better understand positive masculinities (Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). This is an important direction of research given that men may increasingly reject hegemonic masculinity, particularly as hegemonic masculinity has high costs, and men may increasingly weigh its costs and benefits (Elliott, 2016). While domineering and aggressive masculinities may beget social and cultural benefits, they also interfere with interpersonal relationships and emotional well-being. Scambor, Wojnicka, and Bergmann (2013) note several reasons for why men's rejection of hegemonic masculinity and striving toward gender equality can be beneficial for men, such as increased physical and psychological health, increased quality of social life, better familial relationships, and reduced aggression between men. Elliott (2016) also states that men's adherence to caring masculinities can be more satisfying and nourishing for men than the traditional notion of hegemonic masculinity.

Bystander Intervention

Bystander model. The bystander effect is the phenomenon in which an individual becomes less likely to help in a critical situation when others are present

(Latane´ & Darley, 1968), with this effect also being known as the *diffusion of responsibility*. This effect was infamously demonstrated in the murder or Kitty Genovese, who was raped and murdered in the presence of 38 witnesses, with no one intervening until it was too late (Rosenthal, 1964). There have been several other high-profile cases demonstrating this effect, and as a result, the bystander effect remains one of the most well-known and well-studied phenomena in social psychology. The classic bystander study often includes a participant working alone or in the presence of others, when they suddenly witness a staged event. The participants' responses to the events are recorded, usually in terms of their willingness to intervene as well as the length of time it takes them to do so (Fischer et al., 2011). Results from these studies have shown that when participants are among other passive bystanders, their helping is decreased in serious emergency events such as an injury (Latane´ & Darley, 1968), an asthma attack (Harris & Robinson, 1973), and even in noncritical events such as a stranded driver (Hurley & Allen, 1974) or mundane mishaps, like when pencils are dropped onto the floor or when a door needs to be answered (Latane´ & Dabbs, 1975; Levy et al., 1972). An early meta-analysis of over 50 studies found that all of the studies supported the inverse relationship between group size and helping behavior (Latane´ & Nida, 1981).

According to Latané and Darley (1970), a bystander must go through 5 stages in order to successfully perform an intervention, with these stages being: noticing the event, perceiving the event as a problem or an emergency, feeling responsible to help, deciding how to take action, and actually performing the intervention behavior. There are several ways that each of the stages may be interrupted and bystanders can avoid

active involvement. Additionally, at any step, a bystander may choose to remain silent or to not become involved. Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) also note that bystander interventions can be understood as existing on two dimensions, which include: the immediacy of the intervention, and level of involvement. The first dimension distinguishes between situations that require intervening in a current situation (high immediacy) and interventions that take place at a later place in time (low immediacy). The second dimension relates to how the extent to which bystanders become involved, as well as their behaviors, during the event. High-involvement pertains to the bystander become directly involved (i.e. direct confrontation against an offender), whereas low-involvement pertains to intervention strategies that do not require an empathic or direct public display of behavior (i.e. offering private support).

Findings from bystander intervention studies have also uncovered the importance of a number of variables in determining intervention. Research suggests that the bystander effect relies not only on the number of people present, but also on the relationship between the witness and the victim, and the perception of the victim by the bystanders. For instance, a study by Shotland and Straw (1976) found that if bystanders witnessed a man attacking a woman, they would be less likely to intervene if they assumed that the couple was married. Levine and Crowther (2008) found that when bystanders were among friends, an increased group size actually encouraged intervention, and that gender also became more salient such that men were more likely to intervene in the presence of women, but less likely to intervene if there were more men in the group. Similarly, women were more likely to intervene when there

were more women in the group. Situational variables are also important, such that bystanders may be less likely to help if they interpret an emergency as ambiguous (Harada, 1985).

Research has also examined factors such as peer context, wherein bystanders are positively influenced based on peer relationships and group affiliation (Rushton & Campbell, 1977), and are more likely to help if an emergency takes place in a rural, sparsely population location, as opposed to a densely populated area (Levine et al., 1994). Bystanders are also more likely to act if they are more altruistic (Eisenberg et al., 1999) or more agreeable (Graziano et al., 2007), as well as if they have a more prosocial personality (Carlo & Randall, 2001), or perceive a victim to be more similar to themselves based on physical attributes (Levine et al., 2002). With regard to gender, a meta-analysis by Eagley and Crowley (1986) found that men were more likely to help women, especially if there was an audience, whereas women were more likely to help if they perceived a situation as being safe. Fischer and colleagues (2011) conducted a meta-analysis on bystander behaviors in dangerous and non-dangerous situations, and found that the bystander effect was attenuated when situations were perceived as dangerous, the perpetrators were present, and the costs of intervention were perceived to be physical. Research has also shown that women exhibit less helping behaviors when an audience is present (Schwartz & Clausen, 1970), and that men may act more in social situations due to social comparison (Karakashian et al., 2006). Studies on individual gender conformity have found that men who adhered strongly to traditional masculinity are less likely to help (Tice & Baumeister, 1985), and that norms such as expressiveness and assertiveness are

positively correlated to helping behavior among women, but decreased behavior among men (Siem & Spencer, 1986). Perceived efficacy is also an important variable, given that participants generally indicate more willingness to engage in prosocial behaviors, as well as greater numbers of actual behaviors, if they have higher perceived effectiveness (Banyard, 2008).

Sexual assault bystander intervention

The prevalence of violence against women on college campuses has generated a number of intervention programs, with bystander intervention programs showing promising results as a preventative approach (Katz, Heisterkamp, & Fleming, 2011). Bystander intervention programs are promising, given that a third party is present in approximately one third of sexual assaults (Planty, 2002), and thus engaging with bystanders can be a powerful way of disrupting the frequency of sexual violence. Presently, bystander intervention programs targeted at preventing sexual assault often work to redefine sexual assault as a concern that should be shared by both men and women, and also teaching men to become social justice allies (Fabiano et al., 2003). These interventions encourage men to develop greater empathy for victims of sexual assault, and provide education on intimacy and consent.

Bystander interventions also often address sociocultural factors that contribute to sexual assault, such as male socialization processes, and attitudes towards women (Fabiano et al., 2003). For example, Foubert (2000) has engaged men as bystanders through his development of The Men's Program, which has been shown to create long-term changes in men's attitudes and behaviors. Stewart (2014) reported that inviting undergraduate male participants to engage in The Men's Project, which

taught men to think critically about gender socialization, male privilege, sexuality, and sexual violence (i.e. particularly its impacts on survivors of sexual assault), reduced sexism and rape myth acceptance, and increased bystander efficacy, action willingness, and feminist activism. Similarly, Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (2011) reported that the program not only reduced men's defensiveness regarding sexual assault, but also increased empathy for victims, which resulted in an increase in bystander efficacy and willingness to help, as well as a decrease in rape myth acceptance. Several other evaluations of The Men's Program have also shown long-term changes in men's attitudes and behaviors, such that men show decreases in rape myth acceptance and likelihood of perpetrating sexual violence, but also increased empathy toward rape victims, increased willingness to speak up against sexist comments, and increased support showed for rape victims (Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Newberry, 2006; Foubert & Perry, 2007).

Bystander approaches shift the conversation on sexual assault prevention away from addressing audience members as either perpetrators or victims, to empowering members to be potential bystanders (Banyard, 2008), which may in turn help members feel less defensive. Banyard and colleagues (2004) suggest that bystanders can therefore create new community norms that prevent sexual assault, act as role models for helping behaviors, and increase others' sense of responsibility and efficacy. This is particularly significant given the role of normative believes in perpetuating the frequency of sexual assault; most college men overestimate the extent to which their peers approve of misogynistic behaviors (Berkowitz, 2003), and this perceived norm may influence men's decisions not to intervene in a situation of

sexual violence, despite men's own discomfort or pressure to conform (Berkowitz, 2002; Mahalik, 1999). Thus, changing both social norms, and perceived social norms, is an important direction for bystander intervention. For instance, a study by Mabry and Turner (2016) reported that communicating injunctive norms (i.e. norms about what behaviors ought to be done) was most effective among men who were least likely to engage in bystander behaviors, while descriptive norms (i.e. norms about the prevalence of particular behaviors) played a significant role such that those with stronger norms reported greater intentions to engage in bystander behaviors in the future. This is promising, given that the bystander model for sexual assault prevention assumes that men don't feel comfortable speaking up against their peers, often out of fear of being alone or out of place (Berkowitz, 2003), thus changing normative believes may help men feel more empowered to intervene (Mabry & Turner, 2016).

Emphasizing the role of bystanders also represents a change from the traditional narrative of rape prevention, which places the responsibility on potential victims to avoid rape (Ullman, 2007). Specific intervention behaviors are gendered (see: Rozee & Koss, 2001), such that women are taught to intervene against high-risk markers which include: preventing a female friend from being in a secluded location alone at night; refusing to leave an intoxicated friend alone at a party; preventing a female friend from going to a private location with a male acquaintance. For men, intervention behaviors include: reminding a male friend that consent cannot be given by an intoxicated woman; preventing a man from taking an intoxicated woman to a secluded location; telling a sexually aggressive male that he must leave a party or location where he is attempting to coerce a woman. Banyard (2008) has developed

and examined sexual violence bystander intervention models over time, and has found that participation in such programs result in increased prosocial bystander attitudes, increased efficacy, and more frequent self-reported bystander behaviors among students (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). These positive behaviors are found not only in general student populations, but also in "high risk" populations such as athletes and members of Greek organizations (Moynihan & Banyard, 2008). While the evolving literature on bystander intervention shows promising results, there is a need to continue to understand the number of complex variables that contribute to bystander intervention. This is relevant given the number of stages within bystander intervention, and the factors that may affect a bystander as they go through each of these stages.

The five stages of intervention, as outlined by Latané and Darley (1970) note that the observer must: 1) notice the event, 2) interpret it as an emergency, 3) take responsibility for intervening, 4) decide on a course of action, and 5) choose to act. Regarding sexual assault intervention, there are several barriers that exist at each stage, and similar to bystander intervention in other types of emergencies, bystanders can at any point decide to ignore an event and stay silent or passive. Researchers have provided several examples of barriers that occur across the five stages of intervention. In the first stage of *noticing the event*, distraction, intoxication, or lack of focus may result in failure to notice an event. Alcohol use and intoxication are particularly salient barriers that may inhibit bystanders' ability to recognize an opportunity to intervene. This is in part explained by alcohol myopia theory (Steele & Josephs, 1990), which posits that alcohol physiologically impairs attentional capacity. Thus,

intoxicated individuals allocate their limited attention to more salient cues in the environment, and in situations involving sexual violence, may be inhibited from intervention if they focus on salient and immediate cues such as a peer's forceful sexual behavior, while not being attuned onto a less salient cue such as a potential victim's discomfort (Leone, Haikalis, Parrott, & DiLillo, 2017).

Next, ignorance or ambiguity can result in a failure to *interpret an event as an emergency* (Burn, 2009). This may be particularly relevant for situations concerning sexual assault, which can be ambiguous, particularly for individuals who are ignorant regarding rape prevalence, or issues concerning consent. For example, men may be unaware that women who are heavily intoxicated are incapable of giving consent, or perhaps may fail to recognize that sexual abuse can occur within a relationship where consent was previously given (Deming, Covan, Swan, & Billings, 2013). Research indicates that bystanders are less likely to intervene if they perceive that the abuser has a relationship with their victim (Banyard et al., 2004), which is particularly problematic given that a significant portion of sexual assaults are committed by a current or former intimate partner, friend or acquaintance (Planty et al., 2013). Common rape myths also perpetuate ignorance and ambiguity regarding incidents of sexual violence. Indeed, even women who have experienced rape may have a difficult time labeling these experiences as such, particularly if these experiences fall outside the rigid "rape scripts" such as stranger rape (Deming, Covan, Swan, & Billings, 2013; Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2004). Furthermore, the frequent displays of gendered aggression towards women reinforce rape myths and create a culture

wherein acts of sexual violence are not only tolerated, but normalized (Belknap, 2010; Ellis, 1989), and thus difficult to recognize as dangerous.

In the next stage of *taking responsibility*, a significant barrier may be diffusion of responsibility (Latané & Darley, 1970), or the phenomenon wherein individuals feel less personal responsibility to intervene when there are others present. Other barriers at this stage may be that the bystander does not feel that they have a relationship with the potential victim, or that they may not perceive the victim as being a member of their in-group (Gottlieb & Carver, 1980; Howard & Crano, 1974; Levine et al., 2002). A relationship with the perpetrator may also be an important factor, although the research findings in this area are mixed. Burn (2009) reported that men reported greater intent to intervene if the perpetrator was a friend, whereas an earlier study by Schwartz and DeKeserdy (1997) found that men were *less* likely to intervene if they knew the perpetrator. Furthermore, bystanders may feel less responsibility to intervene if they perceive the victim negatively – for instance, victims may be deemed less "worthy" of intervention if they have consumed alcohol or dressed provocatively (Norris & Cubbins, 1992; Workman & Freeburn, 1999). In line with this finding, bystanders report more perceived barriers to intervention when a potential victim is intoxicated (Pugh, Ningard, Ven, & Butler, 2016).

The next stage of intervention is in *deciding how to help*, and bystanders may fail in this stage due to a skills deficit or lack of certainty or efficacy in intervening (Cramer et al., 1988; Shotland & Heinhold, 1985). Research has indicated that individuals' perceived self-efficacy as bystanders was positively associated with intervention in situations involving interpersonal violence (Banyard, 2008),

demonstrating that efficacy is a significant factor in the decision to intervene. In the final step of *taking action*, major barriers include bystanders' fears relating to the social context (Latané & Darley, 1970), as well as apprehension related to concern about potentially being negatively evaluated by others. This can be particularly relevant for men who experience pressure by male peers not to take action against sexual assault, given the normalization of sexual assault in certain male-dominated spaces (Seabrook et al., 2016). One study found that the most important factor influencing men's willingness to actively intervene was their perception of other men's willingness to intervene (Fabiano et al., 2004), suggesting that in environments where social norms codify the objectification of women and normalize sexual violence, men may believe that their peers will not intervene, which will in turn discourage them from intervening. Accordingly, it is important to investigate the role of masculinity, given that it may contribute to men's choice to intervene or not.

Masculinity in sexual assault intervention. While there has been research examining men's bystander behaviors as well as intervention programs that specifically encourage men to act as bystanders against sexual assault (McMahon & Dick, 2011), there have been few studies specifically examining the role of masculinity in sexual assault bystander intervention. A dissertation study by Koon (2013) found that distinct masculine norms, including emotional control, risk-taking, violence, self-reliance, and winning, were not significantly related to bystander interventions, perhaps because these specific aspects of masculinity are not related to the types of interventions chosen by participants. However, other studies have

delineated aspects of masculinity that may affect bystander behavior, either positively or negatively.

Carlson (2008) sought to examine the role of masculinity in bystander intervention through a qualitative study. She presented the participants with three scenarios which included: two men beating up one man, a man shoving around a woman, and a man having sex with an unconscious woman while other men stand around and watch or cheer on. Participants were asked about how they would hypothetically respond to each of these scenarios. Interestingly, it seemed that participants drew a hypothetical line between physical and sexual violence toward women – that is, the men in this study believed that an important part of their masculinity was in protecting women, and that although physical aggression between men was considered a normal aspect of masculinity, aggression towards women was not. In fact, physical aggression toward women was viewed quite negatively, because women were perceived as being defenseless and unable to fight back. Despite this sentiment, the men in the study not only expressed empathy for actual male bystanders who did not intervene to stop a sexual assault, but also personally expressed hesitation regarding whether they would step in to prevent a sexual assault. This hesitation was largely related to the fear of looking weak in front of male peers, as well as appearing too sensitive or even being perceived as gay. Some men described interrupting a sexual assault as "entering another man's territory…the man's territory being his girl and henceforth by entering his domain" (Carlson, 2008, p. 10). Thus, it appears that masculinity plays an inhibitory role regarding sexual assault intervention; men may place greater priority on the need to uphold and

demonstrate their masculinity to their male peers, over the safety of a woman being raped. It is important to acknowledge that this decision isn't necessarily an indicator of lack of empathy for the victim, but can instead demonstrate indecision and internal conflict – men's non-responsiveness can be viewed as a sign of a moral dilemma (Latané & Darley, 1968). Indeed, men may experience a great deal of internal conflict given the powerful gender socialization that encourages sexual violence and the objectification of women (Sanchez, Feterolf, & Rudman, 2012).

Researchers have also employed quantitative designs to examine men's sexual assault bystander behaviors in relation to masculinity. A study by Leone and colleagues (2016) examined the process of bystander decision making as a mechanism through which men's adherence to traditional masculinity was associated with their confidence to intervene in situations where a woman was experiencing sexual aggression. The results of their study indicated that men who more strongly adhered to masculine norms such as status and toughness were more likely to have bystander efficacy through bystander decision-making. Specifically, results showed that men who adhered more to the status norm had more confidence to intervene, and also believed that intervention would beget more positive consequences. Conversely, men who adhered to the toughness norm believed that intervention would result in more negative consequences, and were less confident in their ability to intervene – this could be because men who want to appear tough may believe that intervening against sexual assault will make them appear weak in front of male peers (Carlson, 2008). Leone and colleagues' (2016) study also found that men who adhered more to antifemininity norms also had less confidence to intervene, perhaps because

intervention contradicted their antifeminine notion of masculinity, which promotes the degradation of women. The authors note that this is in line with prior research indicated that men's fear of appearing unmasculine or being perceived as gay, is a significant barrier to sexual assault intervention (Barone, Wolgemuth, & Linder, 2007; Carlson, 2008).

There has also been a study using an experimental lab paradigm to examine men's bystander behaviors against sexual aggression (Leone, Parrott, & Swartout, 2016). In this study, male participants were given the option to send either a sexually explicit video or a neutral video to a female confederate, and the participant was also placed in a room among male confederates, who were behaving like they were also participating in the study. After sending a clip to the female confederate, all of the men would watch her watch the clip (wherein the female confederate was visibly uncomfortable upon viewing the sexually explicit film clip), and male participants had the option to stop the video clip at any time – this lab analog has been shown to represent imposing sexual aggression on a woman, via sending an unwanted, sexually explicit clip, as well as bystander intervention, through measuring the decision to stop the clip (Parrott et al., 2012). Furthermore, the male peer confederates were instructed to produce either a neutral condition by making non-objectifying comments about the female confederate, or a misogynistic condition by making objectifying comments about the female confederate. Interestingly, results showed that approximately 75% of participants did not intervene at all across the conditions, but that male participants who were exposed to the misogynistic peer norm, and who had more masculine gender role stress, were actually quicker to intervene compared to those who were

lower in masculine gender role stress. Leone, Parrott, and Swartout (2016) suggest that this is because these men may view the sexual aggression as stressful, given their increased cognitive appraisal of masculine-relevant situations as stressful, and would intervene faster as a result. Furthermore, men with higher stress may have viewed intervention as a means of obtaining social status through behaving in a chivalrous way – thus, benevolent sexism, or men's idealization of and chivalry toward women who fit gendered stereotypes (Glick & Fiske, 1997), may be relevant for understanding men's bystander intervention. This is somewhat consistent with a finding by Good, Sanchez, and Moss-Racusin (2016), which suggests that men may confront sexism or misogyny out of a sense of paternalistic duty – however, the role of chivalry and protectiveness is in contention, given that other studies have noted that men's chivalry might not fully account for bystander intervention, and only apply to women who are socially close, such as girlfriends, wives, mothers, or sisters. Given the mixed findings within this body of literature, there is a better need to gain a deeper understanding of the role of masculinity in active bystander intervention.

Summary of Study Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify men who have acted as bystanders against sexual violence, and qualitatively investigate their subjective experiences and construction of masculinity in order to understand how their masculinity may have contributed to their decision to intervene. This study has the potential to contribute to the literature on bystander intervention among men, and to particularly address the gap in the literature, which has often overlooked the role that masculinity can play in

increasing intervention, as opposed to decreasing it. Findings may have important implications for intervention efforts that can help address the persistent frequency of sexual violence on college campuses, and better understand how to encourage men become better allies for women. This study used a grounded theory approach, which can help explore men's lived experiences and unique perspectives (Fassinger, 2005), rather than pigeonholing them into narrow conceptualizations of masculinity (Harris & Edwards, 2010; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). It was important to not only examine the personal variable of adherence to masculinity, but to also understand the important role of the social context (Leone, Parrott, & Swartout, 2016), and the way that masculinities were expressed therein. Given that, for men in general, their willingness to intervene against sexual violence is affected by their perceptions of other men's willingness to intervene (Fabiano et al., 2003), men who have intervened may not only be socially situated to impact their male peers, but can also help further understanding of the contextual and personal variables that contributed to their decision to intervene. By identifying these variables, this study has the potential to inform future intervention efforts.

A recent study by Leone, Parrott, and Swartout (2016) suggested that men who exhibit higher masculine gender role stress may be quicker to intervene against sexual aggression when in the presence of a misogynistic peer norms – this can be done to elevate their own sense of masculinity through acting chivalrous. The authors noted that this finding was somewhat surprising, given previous research suggesting that men who experienced more social pressure to appear masculine would be less likely to intervene (Carlson, 2008). That is, there are mixed findings regarding the

role of a "secure" sense of masculinity. For instance, perhaps it is possible that for men who are secure and confident in their masculinity, despite its precarious nature (Vandello & Bosson, 2013), there is not as much anxiety around appearing manly in front of male peer groups, which can in turn encourage intervention. In contrast, men who are particularly anxious about their masculinity may feel too threatened to intervene, particularly because sexual violence intervention is often perceived as an un-masculine act (Carlson, 2008; Fabiano et al., 2003). Within this study, it was expected that men who have intervened experience less insecurity or anxiety surrounding their masculinity, or have developed a critical or feminist consciousness that encourages them to act as allies for women. However, it is important to acknowledge that some of the most important aspects of bystander intervention are related to contextual, rather than individual, factors. For instance, situational factors are particularly important (Fischer et al., 2011), and perceived peer support of sexual aggression is more predictive of bystander intervention than personal beliefs (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2010). Moreover, masculinity is an individual-level variable that is sensitive to peer norms, as well as social and contextual variables (Bem, 1981).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Participants

This study was approved by a University Institutional Review Board prior to data collection. Potential participants were identified using criterion-based sampling (Patton, 2002), such that participants had to: a) identify as men, b) be enrolled in the university, c) be between 18-25 years old, and d) have engaged in at least one sexual assault bystander intervention behavior in their lifetime. Participants were recruited through the university SONA system, university email listservs, recruitment fliers posted in public spaces on campus, as well as through advocacy and educational groups on campus which aim to prevent sexual violence.

Students who expressed interest through recruitment were invited to complete a brief online survey that established their eligibility to participate in the study. Students were asked to complete the Students' Intent to Intervene by Intervention Behavior measure (Hoxmeier, Flay, & Acock, 2015), which measures intentions to intervene against sexual assault (α= .90). The measure includes three types of bystander intervention: preassault, or primary, intervention ("Confront your friend who says he plans to get a girl drunk to have sex"), midassault, or secondary, intervention ("Interrupt the situation when you walk in on your friend who is having sex with an intoxicated girl"), and postassault, or tertiary, intervention ("Cooperate with the police or campus security in an investigation of sexual assault that your friend committed"). The measure was modified to only include 8 items, which focus on preassault and midassault intervention behaviors, given that these behaviors

represent active sexual assault bystander intervention, and better represent the construct of interest. The measure was also modified such that each of the items asked potential participants whether they have or have not engaged in that behavior (see Appendix A for a full list of the items). Students were also provided with a space to describe their intervention in more detail, and further had the option to indicate whether they had intervened in a way that was not included in the measure. Those who had engaged in at least one bystander behavior, based on the Students' Intent to Intervene by Bystander Behavior Measure, and who met the other inclusion criteria, were invited via email to participate in an interview that was approximately one hour long. Participants who were recruited through SONA received course credit in exchange for their participation, and all other participants received $25 compensation. Data were continuously evaluated and analyzed, and participant recruitment continued until data saturation was reached (Patton, 1990). Data saturation was determined by redundancy in responses, and researchers indicate that approximately 15 participants is the minimum for grounded theory work (Creswell, 2013).

We recruited 15 participants who were aged 18 to 25 (*M age* = 19.9); all but one of the participants identified as heterosexual, cisgender men. One participant identified as queer and gender non-conforming, but responded to the call for participation (with specified male-identified participants), and stated that he identified as a male at the time of his interventions. Nine of the participants identified as White, four as Asian-American, and two as African-American. Six of the participants reported that they were members of Greek organizations on campus. Participants were eligible to participate in the study if they reported having completed at least one

bystander intervention behavior in their lifetime, and all of the participants reported on an intervention that had taken place within the last one to five years. Eight of the participants endorsed that they had intervened multiple times, and six reported that they received bystander intervention training. All participants stated that were exposed to sexual assault and rape prevention education through mandatory Title IX sexual misconduct training prior to their freshman year. See Table 1 for participant demographics.

Research Team

Within grounded theory, researchers are seen as instruments, whose social positions and privileges are important to consider (Charmaz, 2008; Glaser & Strauss, 1967), thus it is important to highlight the social identities of the research team members. The primary investigator is a first-generation Turkish-American, heterosexual, cisgender female doctoral student in counseling psychology. She has experience with researching gender norm conformity and identifying distinct masculine norms that influence both positive and negative health and social outcomes. She also has experience conducting qualitative research from the grounded theory approach. She was responsible for participant recruitment and scheduling, conducting interviews, and data transcription and analysis. The other research team member is a White, heterosexual, cisgender female doctoral counseling psychology student who has an interest in masculinity research, and has experience with grounded theory research. She assisted with data transcription and analysis. Our team was later joined by a researcher who identifies as a first generation Vietnamese-American, gay, cisgender male doctoral student in counseling psychology who has

experience conducting research on masculine and feminine norms through a feminist and social justice perspective. He assisted with participant recruitment, data transcription, and analysis. The final member of the research team, an auditor, is a fourth-generation Japanese-American male professor, who has extensive experience conducting research on gender socialization.

It is important to consider the gender dynamic that can potentially occur given that a woman conducted all of the interviews. There was a risk that male participants could feel uncomfortable openly discussing topics such as their gender socialization. Thus the interviewer strived to acknowledge this dynamic with the participants themselves and emphasized her curiosity and empathy regarding their experiences. Encouragingly, there is research that indicates that within counseling settings, men may feel more comfortable speaking honestly and expressing feelings with a female clinician (Reed, 2014), thus utilizing a female interviewer to speak to men about this potentially vulnerable topic may generate more honesty and authenticity in their responses. However, it is still important to acknowledge that the use of a female interviewer was a potential limitation and may have impacted the nature of the participants' responses. Carlson (2008) similarly conducted qualitative research on sexual assault bystander intervention among males, and noted that she judged participants to be truthful based on the way they spoke and answered her questions. I utilized a similar strategy, and observed participants' honesty through noticing their reactions, how long it took them to respond, and how thoughtful they appeared.

Procedure

Interviews took place in a quiet, private lab space, with the door locked. The lab was not available for access when interviews took place. Upon arriving, participants were asked to review and sign the informed consent form, and were informed that they could withdraw from participation at any point without penalty. At the onset of the interview, participants were informed of the purpose of the study, in order to allow for transparency. The interviewer used the semi-structured interview protocol and instructions (see Appendix B); the protocol was crafted in order to gather information pertinent to each point, but also encouraged the interviewer to be flexible, spontaneous, and reflective in their responses to participants. The interview protocol encouraged the use of clarifying, and open-ended questions. This was done with the intention of encouraging participants to elaborate on their responses, and to allow space for deeper exploration of the topics. All participants were interviewed individually.

Interviews took place from May 2017 to April 2018, with the majority of interviews taking place in September of 2017. Interviews lasted from 30 to 90 minutes, with the majority of interviews lasting approximately 50 minutes. Participants were recruited through emails sent to Greek chapter leaders, university listservs, university course postings, and through university organizations that conduct trainings on sexual assault prevention and bystander intervention. All participants were assigned pseudonyms in order to protect their confidentiality, and participants were compensated with either a SONA credit, or with a payment of $25.

Immediately following the interview, participants were given space to process any emotional reactions to the interview, and were also offered campus resources related to counseling, due to the sensitive subject matter. Interviews were recorded using a secure audio recording device, which was stored in a secure lab space. Informed consent forms were stored in a secured space. Contents of the audio recording were transcribed verbatim, and any identifying information (e.g. names, locations, individual characteristics) was omitted. Participants were all assigned pseudonyms and participant codes, which were linked to their interview transcript, in order to further protect confidentiality.

Interview questions. Interview questions were developed by the first author, as well as the other members of the research team. Participants were first asked to describe the situation in which they intervened, the social context therein, their relationships with the perpetrator(s) and the victim(s), their thoughts and reactions preceding and following their decision to intervene, the responses and reactions of others. The questions surrounding their intervention are consistent with stages of the 5-step bystander model proposed by Latané and Darley (1970).

Within their individual interviews, participants described their intervention(s), and were asked open-ended, follow-up questions regarding the social factors that influenced their decision to intervene, including their relationships with the potential perpetrators and potential victims, presence of others, familiarity with the social environment, and reactions of other bystanders. Men were asked directly what gave them the confidence and efficacy to intervene, as well as how they noticed the event, and what made them feel responsible to intervene.

Participants were then asked about their construction of masculinity, as well as how their intervention related to their understanding and conceptualization of their masculine identity. This order was established so as not to prime or unintentionally pressure the participants into making a connection between their bystander intervention and their construction of masculinity. Men were asked explicitly about their development and understanding of masculinity, with follow-up questions gauging the extent to which they conformed to and internalized these norms, or how much they disagreed with and rejected these norms. Finally, participants were asked explicitly whether they saw a connection between their definition of masculinity and their decision to intervene. Men who said "no" were asked what they largely attributed their decision to intervene to, and men who answered "yes," were asked follow-up questions regarding which specific aspects of masculinity contributed to their decision to intervene. Participants were also asked about their observations, opinions, and experiences around why other men may not intervene, and were encouraged to consider ways that men might be more efficacious and willingness to intervene against sexual assault in the future.

The proposed interviewing method was consistent with suggestions made by Strauss and Corbin (1998), who recommend that researchers used a funnel-like approach, such that the interview questions move from being broad to more specific. The interviewer was flexible and frequently prompted for deeper exploration of participants' responses. It was important that participants' subjective understanding of their masculinity, as well as their decision to intervene, was thoroughly explored with follow-up questions and questions that facilitated exploration and elaboration, and

that this was all done within the context of established rapport (Fassinger, 2005). The semi-structured interview format encouraged the use of open-ended and clarifying questions in order to help the participants elaborate on their responses, and in order to maintain flexibility in order to capture emerging concepts.

Grounded Theory

The grounded theory approach allows for the generation, rather than verification, of theory from qualitative data (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). That is, the ultimate goal is to produce a novel theory that is "grounded" in data collected from participants based on their complex, lived experiences which exist within a social context (Fassinger, 2005). Grounded theory often uses inductive strategies for collecting data in order to develop theory; the social constructivist approach continues with this strategy while also preserving the complexity of social lives and contexts (Charmaz, 2008). The constructivist approach also allows for the exploration of gender as being socially constructed, while a social justice framework recognizes the context in which gender is constructed, and particularly contextualizes it within other hierarchical social systems based on identities (Bell, 1997; Harris & Edwards, 2010). The constructivist approach also allows for more flexibility compared to an objectivist approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), and acknowledges the positions, privileges, and perspectives of the researchers (Charmaz, 2008). This method is well suited not only for understanding how male bystanders construct their gender socialization experiences and how this potentially impacted their decision to intervene, but also for allowing for the researchers to remain flexible, curious, and

reflective of their own social positions, and how these positions impact the research process. Grounded theory was selected primarily because it will allow for the generation of a novel theory, given that there is a sparse literature regarding this topic. Furthermore, grounded theory has been employed successfully in a number of studies on masculinity and masculine gender role enactment in social contexts (Harris & Edwards, 2010).

It is important to note that one of the main features of the grounded theory approach is its method of data collection (Rennie, Phillips, & Quartaro, 1988). Participants who represent the phenomenon of interest are selected, to increase the odds that the unique aspects of that phenomenon will emerge clearly. This facilitates the generation of codes, as well as consensus about their properties. Furthermore, the collection of data is done successively, such that successive stages are determined by what has been learned from previous data collection. The transcripts of the interviews are used as data, and are deconstructed and reassembled into a coherent theory that describes the phenomenon of interest by collectively telling the participants' story (Harris & Edwards, 2010). The analysis of data proceeds through open, axial, and selective coding (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1998), as well as through the constant comparative method (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), such that the researchers will constantly compare, evaluate, and reconstruct coding to capture emerging or significant themes. Charmaz (2000) notes that the constant comparative method also includes comparing data from different individuals, comparing data within individuals (i.e. at different points in their own narrative), comparing incidents with other incidents, and comparing categories with other categories.

Incorporation of Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR). In order to ensure data analysis was not being overly influenced by the perspective, biases, and experiences of only one investigator, we incorporated elements of CQR, which is also housed with a constructivist philosophical approach (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997; Hill et al., 2005). Namely, we followed CQR guidelines such that we included several judges throughout the data analytic process (CQR recommends three to five judges, and our research team consisted of three), in order to foster multiple perspectives, and the research team worked to arrive at consensus regarding judgments about the data's meaning. Consensus is used in order to ensure that "the best possible construction is developed for all of the data" (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997; p. 523; Hill et al., 2005). In line with CQR, we also included an auditor to examine and check the work of the team of researchers, in order to minimize the effects of groupthink on the data analysis. Other key components that we adapted from CQR were that data were gathered through a semi-structured format, with the inclusion of extensive open-ended questions such that participants' responses were not constrained. Finally, the primary team of investigators repeatedly revisited the raw data in order to ensure that our research findings were based on and grounded in the participants' experiences and data.

Analysis. Following data collection, the choice of analytic unit is defined and is then consistently used. For instance, Glaser (1978) recommends that interview material is analyzed line by line, whereas other researchers recommend that the transcript is broken up into units of meaning wherein individual concepts are conveyed by interview participants (Rennie, Phillips, & Quartaro, 1988). For the

purpose of this study, the researchers analyzed the data line by line. The basic analytic process was done through coding, which consisted of open, focused, axial, and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 1990; Fassinger, 2005).

In the first stage of *open coding*, data were broken down analytically into units of meaning, and compared against others for similarities and differences; they were then conceptually labeled, and conceptually similar data were grouped together to begin to form categories and subcategories. Finally, the units were interrogated for alternative interpretations, conditions surrounding the data, and any remaining gaps – this comprises of the first steps toward theorizing from the data (Fassinger, 2005). In this stage, we further included *focused coding*, which is more selective and conceptual (Charmaz, 2006; Murray, 2018). During this stage, the members of the research team determined which codes were considered the most meaningful and relevant in addressing the current study questions; codes that did not comprise a separate category, or that were determined to fall outside the scope of the present study, were not included. Herein, we removed codes that did not have enough substance to hold up as a separate category, as well as codes that fell outside the scope of the present study (e.g. a participant's description of helping a female friend leave an abusive relationship; a different participant's description of the backlash to liberal ideals). In this stage, the primary investigator, in conjunction with consultation with the other members of the research team and the outside auditor, collapsed similar codes into a single code. For instance, codes including "alcohol was salient" and "role of alcohol in potential sexual assault" were collapsed into the subcategory of

"Drinking Climate" which was subsumed by the key category of "Role of Alcohol." The auditor examined and verified the emerging theory following focused coding.

In the next stage of *axial coding*, categories were organized based on their relationships with one another, and were further explicated such that they were grouped into encompassing *key categories*, which subsume several *subcategories*. Herein, the constant comparative method was used, such that subcategories were compared to and related to categories, categories were compared to new data, the attributes of the category were expanded upon such that they were viewed in a more complex way, and finally, researchers explored variations or disconfirming instances in the data, and thus re-conceptualized categories as necessary. Data collection ceased when categorical saturation was reached, or no new information was being discovered about the categories, and when the categories were complex enough to capture the variety of participants' lived experiences. Data collection occurred concurrently with coding. During axial coding, in order to ensure that the selected quotes were representative of the emerging categories and subcategories, the members of the research team would not only carefully examine each quote, but would retrieve the full transcript in order to examine the quotes in their original context, to ensure we were fully understanding the quotes as the participants intended, and that our analysis was grounded in the experiences of the participants.

In the third stage of *selective coding*, the researchers created a substantive theory. A central, or "core" theme was selected on the basis of integrating all of the other categories. The core category represents the main phenomenon of the study, and was identified by understanding what main analytic idea was presented by the

research, how the findings could be conceptualized in brief terms, and what all of the interactions within the data seemed to be centered around. That is, a "core" story was generated, and represented the most important aspects of the data by "subsuming all of the other categories and articulating their relationships to the core story" (Fassinger, 2005, p. 161). The other categories stand in relationship to the core category as conditions, interactional strategies, or consequences of those strategies. It is important that the participants' narratives are repeatedly checked against this emerging theory, such that both confirming and disconfirming evidence is uncovered. Finally, the last step in grounded theory research is in presenting the results – in our reporting, consistent with this approach, we included extensive quotes from participants in order to ensure that our theory was grounded in the participants' subjective experiences and unique voices.

Reflexivity. Consistent with constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2008), the researchers rejected the notion that they are *tabula rasa*, and instead acknowledged their prior beliefs and expectations, and theoretical preconceptions related to the phenomenon, and these preconceptions were subjected to rigorous scrutiny. Charmaz (2008) suggests that researchers must acknowledge they construct categories out of the data, rather than assuming that the theory emerges from data. This allows for an interpretative understanding of the phenomenon of interest, which also accounts for context. Grounded theorists who adhere to the constructivist position must: (1) treat the research process as a social construction in and of itself; (2) scrutinize all decisions and directions, which in turn leads to, (3) improvising methodological and analytic strategies throughout the entire research process; (4) and

collect sufficient data such that they can fully discern how participants construct their lives.

The grounded theory approach is ultimately one that is reflexive, and in accordance with this, the researchers made the entire process explicit through auditing and keeping memos such that their analytic decisions were documented, and emerging ideas were well understood (Fassinger, 2005). Researchers maintained reflexivity through memo-writing, which was an ongoing process and record of the evolving ideas, assumptions, and feelings that emerge as the theory is being developed. We also maintained an audit trail, which comprised of all of documents related to the grounded theory inquiry. Here, we documented our process of decision-making and data analysis, as well as our emerging findings, areas of surprise, expectations, and biases. Auditing occurred within debriefing meetings (wherein the researchers' coding, categorizing, and theorizing is ensured to remain close to the content of the data), as well as by an auditor, who verified the interviewers' interpretations of the data. When coding and agreeing upon categories, the team members came upon decisions through consensus (Hill et al., 1997); when disagreements were encountered, we retrieved and reviewed the data in full, and engaged in an open dialogue until consensus was reached. This helped ensure that the analysis of the data was not subject to one researchers' interpretations or biases. The use of an auditor, who was outside of the primary research team, helped mitigate the effects of groupthink on data analysis.

Trustworthiness. Trustworthiness was established in the study by two methods recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985), and in line with previous

qualitative studies that have focused on masculinity through a grounded theory lens (Harris, 2008). These steps included: peer debriefing and member checks. All of the data were analyzed by multiple members of the research team, whose identities and experiences were described above. All members of the research team read all of the interview transcripts out load and coded the data line-by-line; we ensured that consensus was reached in every aspect of data collection, in order to ensure that data analysis was not being solely determined by the primary investigator. The members of the research team were knowledgeable on gender norm conformity research, and conducting research through a social justice lens. Members of the debriefing team were able to provide interpretations of the data I had not considered, and we were all mindful of acknowledging and openly discussing our biases and expectations. Every transcript was coded by at least two people, while the majority of transcripts were coded by all three members of the research team. When there was a discrepancy or disagreement regarding coding, all members of the research team carefully examined the data within its context, and engaged in an open discussion until consensus was reached. Our analyses were further examined by an outside auditor, who offered verification and further suggestions for data analysis.

Further, member checks were used to verify our findings, such that the primary investigator obtained verbal consent from all study participants to verify that findings within our emerging theory. The primary investigator sent a follow-up email to all participants and presented the emerging theory. Participants were given the opportunity to review the research findings and were asked to provide feedback and

commentary on the extent to which the study findings accurately reflected their experiences.

Summary

In this study, we used a grounded theory approach, informed by elements of CQR, to explore the experiences of male college students who have acted as bystanders against sexual assault. We further used a constructivist approach, and applied a social justice perspective as we proceeded through data collection and analysis. Participants were identified through a number of sampling strategies, and the primary investigator conducted all of the interviews. After the interviews were transcribed verbatim, the research team used line-by-line open coding, followed by focused coding, axial coding, and selective coding in order to analyze the data and develop a theory grounded in the participants' lived experiences. The constant comparative method allowed data analysis to concurrently inform future data collection until we reached participant saturation, and identified the emerging theory. We maintained an audit trail and engaged in memo'ing throughout research coding meetings in order to document our process of coding, analyzing, and decision-making, and also utilized an expert auditor who verified our analysis. Further, we engaged in peer debriefing and member checks to ensure trustworthiness in the data analysis. In line with CQR principles, all data analytic decisions were made through consensus, and we utilized an auditor in order to minimize the effects of groupthink. Through these processes, the present study sought to explore social and gender relevant factors in college men's bystander intervention behaviors against sexual assault.

Chapter 4: Results

Overview of Emerging Theory

The core concept of bystander intervention was comprised of three subtypes of bystander behaviors: direct, indirect, and passive. Participants reported acting as bystanders through direct methods of intervention (e.g. confrontational, persistent behaviors directed at the potential perpetrator), through indirect methods of intervention (e.g. distracting, calling other people to help), and also reported on incidents where they had been passive bystanders (e.g. saw a potential assault and did not act). Bystander intervention, and the behaviors that participants chose to engage in, were informed by five key categories. These categories include: 1) exposure to training, 2) the role of alcohol, 3) social factors, 4) individual characteristics, and 5) masculine norms. These categories were salient for all participants but differentially influenced and facilitated intervention for each participant. In the following sections, I will describe the types of intervention behaviors, as well as barriers to intervention as described in situations where participants reported not intervening. Additionally, I will describe in detail each of the five key categories, the subcategories that they subsume, the relationships between the categories, and how the categories relate to types of intervention behaviors.

Types of Bystander Behaviors

All participants were asked to provide details on their intervention(s), including what exactly their intervention(s) entailed (see Appendix B for a full list of interview questions). The following section will include descriptions of the bystanders'

behaviors, which included direct and non-direct intervention. This section will conclude with a description of incidents that participants reported where they had been passive bystanders, and participants' perceived barriers to intervention.

Direct Intervention. Most of the participants described intervention behaviors (n = 11) that were direct and confrontational with the potential perpetrator (PP), as well as behaviors that were very persistent. That is, these participants made multiple attempts at intervening, usually in a direct manner. These participants described being confrontational with the PP through engaging directly with him and questioning him and his relationship to the potential victim (PV), as well as engaging in behaviors such as threatening to call the police. For instance, Jason, who intervened to protect an intoxicated woman, said that he persistently questioned the PP:

> We walked over, we were like, hey is everything okay, does she need help? And he was like, no she's fine, I got it. So we were like, alright do you know her name, do you know where she lives? And he didn't know anything about her, didn't know where she lived, and he was like, no it's fine, I'm just putting her to bed in my place. And we were like…uh, no, I don't think you're going to. So after we pressed him for five or ten more minutes, he put her down and left.

Rami also described the persistent nature of his intervention, wherein he asked the PP about his relationship to the PV, saying "he didn't know her, so that was another red flag…so we got the guy to go away by telling him we had called the cops and it kind of scared him off."

Participants also noted that their direct confrontation was often met with a push-back or a defensive response from the PP, yet this did not deter participants from persisting in their intervention. For example, Kumar described the retaliation he received from

the PP, stating, "he called me a queer, I'm like 'I'm more of a man that you are.'"

Another participant, Alex, also described the PP's attempt to avoid responsibility:

> I told the guy, I was like "you shouldn't be doing this and if I see you trying to do it again, I'm going to kick you out…[his response] was kind of indignant, just like "oh no I wasn't trying to do that or anything." I was like, "okay, yes you were, I know you were, I heard you, and I'm not happy about it."

Steven also directly addressed the PP and informed the PP that he was about to commit a sexual assault:

> But she was intoxicated to the point where she didn't have any cognition available to give consent, and I saw her walking out of our room with some dude I didn't know that night, and I stopped her and I grabbed the guy and was like, "hey man, I don't know what she said, but I've known her for a long time and I think she's too gone, I don't think you should be doing this right now." And I told him "honestly it could end bad for you, 'cause you know, it could end in a situation that you don't want to be in because you had sex with a girl who was way too intoxicated."

One participant, John described physically confronting the PP, stating: "The first time it was like, stop. The second time I pushed his arm away. The third time he came up from behind, and I was standing up and I pushed him away by his chest, pretty strong, he almost fell over." Two participants also described their preparedness to physically confront the PP if their verbal confrontation didn't work. For instance, Andrew stated, "If he's at the point where he's taking her, he has her in his hands, we're gonna be like, we're gonna attack you if you do something, that ain't right." Chris described having confidence to physically attack a PP who was smaller than he was, saying, "He was probably a little smaller than I was…if anything happens, I'll punch him in the face." Participants appeared to anticipate the potential for violence and showed readiness to use aggressive means as necessary.

Indirect Intervention. Notably, many of the participants also described that they had engaged in indirect methods of intervention (n = 8). Participants engaged in

indirect intervention through distracting and delegating behaviors. They made attempts to either distract the PP, or to distract the PV to withdraw her from a risky situation. They also asked for support from the PV's friends or from others. For instance, Alex noted, "I found the girl's friends and I was like, hey she probably shouldn't go home with this guy, she seems too intoxicated."

Sean described his delegating intervention, when he was a sober monitor at a fraternity party, and coordinated with the chapter's head Risk manager to help him escort an intoxicated girl out of the fraternity:

> But so this girl was extremely drunk, and I was like, alright I'm gonna go get our head Risk manager, who's the person who does all this, and I'm gonna see if I can order her an Uber, because we have an Uber account that's connected to our chapter funds…so I went to get him.

Ethan described his intervention wherein he used distraction, saying, "Me and my friend just started talking to the guy, the whole distracting thing, which is funny because when I saw that in the [training], I was like, hey that's what we did." Sean also described engaging in distracting behaviors, and described a situation where he prevented an intoxicated fraternity brother from potentially assaulting an intoxicated woman, stating: "I thought I could kind of distract him a little bit…so I walked back to his room, and I was like, hey I have to get something from your room, and he was like sure." Notably, indirect methods of intervention were used on both PP and PV, and were often utilized by participants who had been exposed to bystander training. These participants were also more likely to have reported on having intervened multiple times – they sometimes used direct behaviors as well, but used indirect methods more often.

Passive Bystander. During the interviews, some participants (n = 5) provided unprompted descriptions of a situation where they had not intervened, despite noticing a potentially risky situation. While this result was surprising, especially given that these participants reported intervening in other conditions, this speaks to the complexity of bystander intervention, as well as the common failure of bystanders to perceive a situation as an emergency, take responsibility to intervene (i.e. diffusion of responsibility), and act (Latané & Darley, 1970).

In describing situations where they did not intervene, participants reported that the ambiguity of the situation was a significant barrier. For example, Sam reported that he walked in on a situation where he saw a man having sex with an intoxicated woman, and stated:

> I did walk in. And I might have just walked in on them doing it but I wouldn't have, I don't know…I'm not sure If they really discussed it like, we're gonna get messed up blah blah and then not that they're going to just let whatever happens, happens. So I'm not really sure. And I didn't talk to her like are you okay with this, or do you agree with it and stuff like that. So I don't really know.

Andrew explicitly spoke about the bystander effect, or diffusion of responsibility (Darley & Latané, 1968), describing a situation where he and his friends were watching an intoxicated male aggressively and sexually approach an intoxicated woman. He stated that he observed this male repeatedly harassing the PV, and stated:

> At this point I was like 'I need to do something about it,' but I don't know why I didn't take the approach or why I didn't intervene, and I got to the point where me and my friends were just watching, we were just bystanders not intervening…no one could intervene because it was no one's job really.

These participants' lack of intervention raises important questions about male bystanders' perceptions of barriers to intervention (e.g. ambiguity, diffusion of responsibility), as well as times when they are able to push past these barriers. For

example, Andrew, who is quoted above, noted that when he did intervene, he intervened because the situation had little ambiguity (i.e. it was one where an intoxicated female was passed out on the couch and was being approached by a sexually aggressive male). He added that he intervened after his best friend encouraged him to. This points to the importance of both the perception of the dangerous scenario, as well as the presence of supportive peers, which is described further in the section on social factors.

Of the five participants who reported on a situation where they did not intervene, none of them had received bystander intervention training. Thus, it is possible that their lack of exposure to training influenced their passive bystander behavior. However, it is possible that other participants, including those who have received training, simply chose not to disclose on an incident where they did not intervene. The following section will focus further on the influence of bystander training.

Key Category: Exposure to Training

This category relates to men's experiences surrounding training with either bystander intervention training or sexual assault prevention education. Herein, participants noted their overall positive experiences with training, which they said equipped them with the tools and confidence to intervene. Participants also discussed the salience of empathy and perspective-taking within these training programs. This category examines participants' overall experiences with training and perceptions of what makes training effective.

Training gave tools and confidence to intervene. Several participants (n = 6) reported that they received bystander intervention training and all participants had undergone mandatory sexual assault prevention training as part of their freshman orientation. Many (n = 9) of the participants described overall positive perceptions of the sexual assault education and bystander intervention training they had received. Participants noted using the tools they had learned (i.e. the 3 D's of intervention, Distract, Delegate, Direct), as well as the confidence of being able to intervene based on the training. Even when participants did not use the tools they had learned from the intervention training, they stated that the training still taught them the importance of intervening, which in turn made them more attentive to opportunities to intervene. For instance, Jason reported that: "I think the big thing I pulled away from [the bystander training] is how important it is for you to step in and intervene in situations…so I think all that I took away from it was the importance of me stepping up and actually doing something about it." Alex also emphasized the importance of being exposed to bystander intervention training, stating that it had taught him the tools for intervention, which in turn made him feel more confident and efficacious to intervene:

> I think the confidence came from knowing that I had the tools in my mind of what to do, of just like find the girl and her friends and then take the guy to the situation and talk to him, and let him know, you know? So I think it gave the path and once you knew what to do about the situation, it's really easy to do it.

As noted above, one finding was that participants who reported receiving exposure to bystander training often reported multiple interventions, as well as reliance on indirect methods, which are often taught through bystander training programs (i.e. distract, delegate).

Importance of empathy. One of the most salient aspects of both trainings was the teaching of perspective-taking through empathy for survivors of assault, as well as for women in general. Some men noted that this was the most important aspect of training. Participants like Charles also emphasized the importance of empathy, saying: "I loved the discussion-based aspect, especially when we'd do it with sororities because I could hear a woman's perspective." Ethan noted that empathy would be the most important factor in future intervention training, and said, "I think that the best thing we could teach people – if you were in that situation, wouldn't you want people to stand up for you? Like treat people the way you want to be treated, I feel like a lot of people can understand that philosophy, and a lot less of these instances would happen." Notably, participants emphasized the role of empathy in their decision to intervene, attributing learning empathy for survivors of assault *through* these trainings, as opposed to personal connections with survivors. Participants even noted that men's lack of empathy was one of the greatest contributors to men's unwillingness to intervene against sexual assault. When I asked the participants for their thoughts on why men do not intervene as frequently as women, most of the participants (n = 9) stated that men did not empathize with potential victims, and may even identify with the potential perpetrators. For example, John said:

> A group of women going to a bar and a group of guys there, a guy tries to sexually assault a woman there, the women might identify with the woman more because they identify as female. And the men might identify with the guy who's committing the crime…so guys might be watching and think, "oh, he shouldn't be doing that" but they'll try to empathize with him.

Sean similarly described the role of empathy, as well as men's lack of understanding and empathy toward women as being an important contributor to their unwillingness

to intervene. He also described the role of male privilege in distancing men from women's experiences:

> I think girls can intervene because they feel that empathy, they're like, "I've had that happen to me," or "I've had guys hit on me before and I know I don't like that." Whereas guys are like – oh, I've never had that happen to me, these girls are being dramatic…and there's such a gap of understanding between men and women because men will never have a full understanding of what women feel when they go to a party, just like I'll never understand how somebody of a different race or different socioeconomic status class lives their life because I've never actually been in their shoes.

When I asked participants how training programs could be made more effective for encouraging men's interventions, participants again emphasized the importance of teaching empathy for women, with Louis explicitly discussing this in stating: "[Men can] develop a better point of view, like to understand where girls come from, to understand their point of view of things."

In sum, this category encapsulates men's experiences with sexual assault prevention and bystander intervention training, noting the importance of learning the tools of intervention, and developing empathy for women and survivors of assault. The following categories will examine contextual and individual factors that also impacted men's willingness to seek out further training, as well as their actual intervention behaviors.

Key Category: Role of Alcohol

Alcohol has been found to be a very salient factor in both sexual assault perpetration and victimization (Abbey, 2002), as well as in intervention behaviors against sexual assault. In line with these findings, all but one of the participants reported on situations where alcohol played a salient role in their intervention (i.e. participants

described their interventions taking place in high-risk drinking environments such as college dorm parties, fraternity parties/events, and/or bars). The key category of the Role of Alcohol encompasses three subcategories: the drinking climate, the bystander's alcohol use, and the discrepancy between the PP and PV's levels of intoxication. Notably, participants reported that discrepancies between the PP and PV's levels of intoxication played a significant role in the participants noticing the event, such that PV's were often highly intoxicated, whereas the PP's were not. We noted that participants were more likely to utilize indirect strategies when they were sober, and were often more direct and confrontational when they were somewhat intoxicated.

Drinking Climate. All but one of the participants reported on an intervention behavior that took place in a high-risk drinking environment, or near others who had been drinking or intoxicated. These environments included college dorm parties, fraternity parties and events, and local bars. They described people around them who were drinking heavily to pre-game, and participants also noticed the use of alcohol to facilitate hook-up culture. Andrew described the environment in which he intervened, and the salience of alcohol therein:

> It was at a party, people were drinking…and like this brother pregame very hard, and so he's super drunk and I mean it's like at this point where it's like, I don't know how guys are really – I don't know their psychology, but like, 'I want a girl, I'm going to do whatever it is to get one,' and most people were like "no, it's not like that, it doesn't work like that"…and he was getting outrageous and he was approaching any girl he could…

Participants' descriptions of the drinking climate related to the salient masculine norms that are perpetuated within these environments (i.e. the playboy norm, power

over women), which participants described navigating (see: the key category on masculine norms).

Bystander's Alcohol Use. About half of the participants reported that they were sober when they intervened, while the other half reported that they had been drinking, but were still cognizant and able to recognize potentially dangerous situations. Of the participants who were sober (n = 7), many reported that they were not sober because of choice; for instance, fraternity members reported that they had been assigned to be a sober monitor, or were engaging in chapter risk duty. Other participants noted that they had not been drinking prior to their intervention because of other circumstances (i.e. they were studying for exams, or playing video games), but that they were still near others who were intoxicated. Ethan pointed to his sobriety as a key factor in his ability to coordinate his intervention with his friends, as well as in his noticing the event:

> It helped too that we were very sober, we could kind of play the part of "hey man" that sort of buddy buddy attitude [with the potential perpetrators]…that definitely helped. I think it'd be harder, obviously, if we were drunk. We might not have even noticed if we were drunk, that's the scary part.

Later, when asked specifically about what gave him the sense of responsibility to intervene, Ethan emphasized his sobriety, stating, "Being one of the few sober people…we have the sort of mentality of like, if we see something going on, we're the ones who are in the proper state of mind."

The other participants (n = 8) reported on instances where they had intervened when they were not fully sober. Participants stated that while they were in situations where they had been drinking, they were still cognizant of the situation, and were "sober enough" to intervene. One participant, Steven, who reported that he was somewhat

intoxicated, noted that his intoxication increased his motivation and perceived efficacy to intervene, stating: " … the alcohol I guess reacted with my mind and I got a lot more angry than I usually would've, had I been sober, and that might've been a more compelling reason that I stepped in, as forcefully as I was and was like 'stop' or 'I'm gonna call the police.'" Steven elaborated by stating that his intoxication not only heightened his anger with the potential perpetrator for attempting to take advantage of his intoxicated friend; it also made him more cautious and attuned to his friends' safety:

> But I feel like even intoxicated, my judgment is better for what I should be doing than my friends or what I should do for my friends because once I got intoxicated I was like okay, we're intoxicated, we shouldn't be doing anything that's not completely safe, that's like in here playing video games or walking on the beach or some stuff.

Rami similarly noted that "we weren't like super intoxicated, but we were a little intoxicated, and I think that kind of heightened our senses and made us, I don't know, feel that we had to do something." Thomas also stated that he wasn't overly intoxicated when he intervened: "Most drunk people…they're not capable of doing such things as intervening, but I don't get drunk to the point where I don't notice what's going on around me."

Alcohol use differentially impacted bystanders' alcohol use, with certain participants indicating their sobriety as being an important aspect in their intervention, where other participants reported being mildly intoxicated. For these participants, both sobriety and moderate alcohol use facilitated their intervention such that it heightened their sense of responsibility and efficacy to intervene, while also appearing to help draw participants' attention to a potentially risky situation. Participants, whether they

were sober or not, noted the importance of their cognizance, and their recognition of potentially being unable to intervene if they were overly intoxicated or incapacitated.

Discrepancy between PP and PV's levels of intoxication. A significant factor in many of the participants' intervention was not only the salience of alcohol use in the environment, but also the discrepancy between the PP and PV's levels of intoxication. Ten participants reported on incidents where they noticed the opportunity to intervene *because* of this discrepancy. Notably, they described that the PV was often visibly intoxicated, and that a potential perpetrator was coherent or far less intoxicated, and attempting to take advantage of an intoxicated woman. For example, Andrew described seeing: "…the guy who was approaching her…she got really drunk, fell passed out on the couch, and you could tell, anyone at the party, who was at least in a state of mind, you could tell she was passed out." Sam echoed this, stating that the potentially dangerous situation drew his attention because of the discrepancy of intoxication between a potential victim and two male aggressors: "Something happened like, it was really sketchy about it because the two boys were fine but it was her that was messed up."

Jason similarly reported that he became attentive of an opportunity to intervene when he and a friend were walking home from the bars and noticed an intoxicated female who was being guided home by a coherent male, stating:

> He had his arm around her and she wasn't talking, and he was pretty coherently steering her in the direction of campus… it was just kind of odd how he was extremely coherent and she was not. And didn't seem that they knew each other – like they weren't speaking, he was just walking with her home. It kind of looked like she was looking around trying to find people and she didn't know where she was.

Another participant, Rami also described observing a male and female walking home, and noticing a visible difference in their levels of intoxication:

> …the female was highly intoxicated but the male was kind of carrying her and stuff but it didn't really appear the female was like comfortable with her situation…so we were observing them as we were walking with each other, and it became kind of clear that the female in the situation didn't really want to be helped by the male, and also she was so intoxicated that she couldn't really walk on her own or talk on her own, like she was very – that level of intoxicated. So we kind of went over and asked them what's up, and when we asked that, the male seemed kind of defensive, which gave us a red flag.

Kumar, who also reported having intervened multiple times, described a scenario where he explicitly perceived a male acquaintance as trying to encourage a woman's drinking in order to take advantage of her: "Like obviously he knew, okay, the more drunk she is, the more likely, because you know a lot of guys think she's cute, and it's just like a push and pull the entire night, he's trying to get her to come home…we kind of knew he wanted to go home with her, get her more drunk..."

In sum, almost all of the participants reported interventions that occurred in or near high-risk drinking environments. Participants reported on their own alcohol use, with approximately half stating they intervened when they were sober, with the rest of the participants stating that they were not fully sober, or were even intoxicated when they intervened. While this finding was surprising, given the potential for alcohol to inhibit bystanders' attentiveness to a potentially dangerous situation (Leone et al., 2017; Steele & Josephs, 1990), participants who reported that they were somewhat intoxicated noted that alcohol actually facilitated their intervention. Finally, participants often became attuned to the need to intervene because they were observant of and attentive to the discrepancy of intoxication between a potential perpetrator and a potential victim. Most participants (n = 10) reported that they

witnessed an aggressor who was less intoxicated, or coherent, attempting to take advantage of a visibly intoxicated woman. Given the salience of alcohol within participants' intervention, as well as the social context in which alcohol use took place, the following category will further examine the social factors that influenced participants' intervention decision.

Key Category: Social Factors

Another category that we identified as being a significant factor in informing college men's bystander intervention was the role of social factors, which encompasses the following subcategories: peer context and sense of support, relationships to PV and PP, and reactions to intervention. This category emerged given participants' common experience of intervening in environments that included supportive peers, familiarity within the social environment, and a sense of empowerment that was derived from the presence of affirming friends. Notably, many of the participants stated that they intervened with male friends, who either affirmed or encouraged intervention. Participants described that their fear of backlash from the PP, or of entering a physical altercation, was mitigated by the presence of supportive peers. This category also encompasses the participants' relationships with the PV and PP. In the Results, I will explore how participants' relationships with the PV and PP relate to types of interventions.

Peer context and support facilitate intervention. Participants described the social context in which their intervention took place, most notably describing the presence of socially supportive male peers who either affirmed or encouraged their decision to intervene. Participants (n = 5) described their peers as being explicitly

affirming, and also described perceiving that their peers would be supportive of their intervention. For example, Rami stated that the presence of a male friend, who was also uncomfortable with a potentially dangerous situation, was the most important factor in his decision to intervene, saying: "Since it was a friend and I and we both felt the same way about the situation…I think if it was maybe just one of us, we would've not done anything, we would've just kept walking, but since it was both of us, that's why."

Several participants (n = 7) noted that the presence of supportive male peers also mitigated the potential threat that the PP would retaliate, or that the participants would enter into a physical altercation. For example, Rami noted, "It was the two of us versus one of him, so he wasn't gonna do anything to us." Charles, who had intervened to protect a female friend similarly said: "I didn't think it would get physical, and not that I would be afraid to be physical with someone who was being creepy, but also I had like ten of my close friends with me that had my back if it did come to that." Andrew, who described his intervention of protecting an intoxicated female acquaintance from sexually aggressive men, stated that his best friend encouraged him to intervene, and that both men intervened together. When I asked him what gave him the confidence to intervene, he stated:

> My best friend…he's like six feet, ideal, he had my back, and I also knew the other guys there very closely, and going through high school for four years with them, I knew they had my back no matter. That's what gives you the most confidence, when you know you're not going to get hurt in the situation.

Other participants described the peer context as affording them a sense of empowerment or authority to intervene, noting situations where they were in a familiar setting and became attentive to a dangerous situation because the potential

perpetrator(s) were unfamiliar within their social groups. These participants also linked the sense of familiarity and empowerment to diminishing their fears of potentially entering a dangerous or violent situation themselves. For instance, Ethan stated:

> In this situation, I knew just about everyone there, it was a comfortable setting, I'd been in that friend's house multiple times, and these two guys we just did not know and were giving off bad vibes, so I felt very confident…even if they tried to do anything, there was no way it would escalate to the point where someone got injured.

Alex echoed this, explicitly tying his confidence in intervening to a sense of entitlement and authority in his familiar social setting, while also stating that the confidence in his support system made it so he was not worried about the PP becoming aggressive.

> I think part of it also just plays into hyper-masculinity, it's just like "I'm in my house, with my friends, my fraternity." And it's like some random kid showing up so he has no right to be here if I don't want him here so if he tries to fight me or whatever it's okay because I'm going to have help…I don't really have to be concerned with him being aggressive or whatever because he's in the wrong and I have all of my support system to be there to help me out.

Finally, with regard to the peer context facilitating intervention, some participants (*n* = 3) also explicitly discussed their social position as helping to facilitate their decision to intervene. For instance, I asked Charles, a new recruit of his fraternity whether he would feel comfortable intervening if a PP was a senior member, and he stated that: "We [have] talked about ways that the freshman should be comfortable talking to the senior, one because he's your brother, two because you know that if there was one of the older brothers with you who was sober, he would say the exact same thing. So you have to think like, okay this guy might yell at me and get pissed, but that's fine." Alex also discussed the role of his leadership position in his fraternity

as facilitating his intervention, and even as putting him in a position where others alerted him of a potentially dangerous situation, stating, "I'm kind of higher up in our chapter's leadership so that's probably why they came to me about it." Sean also described his leadership position, and noted that his authority gave him confidence to intervene:

> I speak up a lot more now than I used to because I have a position with the fraternity that I do, so people kind of automatically give you respect and defer to your judgment…so I think if I was just some random guy at a party who came up to [the PP's] and did it, I wouldn't have the same reaction. If I was pledging and I tried to go up to a brother when that was happening, it would not go well at all.

Notably, there was a discrepancy between Charles' and Sean's perceptions of their ability to intervene based on their positioning within their fraternities. While Charles noted that his fraternity encourages intervention regardless of the positions of the bystander and the perpetrator(s), Sean stated that his lower position in the fraternity would result in less of a successful intervention.

Finally, participants (n = 5) reported that when they feared a dangerous outcome, they also reported that their perceived sense of support outside of their immediate context helped buffer their fear of a negative outcome. For example, Sam noted that he intervened when he was alone, but believed that he would receive support from authorities, which in turn gave him confidence to intervene:

> I'm not really a big fan of police and security but I just felt like knowing that they will hopefully have my back gave me that confidence to approach [the potential perpetrators]. Because if something would have happened, in any way, he would be wrong. I could have easily told the security or police what happened, what was going on, and things like that. So I felt like that gave me confidence.

Overall, participants described the peer context as being an important aspect in facilitating their intervention given the sense of support and empowerment that this

allowed them. The presence of supportive peers both encouraged participants' intervention behaviors and mitigated fears of potential consequences and/or physical aggression. Participants' intervention behaviors were further influenced by their relationships to the PV and PP.

Relationships to PV and PP. Participants described intervening in situations where the PV was a close friend (n = 6), as well as situations where they intervened when the PV was a stranger or a very distant acquaintance (n = 7). Additionally, two participants who indicated that they had intervened multiple times described interventions where they have intervened on behalf of a close friend, and where they intervened on behalf of a stranger. Notably, the participants in our sample reported that they tended to use more indirect methods of intervention when the PV was a stranger or a loosely known acquaintance, whereas they often utilized more direct and confrontational methods when the PV was a close friend. For example, Steven, who stated that he intervened to protect an intoxicated female friend, reported using very direct and threatening intervention behaviors with the PP. Conversely, Sean is an example of a participant who has intervened multiple times to protect women he had no relationship with, while using indirect methods such as distracting and/or delegating.

Participants also reported on intervention behaviors based on their relationships to the PP. The participants in our sample indicated that they often felt more righteous and empowered to intervene when the PP(s) was a stranger – this was closely tied to the previous subcategory, such that participants were more confident that their peer groups would support their decision to intervene against men who they

perceived as trespassers in their environment. Participants also reported more direct and confrontational methods of intervention when they were confronting PP's that they did not have a relationship with. Conversely, while participants reported also feeling confident and comfortable intervening when the PP(s) was a friend or acquaintance, they also utilized more indirect methods of intervention. This may be because they anticipated little risk or retaliation, in contrast to participants who intervened when the PP was a stranger, and discussed the anticipation of potential violence. For example, Sean described intervening when the PP was a friend: "I guess we just both really respect each other, and I knew that if situations were flipped, he would probably be doing the same thing for me."

Reactions to intervention. Upon being asked about others' reactions to their intervention, participants reported that their peers' reactions were generally positive, but often the reactions were downplayed. Several participants also reported that those around them did not even notice that there was a dangerous situation, and thus did not notice the participants' intervention. This may be indicative of the larger social environment in which assaults can take place, such that other bystanders are often not attentive to or noticing of potentially risky situations. Alex stated that others did not even notice his intervention, saying: "There's so much going on, there's so many people that you know and haven't seen in a while that you're talking to that sometimes you just get lost in everything that's going on." Louis, another participant who described himself as being very critically conscious and attentive, described confronting a male acquaintance who was bragging about having sex with an

intoxicated female. He noted, "…the other guys, they were kind of supporting it in a way. I was probably one of the few people that went against it."

Participants' intervention decisions within these social contexts appear to be influenced by a number of other categories including individual characteristics, exposure to training, and masculine norms. The bystanders in this study reported on their individual, motivational factors such as their attitudes and awareness around sexual assault, their personal definition of morality, and their identities and social locations as being key components in their decision to intervene.

Key Category: Individual Characteristics

This category focused on bystanders' individual characteristics, and includes the following subcategories: attitudes surrounding sexual assault, moral obligation to intervene, and identities and social locations. When asked about their motivations for both participating in the interview, and their general motivations for intervening, participants discussed their personal attitudes surrounding sexual assault, including their active engagement with sexual assault prevention efforts through vigilance and/or education beyond what was mandated, as well as their attitudes towards perpetrators. Notably, some participants endorsed rape myth acceptance attitudes, yet still intervened. Participants also reported that they attributed their intervention to their personal morality and sense of responsibility to protect vulnerable people from harm. Finally, participants discussed their identities and social locations as being an important individual characteristic that provided them with the values that influenced their decision to intervene.

Attitudes surrounding sexual assault. There was a great deal of variability within this subcategory, which captures participants' attitudes toward sexual assault and perpetrators of sexual assault, as well as participants' personal investment in sexual assault prevention. Several participants (n = 7) reported that they were actively involved with sexual assault education and prevention efforts, and even worked to coordinate and initiate dissemination of these educational opportunities. Notably, while all participants were exposed to some form of sexual assault prevention training (see: the key category of exposure to training), these participants sought further opportunities for training beyond what was mandatory, and put effort into continued engagement surrounding sexual assault prevention. Their involvement with these efforts in turn made them more attentive and perceptive to potentially risky situations.

When I asked these men about the developmental and personal factors that facilitated their investment in sexual assault prevention, these men often described their negative emotional reactions, including sadness, anger, and surprise, to the prevalence of sexual assault. For instance, Kumar stated: "I feel honestly horrible that one in four women get sexually assaulted. I find that horrible. It's deplorable." Participants also described their closeness to women (e.g. sisters, cousins, girlfriends, close friends) who had been assaulted or taken advantage of. Sean, who had intervened multiple times and described being very vigilant and attentive to potentially risky situations, stated that he attributed his vigilance around sexual assault to his sisters: "Honestly, I hundred percent attribute it to my sisters…one of my sisters, her first semester of college, she was sexually assaulted, and I at that time was like 15 or 16, so I was just coming into when that was gonna start playing a role

in my life, and I guess it was just really impactful for me." Jason, who was his fraternity chapter's bystander intervention training coordinator, stated: "My girlfriend at the time experienced an instance of sexual assault before I started dating her…so I kind of learned about the process of handling it, like through her explaining it." When I later asked him what made him different from men who would not intervene to prevent sexual assault, he stated: "I think they just don't know what's going on, they haven't had the same experiences and education I have."

Notably, while all of the participants in the sample had intervened against sexual assault, a few participants (n = 3) described rape myth acceptance, including victim-blaming attitudes, and several participants (n = 5) showed reluctance to place judgment on the potential perpetrator of assault. Sam, for instance, stated: "Yes he sort of did make a mistake. But everybody makes mistakes, in different ways. There are different ways you can make a mistake. So nobody is perfect and you can't judge somebody based off of an incident." Another participant, Andrew, demonstrated victim-blaming, saying of the PV:

> …what would her life be like if she did get raped, or if she did get sexually assaulted, like after. Because I just can't imagine what a miserable life that would be, because that was such a stupid mistake, like getting drunk or really drunk. I understand why the girl got too drunk, what I know is like she shouldn't have gotten that drunk, no matter what, it's a party, you're there to have fun, not to pass out.

However, other participants were explicitly rejecting of rape myths and expressed admiration for survivors. For instance, Kumar stated, "If you're a real man, you're able to get consent. Real men don't need any extra influences to get consent…a woman has to be competent enough to get a legit answer. A drunk yes is not a yes yes."

The findings from this subcategory encapsulate the male bystanders in our sample's attitudes surrounding sexual assault, as well as their education and investment in sexual assault prevention efforts. Notably, several men were invested in education and prevention efforts, while attributing their investment to their emotional reactions towards sexual assault and their close relationships to female survivors of assault, while others expressed endorsement of rape myths. This finding was notable given that rape myth endorsement may be contradictory to men's prevention efforts surrounding sexual assault.

Moral obligation to intervene. One of the most salient factors that participants identified was their personal sense of a moral obligation to intervene to protect vulnerable people from harm. We noted how this subcategory was related to participants' engagement with sexual assault education and prevention efforts, while being distinct such that several participants (n = 5) named it as their primary motivator for intervening. Jason stated this explicitly upon being asked what made him feel responsible to intervene, saying: "A moral obligation. Apathy is one of the leading causes of sexual assault…I've kind of felt an obligation to step in if I saw something wrong."

Participants also stated that their sense of morality and valuing of helping others was a significant factor in their decision to intervene. For instance, Sam said, "I felt that she needed help, and I like to help people…I don't like to see people being taken advantage of." Steven also emphasized his value around helping others and acting morally, stating: "I like to be involved in anything in which I am doing something that is right. And preventing sexual assault, that's clearly right to be

doing." Alex also described intervening as being in line with his morality and sense of responsibility, stating: "I think it really just comes down to being just not a terrible person, like not even like a decent human being, just being somebody that's not completely awful and has no morals."

Identity and social locations. Participants (n = 5) spoke about their marginalized identities influencing their experiences and development of empathy and caring for women and survivors of assault. These participants often spoke about a sense of being "on the outside looking in," describing instances of being marginalized given a variety of oppressed identities, including their mental health, racial and ethnic identity, and sexual orientation. For example, John, who was a White heterosexual male, but strongly identified with his social location around mental illness, noted his experience of intervening: "Mental illness is either people mock it or ignore it…everyone in that unit was on the fringes of society, myself included, and we think differently than most people…we don't think like most people, that could be a contributing factor of why I intervened and most people don't." In line with the notion of being "on the outside looking in," Kumar recounted his experiences of bullying based on his identities, saying:

> I'm kind of on the outside looking in so you kind of do watch, you observe and you learn things, like I have strong values…I was always bullied, left out of stuff so I always – it's easier to observe something when you're not – you get what I mean? Like it's easy to observe something when you're not participating in it.

Taylor, who was the only gay-identifying participant, also described his development around his marginalized identity as being relevant to his interest in social justice and increased critical consciousness around gender:

> I definitely see the connection, in how people were constantly telling me I wasn't doing things I wasn't supposed to be or be doing, and now that I'm kind of stepped back from it, yeah, why not do anything I can to make sure other people aren't in that confused, hurt, violent space?

In sum, participants described a number of individual and personality-related factors that influenced their decision to intervene, including their attitudes and engagement around sexual assault and prevention efforts, their sense of morality and responsibility, and their experiences that were influenced by their identities and social locations. Participants were further influenced by their personal definition and navigation of masculine norms, which became salient within the social contexts of intervention.

Key Category: Masculine Norms

This section will explore participants' experiences with masculinity, and particularly how it was influenced by their early experiences and closeness with women, the ways in which participants navigate masculine norms (including areas of conformity, nonconformity, and flexibility), and how men's personal definitions of masculinity influenced their decision to intervene.

Development of masculine norms. Participants discussed a number of influences on the development of their masculinity, with these influences largely coming from their family relationships and roles models within the family, peers in school, male role models, and relationships with women. Participants (n = 5) described their parents' permissiveness around their exploration with gender; for instance, Rami noted: "My parents never raised me to think of any gender as better over another, you know? And they let me do whatever I want, like as a child, I have so many pictures with little pink dolls, they let me do whatever, they didn't really

care." Steven similarly said, "I loved to dress up when I was six or seven, I loved getting on my mom's clothes, putting on my mom's dress, her bras and stuff…[my parents] didn't discourage that at all. They were like, woo! You look awesome, let's take pictures!" For participants like Alex, their parents' liberal ideas around gender mitigated the restrictive gender-related messages they received in other social contexts, such as their school environment:

> It's been drilled into me that like you should be accepting of people of like all different like creeds, races, like whatever…not everything is binary anymore like in high school I was taught you're either male or female but like I don't believe that, but here it's like actually okay to talk about being like gay, or lesbian, or transsexual, like whatever it may be, but it's more accepting like for that thought process to be like oh we shouldn't put labels on anybody and like people can be who they want to be.

Participants' familial dynamics in turn influenced men's development of flexibility around masculine norm conformity. Ethan explicitly noted that his parents' messages around gender influenced his bystander intervention: "So I have an older sister, so I feel like what they taught her was what they taught me, there wasn't really a defined role of 'you're our only son, you're a man, you gotta do this.' But I feel like the reason I feel somewhat confident trying to intervene is because my parents taught me like okay, we're all people, everyone has their own thing." Kumar noted how his father's masculine norm conformity, particularly around dominance and aggression, contributed to his explicit rejection of these norms, although his own interventions were very aggressive and threatening: "My dad is kind of aggressive…I grew up, I was like, I cannot be that, I cannot be like my dad…I just wanted to be the opposite of my dad, so I knew you can't be aggressive, you got to learn self-control." While he used aggressive forms of intervention, he justified his use of these given that he was protecting vulnerable women.

Participants also described how they developed compassion, emotionality, and awareness of sexism through close relationships with women, such as mothers and female romantic partners. For instance, Chris stated, "Through my relationships, I've had with girlfriends where they've been vulnerable and needed someone to be there for them emotionally, and I've always been that person." Rami also noted that witnessing the sexism that his mother experienced gave him a greater sense of empathy toward women, saying "I always think of my mother and the hardships she faced as a women and that really put things into perspective for me…so I can understand that a lot of other women may be feeling the same way and the struggles that they might be facing so that gives me some perspective."

Participants reported a number of developmental influences that impacted their understanding, development, and awareness of masculine norms. Participants often described their parents' open-mindedness around gender norm conformity, which may have helped mitigate restrictive gender roles that are often placed on men. This development influenced the ways in which men navigate gender expectations, the contexts in which they conform or do not conform to masculine norms, as well as their endorsement of positive masculinity, which will be explored in the following section.

Navigating masculine norms. Given their developmental experiences, men indicated awareness of a number of hegemonic masculine norms, including norms surrounding emotional control, being perceived as heterosexual, being a playboy (striving to have multiple sexual partners), showing power over women, and being aggressive. However, they indicated that they often resisted pressure to conform to

these norms. In turn, they described the masculine norms that they did conform to, as well as the contexts in which conformity emerged. Participants also described their disagreement with a number of hegemonic masculine norms, and described their adherence to positive masculinity, which was in line with hooks' (2004) description of positive masculinity – emphasizing being relationally oriented, caring, and critically conscious.

In describing their masculine norm conformity, the majority of participants (*n* = 10) described areas of conformity to masculine norms, particularly around perceived duty to provide for women and children, being self-reliant, prioritizing work, and valuing competition and winning. Participants often linked their duty to care for others as being influential to their intervention, given that the messages around caring for women were often tied to a sense of duty and responsibility. For example, Sam noted, "As a man, I'm expected to take control and stand up for my responsibilities…because that's my job and that's what I'm supposed to do cause I feel like if I don't do it, then would I really be a man?" When participants endorsed masculine norms relating to dominance, this was sometimes tied to more confrontational, compensatory forms of intervention behavior, especially in the face of a threat to masculinity. For instance, Kumar faced retaliation and the PP attempted to diminish his masculinity while he was intervening, and said: "You can say everything you want. If [the PP] tried – obviously I can beat the crap out of him, I don't care, I know I'm better than him in every single aspect of life."

Many participants (*n* = 8) also expressed explicit disagreement with masculine norms, especially around showing power over women, emotional control and the

playboy norm. Participants' disagreement with these norms was linked to a sense of empathy and emotional reaction in the face of hearing about sexual assault. Disagreement or rejection of norms also contributed to these participants entering high-risk environments without adhering to the salient norms within, including the playboy norm. This is notable given that the playboy norm promotes men's aggressive pursuit of sex, and adherence to it may prevent other men from intervening against sexual assault, given the social stigma around "cockblocking" (Carlson, 2008). Steven described how his rejection of the playboy norm spurred his intervention:

> I guess the stereotype would be that the man, the guy, his buddy is about to be laid, why would he do something about that? You know. Cockblock, that sort of thing…and so I, I think it definitely subconsciously spurred me into action, or thinking that no, there is no such thing as "be a man, let your buddy get laid," that's stupid, that's sexual assault going on, or at least a potential one, and I'm going to stop it. I'm a human being, there's another human being in trouble, I'm going to do something about it.

Andrew also discussed his disagreement with the playboy norm, noting "I know I'm very happy with my girlfriend, I don't need to go out and get other girls, and even if I don't have a girlfriend, I don't need to be like a person who goes out to get 10 or 20 girls, I'm happy with one girl." Louis also spoke about the playboy norm, and specifically how his disagreement with the playboy norm set him apart from other men, and facilitated his decision to intervene:

> I've seen how society kind of makes us robots. Like it puts thoughts into our heads and teaches us how to act, what to do. And I guess the program that they've been sending the robots in society has gotten polluted, like there's a virus, and the virus is that the amount of girls you sleep with makes you more of a man…I guess just the fact that I don't agree with that sets me apart.

Participants showed flexibility in their conformity and non-conformity to distinct masculine norms. They also described the specific contexts in which they conformed

or didn't conform to certain norms. For example, Steven spoke specifically about his flexibility around the emotional control norm:

> I let my emotions flow out…I don't bottle them up, which is a super stereotypically male thing, you're supposed to bottle them up. I don't do that. If I'm mad I'm mad, if I'm sad I'm sad, if I'm happy I'm happy…I don't need to bottle them up except in situations where you have to bottle them up, like at work, you can't get super angry because you're at work.

Taylor also described rejection of masculine norms in general, stating:

> My adult life has really been unlearning and rejecting what it means to be masculine…I try to be intentional about the way I think through things and where I align myself, and I still catch myself conforming to certain things and I realize, oh I don't need to be here, and I leave.

Participants (n = 6) endorsed aspects of positive masculinity that contributed to their intervention, with these aspects pertaining to being empathetic, responsible, emotionally present, and critically conscious. Sean stated:

> I definitely hold true the message of just being as good of a guy as you can be as possible to women…like I respect my friends a lot who have healthy relationships or treat women really well or do advocacy for sexual assault and stuff, like I really admire that in other people and I try to do it myself.

This subcategory demonstrates the complexity of masculine norm conformity and its potential influence on men's decision to intervene. Men discussed flexibility around their conformity to distinct masculine norms, as well as how their personal definition of masculinity relates to their relationships with and views of women, and their interventions against sexual assault.

Personal definition of masculinity facilitates intervention. The majority of participants (n = 10) reported that their definition of masculinity influenced their intervention, whereas the remaining participants noted that it was not connected (and instead attributed their decision to intervene to their sense of morality and responsibility). This subcategory will examine participants' subjective definitions of masculinity, and which specific aspects of their masculinity they associated with their

intervention. Notably, the results were not in line with one of the expectations that men's adherence to positive masculinity would be associated with intervention; indeed, some men (n = 4) described the role of hegemonic masculinity and benevolent sexism in facilitating their intervention. For example, Sam spoke to the notion that men have a duty to protect women, stating:

> Like honestly, women are what make men happy. Not really so much the money. We do it, we get the money to do everything for the women's attention because we want to get the female. So I feel like women really play a big factor in the male's life so why not provide and protect them and not treat them like anything because really that's what we do…don't let them get hurt.

Chris also spoke to the male duty to protect women, saying, "I think that being protective is a masculine trait, like I'm often protective of my female friends and girlfriends, and I always look out for them."

However, other men (n = 6) spoke about notions in line with positive masculinity (hooks, 2004), including being empathic, caring, and critically conscious, that facilitated their intervention. Sean spoke critically about how other men's gender socialization contributes to sexual assault perpetration, whereas his personal definition of masculinity, which he described as being rooted in responsibility, caring, and empathy, facilitated his intervention:

> I know that a lot of people who are perpetrators of sexual assault have that, like they subconsciously do it because they are striving for masculinity, but I feel like I intervene because I'm subconsciously striving for masculinity. So I guess I just have a different definition from most people…when I'm intervening, I'm striving for masculinity, I'm trying to be the best man I can be. When I intervene, I feel masculine.

Louis, who spoke extensively about developing a critical consciousness and being critical of social norms, spoke about his recognition of male privilege, and instead developing a sense of masculinity that included helping others: "Guys we already – society already created a head start, we already have an advantage over women in our

society today…I guess I intervened because I didn't see who else would. And that ties into one of my views of masculinity of being helpful to everyone, basically."

These findings demonstrate men's adherence to masculine norms, as well as their disagreement and non-conformity, and the complex ways in which masculine norms may facilitate bystander intervention. Participants' developmental experiences influence the ways in which they become aware of masculine norms, and how they in turn navigate them. For most participants, their personal definition of masculinity, whether that was based in positive or hegemonic masculinity, influenced their decision to intervene.

Model of Bystander Intervention

The five key categories encompass the individual and contextual factors that influenced and facilitated men's decisions to act as bystanders against sexual assault, as well as the strategies that they used to intervene. This section will integrate the results to describe how the key categories influence strategies for intervention, as well as the relationships among the key categories. Overall, all of the key categories distinctly contributed to bystander intervention, and our findings suggest that the categories of exposure to training, the role of alcohol, individual factors, and masculine norms influence the ways in which men navigate the social environment in which sexual assault may occur. See Table 2.

Participants reported using a number of strategies to intervene against sexual assault, noting that they were attentive to potentially dangerous situations based on

the social factors, their individual characteristics, the role of alcohol, and their exposure to training. Almost all of the participants reported intervening in or near a high-risk drinking environment, stating that their own alcohol use, as well as the PV's intoxication was a significant factor in their ability to notice the event, as well as their perceived responsibility to intervene. Participants also described the important role of the presence of supportive male peers, who often encouraged or affirmed intervention. About half of the participants intervened when they were sober. Among sober participants, they were more likely to utilize indirect methods of intervention, and often intervened on behalf of strangers, whereas the somewhat intoxicated participants used more direct, confrontational methods for intervention, and tended to intervene to protect close female friends, who they were already attentive to. Participants also reported feeling more efficacious to intervene given their exposure to training, with those who were exposed to bystander training being more likely to engage in indirect intervention, and more likely to have intervened multiple times. On the other hand, participants who had not been exposed to bystander training were more likely to use aggressive and direct methods of intervention. All of the participants who reported on situations where they did *not* intervene, endorsed that they had not received bystander training.

Participants' decisions to intervene were further informed by their individual characteristics, which were influenced by their developmental experiences, and in turn influenced their decision to engage in further training, as well as how they navigated the social environments in which sexual assault could potentially occur. We found that the participants in this study described their empathic qualities and moral

obligation to protect vulnerable people as being significant aspects of their attentiveness to dangerous situations, as well as their responsibility to intervene. Participants' morality was often informed by their developmental experiences and their relationships with survivors of assault, as well as their relationships with women in general. Furthermore, participants' subjective definitions of masculinity influenced their relationships with others, their individual ideals of responsibility and morality, and the ways in which they navigated the high-risk environments. Notably, participants' rejection of distinct hegemonic masculine norms such as emotional control made them more empathic toward PV's. Participants' rejection of the playboy norm also mitigated the perceived stigma against being a "cockblock," and thus did not inhibit them from intervening (Carlson, 2008). Even though participants navigated high-risk drinking environments where masculine norms were salient (i.e. playboy norm, risk-taking, power over women), these participants' flexibility around gender norm conformity allowed them to intervene despite the potential for backlash or even possible physical confrontations with the PP. Finally, we noticed that participants who conformed to ideals of masculinity that encompassed benevolent sexism, as well as attitudes around accepting rape myths, were more likely to use direct and sometimes aggressive methods of intervention, whereas participants who adhered to positive ideals of masculinity (i.e. being caring, critically conscious) were more likely to use indirect methods, were more likely to have intervened multiple times, and were more personally invested in sexual assault prevention efforts through continued training.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Discussion Introduction

The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore the role of masculinity in men's decisions to act as bystanders against sexual assault by identifying an outlier population of men who have previously intervened. The study's initial aims were to: 1) explore the social context in which the intervention occurred, including factors such as the social situation, and the individuals' relationship with the perpetrator and victim, and important social dynamics within; 2) delineate aspects of masculinity that contributed to men's efficacy and willingness to engage in bystander behaviors, and 3) develop a theory that encapsulates the role of masculinity in men's bystander intervention in situations of sexual violence. The overarching question that guided data collection and analysis was: "What are the social and gender relevant factors that influence college men's decisions to act as bystanders against sexual assault?" The current study advances the literature on college men's bystander intervention against sexual assault, and proposes a theory that examines the factors that influence and facilitate men's interventions. This chapter discusses the emerging theory of college men's bystander intervention behaviors, encapsulating social and gender relevant factors that influenced their decision to intervene against sexual assault.

Discussion of Emerging Theory

Using grounded theory analysis, this study examined the strategies that participants used to intervene against sexual assault, and identified five key categories that informed bystander intervention. In this study, participants discussed their exposure to training, the role of alcohol, social factors, individual characteristics, and masculine norms in relation to their intervention. The findings indicate that college men used various strategies to intervene, with these strategies being facilitated and influenced by individual, social, and gender-related factors. Participants described the social context in which intervention occurred, the role of alcohol in this context, the individual factors that facilitated their intervention, their exposure to training, and their male gender role socialization as differentially influencing their intervention behaviors. While all of the key categories distinctly influenced bystander intervention, four of the key categories (i.e., exposure to training, role of alcohol, individual factors, and masculine norms) further influenced the ways in which participants navigated the high-risk social environments in which sexual assault could occur.

While all of the participants intervened to prevent a sexual assault, some participants explicitly discussed situations where they did not intervene, and the barriers to intervention. These barriers were related to the ambiguity of the situation and diffusion of responsibility (Fischer et al., 2011). In these instances, participants failed to identify the situation as high-risk or severe enough to warrant intervention (Bennett, Banyard, & Edwards, 2017) and also failed to take responsibility to intervene, which is consistent with existing literature on barriers to intervention

(Burn, 2009). Participants often reported feelings of regret and remorse after their passive bystander behavior and noted that this prompted their future intervention. This is consistent with research on anti-racism bystander intervention, which has found that nonassertive bystanders often report an increased desire to respond differently to future racism (Hyers, 2007), especially in the face of lingering regret and rumination (Low et al., 2007; Nelson, Dunn, & Paradies, 2011). These participants also had not received training, which may have made them feel less responsibility or efficacious to intervene, or less able to recognize the severity of the situation (Bennett, Banyard, & Edwards, 2017).

However, all participants described the influences that facilitated their intervention, including their attentiveness to potentially dangerous situations, navigating high-risk drinking environments, the relationships they had with the potential victims, readiness to intervene based on previous training and experiences, and a supportive peer context, particularly the presence of supportive male peers. This finding is consistent with previous research indicating that the presence of social norms that facilitate intervention, as well as men's confidence that they will not be alone in intervening, is a significant factor in men's sexual assault intervention (Berkowitz, 2003; Mabry & Turner, 2016). This is especially relevant given that fear of social backlash and ostracism is a salient barrier against men's intervention behaviors (Carlson, 2008). Another important marker was around physical stature, for both the interveners as well as male peers who affirmed or encouraged intervention. Many participants spoke explicitly about the presence of physically strong male

peers, or their own physical strength and stature, as providing efficacy and confidence that mitigated fear of a potential retaliation or violence (Brewster & Tucker, 2016).

Participants discussed the salience of alcohol, as almost all of the participants intervened in a high-risk drinking environment (i.e., in a fraternity or near a bar), their own sobriety or slight intoxication as facilitating their intervention, and particularly how the discrepancy of intoxication between the potential perpetrator and potential victim was a significant factor in participants' noticing a potentially dangerous situation. Participants often discussed the drinking climate as one where masculine norms, including the playboy norm, power over women, and risk-taking (Mahalik et al., 2003) became particularly salient, and could be used as a means of facilitating sexual assault (Abbey, 2002; Locke & Mahalik, 2005). One unexpected finding was that approximately half of the participants reported that they were sober when they intervened whereas the other half reported that they were somewhat intoxicated. This is counter to expectations that bystanders' alcohol intoxication may inhibit intervention given the effects of alcohol on narrowing focus and impairing judgment (Leone et al., 2017; Steele & Josephs, 1990). Research has also noted that men who engage in higher frequencies of heavy drinking engage in fewer prosocial bystander behaviors (Orchowski et al., 2016). Indeed, some participants in the present study noted that their sobriety was a significant factor in their ability to perceive the event, and imbued them with a sense of responsibility, and other men noted that their slight intoxication actually bolstered their attentiveness and urgency in intervening. This may occur through heightening alcohol expectancies or the beliefs about the positive effects of alcohol including "liquid courage," which may have mitigated these

participants' perceived barriers to intervention (Leone et al., 2017), and ability to focus on both benefits and costs to intervening (van Bommel, van Prooijen, Elffers, & Van Lange, 2016). All participants noted that despite their slight intoxication, they were still able to perceive a potentially dangerous situation. This was often due to their attentiveness to female friends who were intoxicated, thus these participants' personal connection to the PV was a significant motivator for intervention (Burn, 2009). Indeed, acute alcohol intoxication among bystanders may further perpetuate bystanders' attributions of "worthiness" among victims who they do not feel connected to (Leone et al., 2017) – thus participants who are intoxicated may only feel morally obligated to intervene to help female friends who they feel a connection to, as opposed to helping strangers who they may not feel deem "worthy" of intervention. In contrast, participants who reported that they were sober intervened to protect PV's whether or not they had a personal relationship with them. This has an important implication regarding the relationship between alcohol use and participants' motives to intervene on behalf of strangers. Research should continue examining the interactions between alcohol use and social and relational factors in differentially influencing bystander intervention, especially in high-risk drinking environments.

In addition to social factors and the role of alcohol, participants also explained individual factors and their exposure to training as facilitating intervention. Specifically, participants described their sense of morality, ability to engage empathically with survivors of assault, and their attitudes around sexual assault prevention as positively influencing intervention. Participants' exposure to training,

which emphasized perspective taking and building empathy for survivors (Foubert & Newberry, 2006), was particularly salient. This is in line with research suggesting that bystanders' empathy is a significant factor in the ability to engage with almost every step of the bystander model (i.e., interpret, take responsibility, decide on a course, act; Jenkins & Nickerson, 2017). Participants' experiences connecting with survivors in turn motivated them to continue to actively engage in sexual assault prevention efforts. This is consistent with literature that has explored the role of "sensitizing" or opportunity events, in which men's exposure to the realities of violence against women has been found to be an important factor in men's development as allies against oppression (Casey & Smith, 2010). In turn, participants' exposure to training was an important facet in their perceived efficacy to intervene (Katz & Moore, 2013), with this efficacy further prompting their decision to intervene through indirect methods that were non-aggressive in nature. Participants also described how their exposure to training fostered a sense of responsibility as well as knowledge of skills that mitigated ignorance or perceived deficits to intervention (Yule & Grych, 2017). Participants noted the importance of empathy building and perspective taking within these programs (Foubert & Newberry, 2006), while also identifying themselves as empathic given their developmental experiences surrounding masculine role socialization.

Role of masculinity in bystander intervention. The following section will further explore the role of masculinity in bystander intervention. Notably, masculinity was among the many influences of men's intervention, and given it has been largely unexplored in the literature, this section will aim to more deeply explore it as a

potential facilitator of intervention. Participants provided insight on the complex role of masculinity in influencing their intervention, with the majority of participants indicating that their personal definition of masculinity influenced their decision to intervene. Notably, participants endorsed positive masculinity (i.e., valuing empathy, caring, and critical consciousness), yet also conformed to hegemonic masculine norms, rape myth acceptance, and benevolent sexism. This finding is consistent with experimental research, which has found that men higher in masculine gender role stress may sometimes intervene to stop sexual aggression against women due to benevolent sexist beliefs, and out of a need to boost their own masculinity in the presence of threatening peers (Leone, Parrott, & Swartout, 2016). The findings from this study add to the literature by uncovering the distinct role of positive masculinity in facilitating men's intervention behaviors.

Participants described their navigation of masculine norms, with several men noting that they explicitly rejected norms around striving to have multiple sexual partners (playboy norm), power over women, and emotional control. Extant literature has identified a number of masculine norms, the pressure to uphold masculinity, and acceptance of objectification of women as facilitating men's acceptance of sexual violence (Seabrook, Ward, & Giaccardi, 2018), thus our result that several men in our study rejected these notions is in line with these findings. Significantly, men's explicit rejection of the playboy norm was an important factor in men's willingness to intervene. Studies have found that men may be hesitant to intervene against potential sexual assault given the social stigma around being a "cockblock" and disrupting male peers' sexual conquests (Carlson, 2008). Participants' rejection of this norm

mitigated their fear around this social stigma and facilitated their ability and sense of responsibility to intervene. However, participants reported endorsing other norms related to hegemonic masculinity, including risk-taking, self-reliance, and winning. It is possible that these norms bolstered participants' decision to intervene, given these participants were not risk-averse, and valued competitiveness. Intervening to stop a sexually aggressive male may have been in line with conformity to these norms. Further research should continue to explicate these findings.

As Good and colleagues (2016) suggested, some participants spoke to the intersections of masculinity with other social locations that influenced their decision to intervene. This was especially true for participants whose identities were influenced by their social locations around mental illness and sexuality. The research team noted that male participants who held privileged identities (i.e., White, heterosexual, upper-to-middle class) described having an easier time navigating masculine norms in a flexible way, whereas participants who held stigmatized identities (i.e., men of color with low SES status) sometimes displayed hyperconformity and greater reactivity to perceived threats to their masculinity. One possible explanation for this is the way that masculinity for men of color is often diminished (Collins, 2004; Espiritu, 1997). This can prompt men to alleviate the strain of this diminishment through over-identifying with hegemonic ideals and endorsing oppressive attitudes (Coston & Kimmel, 2012; Gerschick & Miller, 1995) such as benevolent sexism and rape myth acceptance. In turn, men whose identities are marginalized may utilize bystander intervention, particularly through confrontational and aggressive means, as a compensatory measure when they

perceive that their masculinity is threatened, or that there is an opportunity to boost masculinity through performing a stereotypically masculine task (Vandello & Bosson, 2013) such as "rescuing" a vulnerable woman. In contrast, men with privileged identities may have greater allowance to be flexible in their masculine norm conformity, and may also have more opportunities to obtain leadership positions that facilitate their confidence in intervening. Indeed, these participants' endorsement of positive masculinity, which is distinct from hegemonic ideals of masculinity (Thompson & Bennett, 2015; Wong et al., 2011), was an important factor in their decision to intervene. These participants' privilege and security in their masculinity may allow them to engage in critical consciousness-building activities, thus opportunities for training, hence why these participants often intervened "by the books" and used indirect methods of intervention. In contrast, men with multiple marginalized identities may experience greater barriers to intervention. Future studies should continue to extrapolate on these findings, with an emphasis on the intersections between masculinity with other social locations, including race, socioeconomic status, and sexuality.

The findings regarding the role of masculinity uncovers the potential for continued research on the complex role that masculinity plays in men's decision to intervene against sexual assault (Carlson, 2008). Men's continued adherence to hegemonic ideals of masculinity, which in turn confer ideas surrounding rape myth acceptance (Locke & Mahalik, 2005) and sexual assault perpetration (Smith, Parrott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2015), displays the need for intervention programming to continue to address these oppressive constructs. Men can continue to grow as allies in ending oppression

against women by examining both their privileged and marginalized identities, and developing areas of self-awareness around their social privilege (Bishop, 2002; Casey & Smith, 2010; Reason et al., 2005). While some men in the study endorsed benevolent sexist ideals as facilitating intervention, this finding should be considered with caution given the correlation of benevolent sexist ideals with hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Indeed, participants in this study who endorsed benevolent sexism also endorsed attitudes around victim-blaming and rape myth acceptance. Future studies should continue to explore the complex role of benevolent sexist beliefs in perpetuating or intervening against misogyny.

Implications

One notable finding was around the effectiveness of bystander education training, in addition to traditional sexual assault psychoeducation training. Research suggests that engaging with the former results in increased bystander behavior efficacy (Palm Reed et al., 2015), which was consistent with our findings. Our results overall indicate the positive influence of participants' exposure to training (Katz & Moore, 2013), especially given that participants who reported receiving bystander training were more likely to have intervened multiple times, and were more likely to use indirect, non-aggressive methods of intervention. While participants' direct, aggressive methods were effective at preventing sexual assault, these methods could also be potentially dangerous and escalate in violence. Thus, training men with safe methods such as distracting and delegating, may allow men to feel more efficacious as well as more confident that their intervention will not lead to a potential physical altercation.

Another finding from our study was that while all of the men reported engaging in intervention behaviors that were in or near high-risk drinking environments, several of the participants reported being sober when they intervened. However, of the participants who were sober, particularly those who were members of fraternities, several of them reported that they were not sober by personal choice. Thus, one way that college campuses can consider curbing the high prevalence of sexual assault in high-risk environments such as fraternities (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000) is through compulsory service throughout all chapters, allocating chapter funds to intervention-facilitating resources (e.g., chapter funds being connected to Uber accounts to escort intoxicated individuals out of the party, sober drivers), and providing further social and monetary incentives for sober monitors. This is also relevant given that the majority of interventions occurred in environments that were in or near fraternities, even for participants who were not fraternity members themselves.

Existing bystander intervention programming can also consider incorporating gender-tailored interventions. The majority of participants (n = 10) reported that their definition of masculinity influenced their decision to intervene, and many of these participants endorsed flexibility in their endorsement of masculine norms. Significantly, many of these participants discussed rejecting norms that pertain to being a playboy, showing emotional control, and displaying dominance over women (Mahalik et al., 2003), which was in line with our expectations, given that these norms have been found to be associated with sexual assault perpetration and rape myth supportive attitudes (Corpew & Mitchell, 2014; Eaton & Matamala, 2014;

Locke & Mahalik, 2005). Future programming should consider incorporating these norms, and discussing the benefits and costs of conforming to these norms. Notably, participants stated that men in general fear intervening out of the social stigma of being a "cockblock," which is in line with previous findings on men's apprehensions around bystander intervention against sexual assault (Carlson, 2008). Intervention programming can focus on addressing and challenging the stigma around this, and in turn challenge the playboy norm, which dictates that men's masculinity is determined by having a large number of sexual partners. Men report this as being anxiety-provoking and detrimental to intimate relationship formation (Burn & Ward, 2005), and programmers can align with this anxiety in order to encourage men to define their masculinity through means outside of striving to have multiple sexual partners, and sexually objectifying women (hooks, 2004).

Implications for Future Research. It should be noted that the theory developed is based on a small sample of participants, and while not generalizable, may provide an important initial exploration of men's bystander intervention against sexual assault. These findings should be explored through a follow-up study and using experimental and quantitative methods. Researchers should continue to explore which variables make bystander intervention particularly effective, and empirically examine whether gender-tailored or neutral interventions are more efficacious in influencing college men's bystander behaviors. Results from the present study indicate that both social and gender-relevant factors, including masculine norms, may play a significant role in men's decisions to act as bystanders against sexual assault. Future research should continue to explore men's subjective and fluid understanding

of masculinity as it relates to bystander intervention and other social-justice oriented activities that aim to end oppression (Casey, 2010). Studies may consider utilizing experimental methods to examine whether bolstering positive masculinity may positively influence men's decisions to act as bystanders (Parrott et al., 2012). Future studies should also incorporate measures of masculinity that encompass neutral, negative, and positive ideals (Mahalik et al., 2003; O'Neil et al., 1986, Thompson & Bennett, 2015) in order to further understand the complex role between masculinity and men's continued allyship against sexual violence. Future qualitative research may also be useful in further unpacking the complex intersections of masculinity with other identities in order to further explicate these relationships in relation to men's intervention efforts.

An important direction for research is to further incorporate an intersectionality lens into research on gender and bystander intervention, given emerging research that indicates that White female participants report less intent to intervene, less personal responsibility to intervene, and greater perceived victim pleasure (i.e., a belief that the potential victim will enjoy sexual contact) when exposed to a situation involving a Black potential victim (Katz, Merrilees, Hoxmeier, Motisi, 2017). It was outside the scope of the present study to explore the racial dynamics within participants' intervention, and future research should continue to explore this significant factor in order to understand ways to encourage intervention among White participants regardless of the potential victim's race.

Strengths and Limitations

There are many important limitations to consider in interpreting the findings from this study. The theory is based on this study's sample size of 15 men, who were all identified at a single Mid-Atlantic university, and who all responded to the call for participation and agreed to participate in an in-person intervention. While this limits the generalizability of the results given cultural and geographic limitations, our results are further limited by the participants' demographics. Many of participants identified as White, and all but one identified as heterosexual. All but one of the participants identified as cisgender men, all identified as able-bodied, and the majority indicated upper-to-middle class socioeconomic status. While we explored intersections of identity, the present study focused greater attention on the intersections surrounding race and gender, given our participants' demographics, and future studies should continue to explore the intersections surrounding masculinity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and socioeconomic status. One of the major limitations was that the population of interest (i.e., men who have acted as bystanders against sexual assault) was difficult to identify; in order to account for this, the criteria for bystander intervention being used was inclusive of a number of different types of intervention behaviors (Hoxmeier, Flay, & Acock, 2015). The researchers recruited participants through utilizing campus resources such as listservs, fliers, and outreach groups that focus on bystander intervention and dating violence prevention educational programs. However, it was possible that some men who have intervened did not feel comfortable participating in person, given the sensitive nature of the topic. We were interested in collecting a sample based on stringent criteria of bystander intervention

behaviors, and aimed to collect a smaller but richer sample of data based on these criteria. Notably, this is a challenging and hard-to-reach population to reach given the small number of active bystanders, particularly among men (Carlson, 2008). We believe this research has the potential to significantly contribute to literature given we identified men who have actually intervened, as opposed to utilizing analogues or proxies for intervention, or measuring intention to intervene in the future. We determined that we were approaching saturation (Charmaz, 1990) after we had interviewed and began to code the interview data obtained from twelve participants, and conducted three additional interviews, which supported the emerging theory. We believe that our sample size is consistent with recommendations for reaching saturation in qualitative research and in grounded theory design, although there is certainly potential to further explore negative and disconfirming cases (Charmaz, 2006; Dworkin, 2012; Morse, 1995), and especially to recruit more participants from marginalized identities, particularly queer-identifying and trans*men.

Additionally, male participants may not have felt comfortable fully describing their gendered experiences with the female interviewer; while we utilized a male auditor to verify our analyses and interpretation of the data, the use of a female interviewer may still present a significant limitation in the way participants present their development of masculinity, as well as how they describe their intervention. For instance, male participants may have felt compelled to embellish their intervention behaviors due to social desirability or a desire to present themselves as masculine or impressive. Participants also may have been reluctant to more explicitly describe sexist attitudes, or may have been hesitant to disclose emotions such as fear during

intervening against a potentially aggressive male. Thus, the data and findings must be considered within these parameters. Carlson (2008), a female researcher who interviewed male participants about bystander intervention against sexual assault, noted that she judged participants' statements to be truthful based on the nature of their responses. Accordingly, we judged our participants similarly given the similar research design.

To our knowledge, this is the first qualitative study focusing on male bystanders' experiences intervening against sexual assault. This study has the potential to contribute to the literature by identifying this unique population of men who have intervened, and developing a theory that encapsulates individual and contextual factors that influence intervention, as well as the distinct role of masculinity. Given the use of qualitative methodology, we were able to examine a number of factors that influenced bystander intervention, and incorporate constructs of masculinity that are not fully captured in existing measures (Thompson & Bennett, 2015). We were able to incorporate an intersectionality perspective (Shields, 2008) to begin to understand how different forms of masculinity, as they intersect with privileged or marginalized identities, influence bystander intervention and men's motivations for intervening. Our integration of grounded theory with a CQR lens allowed us to ensure the emerging theory is grounded in the participants' lived experiences (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) within their social contexts (Fassinger, 2005), and that the interpretation of these experiences was not colored by the biases and expectations of the primary investigator (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997).

The results of this study indicate that college men's bystander intervention behaviors might be influenced by a number of individual and contextual factors. In addition to identifying a number of key aspects that have previously been identified in the literature as contributing to bystander intervention, including alcohol use, social relationships, efficacy through training, and the social norms of the environment, this study further contributes to the literature by identifying the role of masculinity. Our results suggest that men's flexibility in conformity and their adherence to positive masculinity through being caring, relationally oriented, and critically conscious (hooks, 2004), is a unique factor in their intervention and in their continued involvement with sexual assault prevention efforts. This has important implications for how positive masculinity can be harnessed to continue recruiting men as allies (Casey & Smith, 2010; Good, Sanchez, & Moss-Racusin, 2016), given their privileged position in society in helping reduce the prevalence of sexual violence against women. While these findings must be considered in light of a number of limitations, we believe this represents an important initial step toward better understanding the complex variables that influence men's bystander intervention against sexual assault.

Appendices

Participation Criteria:

Students' Intent to Intervene by Intervention Behavior
Have you…

1) Confronted someone who says he plans to get a girl drunk to have sex? YES/NO
2) Helped someone who is passed out and being approached or touched by a guy or group of guys? YES/NO
3) Checked in with someone who looks intoxicated and is being taken to a room by a guy? YES/NO
4) Said something to someone who is taking an intoxicated girl back to his room? YES/NO
5) Interrupted a situation where you walked in on someone who appears to be forcing a girl to have sex with him? YES/NO
6) Interrupted a situation where you walked in on a guy who is having sex with an intoxicated girl? YES/NO
7) Interrupted a situation where you walked in on a friend who is having sex with your intoxicated female friend? YES/NO
8) Otherwise intervened to prevent or stop sexual aggression toward a woman? YES/NO

If you have intervened in any way, please describe your intervention in the text box below. Use as much detail as possible:

_____

_____

Adapted from:
Hoxmeier, J.C., Flay, B.R., & Acock, A.C. (2015). When will students intervene? Differences in students' intent to intervene in a spectrum of sexual assault situations. *Violence and Gender, 2*(3), 179-184.

Interview Transcript and Protocol:

You were invited to participate in this study because you indicated that you have acted as a bystander in a situation involving sexual assault. We're interested in understanding the social and gender relevant factors that contributed to your intervention. I'll be asking you some questions about yourself, as well as about your decision to intervene. Please be as open and honest as possible.
To start off, can you tell me a little bit about yourself?
What made you decide to come in to the interview today?
I'd like to talk about your bystander intervention. To start with, can you describe exactly what happened?
Interviewer: include follow-up questions to gather the information below

- Overall, what made you intervene?
- What was the social context? (i.e. at a party? Were people drinking? Were you drinking?)
- How did you notice the event?
- Who else was around?
- What made you feel responsible to intervene?
- What gave you the confidence to intervene? OR what made you feel like you could intervene?
- What was your relation to the perpetrator? To the victim? (*Interviewer: please note, these terms are placeholders – use the participants' words*)
    - How did you perceive the perpetrator? The victim?
- What made you decide to intervene?
- What exactly did your intervention entail?
- What happened after you intervened?
- How did it feel to intervene?
- How did others react to your decision to intervene?

I'd like to switch gears for a little bit and talk to you about your gender development and your experiences of being a man. First, when you think about what it means to be a man, what comes to mind?
Complete the sentence: "As a man, I am expected to…"
For you personally, what does it mean to be a man?
Growing up, what were some of the messages you received about what it means to be a man? Where did these messages come from? How do you feel about these messages?
Which of these messages do you hold true now? Why?
Can you tell me about a time when your manhood felt salient or prominent?
Can you tell me about a time when your manhood (or masculinity) was challenged?
What role does your masculinity play in your relationships with women? With men?
What positive messages have you received about what it means be to a man? Where did these messages come from?
How do these positive messages impact your relationships with women?

How do these messages impact your relationships with male peers?
Thinking back to your bystander intervention, was your decision to intervene is related to your definition of manhood? If yes, in what way? (*Interviewer protocol: use the participants' words, link back to their specific expectations and experiences regarding masculinity*)

- What specific aspects of your masculinity contributed to your decision to intervene?

Research suggests that men are generally less likely to intervene against sexual violence than women – why do you think this might be?
What do you think sets you apart from these men?
What advice would you give to men to encourage them to intervene? What are some ways more men can be encouraged to intervene?
Reflecting on the interview today, do you have any additional thoughts or reactions?

Bibliography

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A. M., & Buck, P. O. (2001). Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 784-807.

Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 14*, 118-128.

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*, 167–195.

Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol, misperception, and sexual assault: How and why are they linked? In D. M. Buss & N. Malamuth (Eds.), *Sex, power, conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives* (pp. 138-161). New York: Oxford University Press.

Addis, M., & Mahalik, J. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist, 58*, 5-14.

Anderson, E. (2008). Inclusive masculinity in a fraternal setting. *Men and Masculinities, 10*, 604-620.

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.

Aubrey, J. S., Hopper, K. M., & Mbure, W. G. (2011). Check that body! The effects of sexually objectifying music videos on college men's sexual beliefs. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 55,* 360 – 379

Bachar, K.J., & Koss, M.P. (2001). From prevalence to prevention: Closing the gap between what we know about rape and what we do. In C.M. Renzetti, R.K. Bergen, & J.L. Edelson (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 117-142). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Banyard, V. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: the case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims, 23,* 83–97.

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.

Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., & Plante, E.G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*, 463-481.

Banyard, V. L., & Cross, C. (2008). Consequences of teen dating violence: Understanding intervening variables in ecological context. *Violence against Women, 14,* 998–1013.

Barone, R. P., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Linder, C. (2007). Preventing sexual assault through engaging college men. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 585–594.

Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking hegemonic masculinity in a globalizing world. *Men and Masculinities, 11,* 86–103.

Bell, L.A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L.A., & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge.

Belknap, J. (2010). Rape: Too hard to report and too easy to discredit victims. *Violence against Women, 16*, 1335-1344.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88,* 354–364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ 0033-295X.88.4.354

Bennet, S., Banyard, V.L., & Garnhard, 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.

Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Edwards, K. M. (2017). The impact of the bystander's relationship with the victim and the perpetrator on intent to help in situations involving sexual violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *32*(5), 682-702.

Berg, L. & Longhurst, R. (2003) Placing masculinities and geography. *Gender, Place and Culture, 10*, 351–360.

Berkowitz, A. D. (2002). Fostering men's responsibility for preventing sexual assault. In P. A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Intervention across the lifespan* (pp. 163–196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Berkowitz, A. D. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In H. W. Perkins (Ed.), *The social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for*

*educators, counselors, clinicians (*pp. 259–279). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bishop, A. (2002). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people* (2nd ed.). Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood.

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., . . . Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C.E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes towards help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(4), 461-465.

Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R., Weaver, J., & Wasti, A. (2009). The links between precarious manhood and physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35,* 623– 634.

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.

Brewster, M., & Tucker, J. M. (2016). Understanding bystander behavior: The influence of and interaction between bystander characteristics and situational factors. *Victims & Offenders*, *11*(3), 455-481.

Broido, E. M., & Manning, K. (2002). Philosophical foundations and current theoretical perspectives in qualitative research. *Journal of college student development*, *43*(4), 434-445.

Brown, A. L., & Messman-Moore, T. L. (2010). Personal and perceived peer attitudes supporting sexual aggression as predictors of male college students' willingness to intervene against sexual aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25,* 503–517.

Burn, S.M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779-792.

Breitenbecher, K. H. (2000). Sexual assault on college campuses: is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied and Preventative Psychology*, *9*, 23–52.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review, 106*, 676-713.

Burn, S. M., & Ward, A. Z. (2005). Men's Conformity to Traditional Masculinity and Relationship Satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *6*(4), 254-263.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct.* Rockville, MD: Westat.

Carlo, G., & Randall, B. (2001). Are all prosocial behaviors equal? A socioecological developmental conception of prosocial behavior. In F. Columbus (Ed.),

Advances in psychology research, Volume II (pp. 151–170). Huntington, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Carlson, M. (2008). I'd rather go along and be considered a man: Masculinity and bystander intervention. *Journal of Men's Studies, 16,* 3–17.

Casey, E. A., & Nurius, P. S. (2006). Trends in the prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence: A cohort analysis. *Violence and Victims, 21,* 629–644.

Casey, E. (2010). Strategies for engaging men as anti-violence allies: Implications for ally movements. *Advances in Social Work*, *11*(2), 267-282.

Casey, E., & Smith, T. (2010). "How can I not?": Men's pathways to involvement in anti-violence against women work. *Violence Against Women*, *16*(8), 953-973.

Casey, E. A., & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a positive bystander: Male antiviolence allies' experiences of "stepping up". *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27,* 62–83.

Charmaz, K. (1990). 'Discovering' chronic illness: Using grounded theory. *Social Science and Medicine, 30*, 1161–1172.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509–536). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2008). Constructionism and the grounded theory method. In J.A. Holstein & J.F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Handbook of Constructionist Research* (pp. 397-412). New York: The Guilford Press.

Collins, P. H. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). NY: Routledge.

Collins, P. H. (2004). *Black sexual politics: African Americans, gender, and the new racism*. Routledge.

Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society, 19,* 829–859.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canon, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13*(1), 3-21.

Coston, B. M., & Kimmel, M. (2012). Seeing privilege where it isn't: Marginalized masculinities and the intersectionality of privilege. *Journal of Social Issues*, *68*(1), 97-111.

Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine, 50,* 1385–1401.

Corprew, C. S., & Mitchell, A. D. (2014). Keeping it frat: Exploring the interaction among fraternity membership, disinhibition, and hypermasculinity on sexually aggressive attitudes in college-aged males. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*, 548 –562

Cramer, R. E., McMaster, M. R., Bartell, P. A., & Dragna, M. (1988). Subject competence and the minimization of the bystander effect. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 1133–1148.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*: *Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *8*(4p1), 377.

Deming, M.E., Covan, E.K., Swan, S.C., & Billings, D.L. (2013). Exploring rape myths, gendered norms, group processing, and the social context of rape among college women: A qualitative analysis. *Violence against Women, 19*(4), 465-485.

Dworkin, S. L. (2012). Sample size policy for qualitative studies using in-depth interviews. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 41*(6), 1319-1320.

Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: a meta-analytic review of the social-psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*, 283–308.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100,* 309–330.

Eaton, A. A., & Matamala, A. (2014). The relationship between heteronormative beliefs and verbal sexual coercion in college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 1443–1457.

Eisenberg, N., Guthrie, I. K., Murphy, B.C., Shepard, S.A., Cumberland, A., &

Carlo, G., (1999). Consistency and development of prosocial dispositions: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 70,* 1360-1372

Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress. Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification, 11,* 123–136.

Eisler, R. M., Skidmore, J. R., & Ward, C. H. (1988). Masculine gender- role stress: Predictor of anger, anxiety, and health-risk behaviors. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 52,* 133–141.

Elliott, K. (2016). Caring masculinities: Theorizing an emerging concept. *Men and Masculinities, 19*(3), 240-259.

Ellis, L. (1989). *Theories of rape: Inquiries into the causes of sexual aggression.* New York, NY: Hemisphere.

Englar-Carlson, M. (2006). Masculine norms and the therapy process. In M. Englar-Carlson & M.A. Stevens (Eds.), *In the room with men: A casebook of therapeutic change* (pp. 13-48). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/11411-002

Espiritu, Y. L. (1997). Race, gender, class in the lives of Asian American. *Race, Gender & Class*, *4*(3), 12-19.

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health, 52,* 105–112.

Fassinger, R. (2005). Paradigms, praxis, problems, and promise: Grounded theory in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 156-166.

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,* 517–537. http://dx .doi.org/10.1037/a0023304

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Fleming, W.M., & Wiersma-Mosley, J.D. (2015). The role of alcohol consumption patterns and pro-social bystander interventions in contexts of gender violence. *Violence Against Women, 21*(10), 1259-1283. 720-742.

Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L., & White, K. B. (2004). First and second generation measures of sexism, rape myths, and related belief, and hostility in college students' experiences with dating aggression and sexual coercion. *Violence Against Women*, *10*, 236-261.

Franklin, C. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2012). Sexual assault on the college campus: Fraternity affiliation, male peer support, and low self-control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 39*, 1457–1480

Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T.-A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology*

of Women Quarterly, 21, 173–206.

Foubert, J.D., & La Voy, S.A. (2000). A qualitative assessment of "The Men's Program:" The impact of a rape prevention program on fraternity men. *NASPA, 30*(1), 18-30.

Foubert, J.D., & Newberry, J.T. (2006). Effects of two versions of an empathy-based rape prevention program on fraternity men's survivor empathy, attitudes, and behavioral intent to commit rape or sexual assault. *Journal of College Student Development, 47*(2), 133-148.

Foubert, J.D., & Perry, B.C. (2007). Creating lasting attitude and behavior changes in fraternity members and male student athletes. *Violence against Women, 13*(1), 70-86.

Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. (1973). *Sexual conduct: The social origins of human sexuality*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Gerschick, T. J., & Miller, A. S. (1995). Coming to terms: Masculinity and physical disability. In D. Sabo & D. F. Gordon (Eds.), *Men's health and illness: Gender, power, and the body, Research on men and masculinities series* (Vol. 8, pp. 183 – 204). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gidycz, C.A., Orchoswki, 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.

Gilmore, D.D. (1990). *Manhood in the making*. New Haven, CT: Yale University

Press.

Glaser, B.G. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity: Advances in the methodology of grounded theory.* Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 491–512. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514 .70.3.491

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21,* 119 – 135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997 .tb00104.x

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, *56*(2), 109-118.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma.* Engelwood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Good, J. J., Sanchez, D. T., & Moss-Racusin, C. A. (2016). A Paternalistic Duty to Protect? Predicting Men's Decisions to Confront Sexism. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/men0000077

Goodwin, J. P. (1989). *More man than you'll ever be: Gay folklore and acculturation in middle America*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Gottleib, J., & Carver, C. S. (1980). Anticipation of future interaction and the bystander effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16*, 253–260.

Graziano, W.G., Habashi, M.M., Sheese, B.E., & Tobin, R.M. (2007). Agreeableness, Empathy, and Helping: A Person x Situation Perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(4), 583–599.

Griffith, D. M. (2012). An intersectional approach to men's health. *Journal of Men's Health*, *9*(2), 106-112.

Hammer, J.H. & Good, G.E. (2010). Positive psychology: An empirical examination of beneficial aspects of endorsement of masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*(4), 303-318.

Harada, J. (1985). Bystander intervention: The effect of ambiguity of the helping situation and the interpersonal relationship between bystanders. *Japanese Psychological Research, 27,*177–184.

Harford, T. C., Wechsler, H., & Muthén, B. O. (2003). Alcohol-related aggression and drinking at off-campus parties and bars: A national study of current drinkers in college. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 64,* 704– 711.

Harris, V. A., & Robinson, C. E. (1973). Bystander intervention: Group size and victim status. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2*, 8 –10.

Harris III, F. (2008). Deconstructing masculinity: A qualitative study of college men's masculine conceptualizations and gender performance. *NASPA journal*, *45*(4), 453-474.

Harris, F., & Edwards, K.E. (2010). College men's experiences as men: Findings and implications from two grounded theory studies. *Journal of Students Affairs Research and Practice, 47*(1), 43-62.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The counseling psychologist*, *25*(4), 517-572.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of counseling psychology*, *52*(2), 196-205.

hooks, bell (2004). *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity, and Love*. New York: Atria Books.

Hopkins, P., & Noble, G. (2009). Masculinities in place: situated identities, relations and intersectionality. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *10*(8), 811-819. doi:10.1080/14649360903305817

Howard, W., & Crano, W. D. (1974). Effects of sex, conversation, location, and size of observer group on bystander intervention in a high risk situation. *Sociometry, 37*, 491–507.

Hoxmeier, J.C., Flay, B.R., & Acock, A.C. (2015). When will students intervene? Differences in students' intent to intervene in a spectrum of sexual assault situations. *Violence and Gender, 2*(3), 179-184.

Humphrey, S. E., & Kahn, A. S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *15*(12), 1313-1322.

Hurley, D., & Allen, B. P. (1974). The effect of the number of people present in a

nonemergency situation. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 92*, 27–29.

Hyers, L. (2007). Resisting prejudice every day: Exploring women's assertive responses to anti-Black racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and sexism. *Sex Roles, 56*(1), 1–12.

Jacques-Tiura, A. J., Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Pierce, J., Pegram, S. E., & Woerner, J. (2015). Friends matter: Protective and harmful aspects of male friendships associated with past-year sexual aggression in a community sample of young men. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*, 1001–1007

Jenkins, L. N., & Nickerson, A. B. (2017). Bystander Intervention in Bullying: Role of Social Skills and Gender. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 1-26.

Karakashian, L. M., Walter, M. I., Christopher, A. N., & Lucas, T. (2006). Fear of negative evaluation affects helping behaviour: The bystander effect revisited. *North American Journal of Psychology, 8(*1), 13-32.

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*, 684-702.

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The Men- tors in Violence Prevention Project. *Harvard Educational Review, 65,* 163–175.

Katz, J. (2006). *The macho paradox: Why some men hurt women and how all men can help*. New York, NY: Sourcebooks, Inc.

Katz, J., & Moore, J. (2013). Bystander education training for campus sexual assault prevention: An initial meta-analysis. *Violence and Victims, 28*(6), 1054-1067.

Kilmartin, C., Smith, T., Green, A., Heinzen, H., Kuchler, M., & Kolar, D. (2008). A real time social norms intervention to reduce male sexism. *Sex Roles, 59*, 264 –273.

Kimmel, M. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.

Kiselica, M.S., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2010). Identifying, affirming, and building upon male strengths: The positive psychology/positive masculinity model of psychotherapy with boys and men. *Psychotherapy Theory, Research, Practice Training, 47*(3), 276–287.

Koon, J. A. (2013)."Masculinity and Bystander Helping Behavior: A Study of the Relationship between Conformity to Masculine Norms and Bystander Interventions." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa.

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,* 639–647.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Foubert, J. D., Brasfield, H. M., Hill, B., & Shelley-Tremblay, S. (2011). The men's program: Does it impact college men's self-reported bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene?.*Violence Against Women*, *17*(6), 743-759.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York, NY: Meredith.

Latane´, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*, 215–221.

Latane´, B., & Dabbs, J. M. (1975). Sex, group size, and helping in three cities. *Sociometry, 38,* 180 –194.

Latane´, B., & Nida, S. (1981). Ten years of research on group size and helping. *Psychological Bulletin, 89,* 308–324.

Parrott, D. J., Tharp, A. T., Swartout, K. M., Miller, C. A., Hall, G. C. N., & George, W. H. (2012). Validity for an integrated laboratory analogue of sexual aggression and bystander intervention. *Aggressive Behavior*, *38*(4), 309-321.

Leone, R.M., Parrott, D.J., Swartout, K.M., & Tharp, A.T. (2016). Masculinity and bystander attitudes: Moderating effects of masculine gender role stress. *Psychology of Violence, 6*(1), 82-90.

Leone, R. M., Parrott, D. J., & Swartout, K. M. (2016). When Is It "Manly" to Intervene?: Examining the Effects of a Misogynistic Peer Norm on Bystander Intervention for Sexual Aggression. Psychology of Violence. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ vio0000055

Leone, R. M., Haikalis, M., Parrott, D. J., & DiLillo, D. (2017). Bystander Intervention to Prevent Sexual Violence: The Overlooked Role of Bystander Alcohol Intoxication. Advance online publication.

Levant, R. F., & Wimer, D. J. (2014). Masculinity constructs as protective buffers and risk factors for men's health. *American Journal of Men's Health, 8,* 110 – 120.

Levant, R. F., Rankin, T. J., Williams, C. M., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. B. (2010).

Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11,* 25–37.

Levine, R, V., Martinez, T. S., Brase, G., & Sorenson, K, (1994), Helping in 36 U.S. cities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 69-82.

Levine, M. & Crowther, S. (2008). The Responsive Bystander: How Social Group Membership and Group Size Can Encourage as Well as Inhibit Bystander Intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1429-1439.

Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorization and bystander non-intervention. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 1452–1463.

Levy, P., Lundgren, D., Ansel, M., Fell, D., Fink, B., & McGrath, J. E. (1972). Bystander effect in a demand-without threat situation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24,* 166 –171

Levy, G. D., Taylor, M. G., & Gelman, S. A. (1995). Traditional and evaluative aspects of flexibility in gender roles, social conventions, moral rules, and physical laws. Child Development, 66, 515–531.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lisak, D., & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims*, *17*, 73–84.

Locke, B. D., & Mahalik, J. R. (2005). Examining masculinity norms, problem drinking, and athletic involvement as predictors of sexual aggression in college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(3), 279.

Loh, C., Gidycz, C. A., Lobo, T. R., & Luthra, R. (2005). A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration: Risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 1325–1348.

Low, K. S. D., Radhakrishnan, P., Schneider, K. T., & Rounds, J. (2007). The experiences of bystanders of workplace ethnic harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(10), 2261–2297.

Lutz-Zois, C. J., Moler, K. A., & Brown, M. J. (2015). Mechanisms for the relationship between traditional masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance among college men. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 24*, 84 –101.

Lyons, A.C., & Willott, S.A. (2008). Alcohol consumption, gender identities, and women's changing social position. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 649-712.

Mahalik, J. R. (1999). Incorporating a gender role strain perspective in assessing and treating men's cognitive distortions. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 30*(4), 333–340.

Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *4*(1), 3-25.

Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Aker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10 year follow-up. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 353-369.

Mankowski, E. S., & Maton, K. I. (2010). A community psychology of men and masculinity: Historical and conceptual review. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45, 73–86.*

McDowell, L. (2003) *Redundant Masculinities: Employment Change and White Working Class Youth*. Oxford: Blackwell.

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. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *19*(1), 3-18.

McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health, 59*, 3-11.

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.

Messerschmidt, J. (1993). *Masculinities and crime*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Messner, M. A. (1997*). Politics of masculinities: Men in movements*. New York, NY: Sage.

Messman-Moore, T. L., & Brown, A. L. (2006). Risk perception, rape, and sexual revictimization: A prospective study of college women. *Psychol- ogy of Women Quarterly, 30,* 159–172.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (1981). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. Watertown, MA: Persephone.

Morrell, R., & Jewkes, R. (2011). Carework and caring: A path to gender equitable practices among men in South Africa? *International Journal for Equity in Health*, *10*(1), 17.

Morse, J. M. (1995). The significance of saturation. *Qualitative Health Research, 5*, 147–149.

Moynihan, M.M., & Banyard, V.L. (2008). Community responsibility for preventing sexual violence: A pilot study with campus Greeks and intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 36,* 23-38.

Murnen, S. K., & Kohlman, M. H. (2007). Athletic participation, fraternity membership, and sexual aggression among college men: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles, 57*(1–2), 145–157.

Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If 'boys will be boys,' then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*, 359 –375

Murray, S. H. (2018). Heterosexual Men's Sexual Desire: Supported by, or Deviating from, Traditional Masculinity Norms and Sexual Scripts? *Sex Roles*, *78*(1-2), 130-141.

Nelson, J. K., Dunn, K. M., & Paradies, Y. (2011). Bystander anti-racism: A review of the literature. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *11*(1), 263-284.

Norris, J., & Cubbins, L. A. (1992). Effects of victims' and assailants' alcohol consumption on judgments of their behavior and traits. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16*, 179–191.

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal*, *60*(4), 203-211.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex roles*, *14*(5-6), 335-350.

O'Neil, J.M. (2008). Summarizing twenty-five years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Role Conflict Scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 358-445.

Orchowski, L. M., Berkowitz, A., Boggis, J., & Oesterle, D. (2016). Bystander intervention among college men: The role of alcohol and correlates of sexual aggression. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *31*(17), 2824-2846.

O'Sullivan, C. (1998). Ladykillers: Similarities and divergences of masculinities in gang rape and wife battery. In L. Bowker (Ed.), *Masculinities and violence* (pp. 82-105). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Palm Reed, K. M., Hines, D. A., Armstrong, J. L., & Cameron, A. Y. (2015). Experimental evaluation of a bystander prevention program for sexual assault and dating violence. *Psychology of Violence*, *5*(1), 95-102.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Safe Publications.

Parrott, D. J., Tharp, A. T., Swartout, K. M., Miller, C. A., Hall, G. C., & George, W. H. (2012). Validity for an integrated laboratory analogue of sexual aggression and bystander intervention. *Aggressive Behavior, 38,* 309–321.

Peterson, Z.D., & Muehlenhard, C.L. (2004). Was it rape? The function of women's rape myth acceptance and definitions of sex in labeling their own experiences. *Sex Roles, 51*, 129-144.

Planty, M. (2002). *Third-party involvement in violent crime, 1993-1999*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Planty, M., Langton, L., Krebs, C., Berzofsky, M., & Smiley-McDonald, H. (2013). *Female victims of sexual violence, 1994-2010*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Pleck, J.H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pugh, B., Ningard, H., Ven, T. V., & Butler, L. (2016). Victim ambiguity: Bystander intervention and sexual assault in the college drinking scene. *Deviant Behavior, 37*, 401– 418.

Reason, R. D., Miller, E. A. R., & Scales, T. C. (2005). Toward a model of racial justice ally development. *Journal of College Student Behavior, 46*, 530-546.

Reed, E.E. (2014). Man up: Young men's lived experiences and reflections on counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*(4), 428-437.

Reilly, E.D., Rochlen, A.B., & Award, G.H. (2014). Self-compassion and self-esteem: The moderating roles of shame and masculine norm adherence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(1), 22-28.

Rennie, D.L., Phillips, J.R., & Quartaro, G.K. (1988). Grounded theory: A promising approach to conceptualization in psychology? *Canadian Psychology, 29*(2), 139-150.

Rosenthal, A.M. (1999). *Thirty-eight witnesses: The Kitty Genovese case.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rozee, P. D., & Koss, M. P. (2001). Rape: a century of resistance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *25*, 295–311.

Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87,* 157–176.

Rudman, L. A., & Mescher, K. (2012). Of animals and objects: Men's implicit dehumanization of women and likelihood of sexual aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38,* 734 –746

Rushton, J. P., Chrisjohn, R. D., and Fekken, G. C. (1981). The altruistic personality and the self-report altruism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 2,* 293-302.

Rutkowski, G. K., Gruder, C. L., & Romer, D. (1983). Group cohesiveness, social norms, and bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 545–552.

Sanchez, D. T., Fetterolf, J. C., & Rudman, L. A. (2012). Eroticizing inequality in the United States: The consequences and determinants of traditional gender role adherence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Sex Research, 49,* 168 –183.

Sanday, P. (1990). Masculinities and men's health: Moving toward post-superman era prevention. In E. Disch (Ed.), *Reconstructing gender: A multicultural anthology* (4th ed., pp. 541-558). Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Sanders, M. R., & Mahalingam, R. (2012). Under the radar: The role of invisible discourse in understanding class-based privilege. *Journal of Social Issues, 68*(1), 112 – 127. doi: 10.1111/j.1540- 4560.2011.01739.x.

Schewe, P. A. (2002). Guidelines for developing rape prevention and risk reduction interventions. In P. A. Schewe (Ed.), *Preventing violence in relationships: Intervention across the lifespan* (pp. 107–133). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schwartz, M.D., & DeKeseredy, W.S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Schwartz, S.H., & Clausen, G.T. (1970). Responsibility, norms and helping in an emergency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*, 299-310.

Schwartz, M. D., DeKeseredy, W. S., Tait, D., & Alvi, S. (2001). Male peer support and a feminist routine activities theory: Understanding sexual assault on the college campus. *Justice Quarterly, 18*, 623-649.

Seabrook, R. C., Ward, L. M., & Giaccardi, S. (2016). Why Is Fraternity Membership Associated With Sexual Assault? Exploring the Roles of Conformity to

Masculine Norms, Pressure to Uphold Masculinity, and Objectification of Women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity.* Advance online publication.Seligman, M.E.P. (2008). Positive health. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 57*, 3-18.

Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex roles*, *59*(5-6), 301-311.

Shotland, L., & Straw, M. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: Can a woman attract help? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34,* 990-999.

Shotland, R. L., & Heinhold, W. D. (1985). Bystander response to arterial bleeding: helping skills, the decision-making process, and differentiating the helping response. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 347–356.

Siem, F.M., & Spence, J.T. (1986). Gender-Related Traits and Helping Behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(3), 615-621.

Simon, W., & Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15*, 97–120.

Sirin, S.R., McCreary, D.R., & Mahalik, J.R. (2004). Differential reactions to men and women's gender role transgressions: Perceptions of social status, sexual orientation, and value dissimilarity. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 12*, 119-132.

Smith, R. M., Parrott, D. J., Swartout, K. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2015). Deconstructing hegemonic masculinity: The roles of antifemininity, subordination to women, and sexual dominance in men's perpetration of sexual aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *16*(2), 160-169.

Sochting, I., Fairbrother, N., & Koch, W. J. (2004). Sexual assault of women: prevention efforts and risk factors. *Violence against Women*, *10*, 73–93.

Steele, C. M., & Josephs, R. A. (1990). Alcohol myopia. Its prized and dangerous effects. *American Psychologist, 45*, 921–933.

Stewart, L., Sebastiani, A., Delgado, G., & Lopez, G. (1996). Consequences of sexual abuse of adolescents. *Reproductive Health Matters, 4,*129–134.

Stewart, A.L. (2014). The men's project: A sexual assault prevention program targeting college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(4), 481-485.

Stout, K. D. (1991). A continuum of male controls and violence against women: A teaching model. *Journal of Social Work Education, 27,* 305–319.

Stout, K. D., & McPhail, B. (1998). *Confronting sexism and violence against women: A challenge for social work*. New York, NY: Addison- Wesley.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Thompson, E., & Pleck, J. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29,* 531–543.

Thompson, E.H., & Bennett, K.M. (2015). Measurement of masculinity ideologies: A (critical) review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(2), 115-133.

Thompson, M. P., Swartout, K. M., & Koss, M. P. (2013). Trajectories and predictors of sexually aggressive behaviors during emerging adulthood. *Psychology of Violence, 3,* 247–259.

Tice, D.M. & Baumeister, R.F. (1985). Masculinity Inhibits Helping in Emergencies:

Personality Does Predict the Bystander Effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49* (2), 420-428.

Toomey, R. B., Card, N. A., & Casper, D. M. (2014). Peers' perceptions of gender nonconformity: Associations with overt and relational peer victimization and aggression in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 34*, 463–485.

Vandello, J.A., & Bosson, J.K. (2013). Hard win and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *14*(2), 101-113.

Vogel, D.L., Wester, S.R., Hammer, J.H., Downing-Matibag, T.M. (2014). Referring men to seek help: The influence of gender role conflict and stigma. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(1), 60-67.

Walsh, W. A., Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Ward, S., & Cohn, E. S. (2010). Disclosure and service use on a college campus after an unwanted sexual experience. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *11*, 134-151.

Walters, M. L., Chen, J., & Breiding, M. J. (2013). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 findings on victimization by sexual orientation*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1*, 125-151.

Wiersma, J. D., Cleveland, H. H., Herrera, V. M., & Fischer, J. L. (2010). Intimate partner violence in dating, cohabitating, and married drinking partnerships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72,* 360-374.

Wong, Y. J., Shea, M., LaFollette, J. R., Hickman, S. J., Cruz, N., & Boghokian, T. (2011). The Inventory of Subjective Masculinity Experiences: Development and psychometric properties. *Journal of Men's Studies, 19,* 236–255.

Workman, J. E., & Freeburn, E. W. (1999). An examination of date rape, victim dress, and perceiver variables within the context of attribution theory. *Sex Roles, 41,* 261–278.

Yule, K., & Grych, J. (2017). College students' perceptions of barriers to bystander intervention. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 0886260517706764

Zurbriggen, E. L. (2010). Rape, war, and the socialization of masculinity: Why our refusal to give up war ensures that rape cannot be eradicated. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 34,* 538–549.