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Visualize for a moment that unforgettable image of small red dots spreading across a map of the US, symbolizing the spread of some terrible epidemic – each tiny red dot representing an individual case. Now imagine a map of your community. Each red dot on this map represents an act of violence.

A red dot is a rape.
A red dot is a hit.
A red dot is a threat.

Violence is not a solid mass that can be removed with one swift action or policy; rather, it is the accumulation of individual choices. It is hard to know exactly how many red dots are on our map at any given moment – but we do know there have been enough red dots to sustain a rate of nearly a quarter of women and an untold number of men becoming victims of violence during their lifetimes.

Now, imagine adding a green dot in the middle of all those red dots on your map. A green dot is any choice that promotes safety and communicates intolerance for violence.
A green dot is pulling a friend out of a high-risk situation.
A green dot is donating a few dollars to your local service provider.
A green dot is putting a green dot message on your Facebook page.
A green dot is simply your individual choice at any given moment to make our world safer.

The truth is, even the best-intentioned of us do not always intervene every time we think we should. There are obstacles that get in our way as bystanders including fear, the risk of embarrassment, not being sure what to do, hating conflict, or not wanting to get a hard time from our friends or family. Whether we like to admit it or not, these obstacles are real and they really can silence us. The solution to our obstacles is not getting over them; instead, it is figuring out solutions that feel realistic for us despite our obstacles. Afraid for personal safety? Maybe the best intervention is reporting to someone in authority. Hate conflict? Maybe the best intervention is subtly checking-in by asking, “hey, are you okay?” Afraid your friends will give you a hard time for making a big deal out of something? Maybe the best thing to do is make small talk with the people involved to diffuse the situation rather than calling out what is happening.

How many green dots will it take to begin reducing violence? Even though we can’t know the exact number, we do know this: there are far more individuals in any given community who don’t commit violence than those who do. If just some of us were willing to step up – even in small ways – very quickly green dots could overtake the map and less of our friends and family would be hurt.
In the fall of 2014, Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc. approached Green Dot, etc., Inc. to discuss the possibility of adapting the Green Dot Violence Prevention Strategy to address bullying, harassment, hazing, and other forms of aggression in the trade industries around Portland. Green Dot proposed a four-phase adaptation and implementation plan to be completed in collaboration with Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc. and other local stakeholders. As a part of Phase One, in February 2015, Green Dot, etc., Inc., in partnership with Portland State University, was contracted to conduct focus groups with key stakeholders such as apprentices, trades workers, foremen, business owners, union officers, labor advocates, and other vested parties to determine how best to apply the Green Dot vision to the trades.

As the Green Dot vision applies to the trades in Oregon, we start with some basic questions. First, what concerning behaviors (red dots) have people seen on work sites? Second, what obstacles make it hard for bystanders to intervene? Third, what kinds of interventions would feel realistic given those obstacles? After we’ve answered these questions, we can move on to talking about what prevention programming should look like. Specifically, how do we approach the issue in a way that most parties involved are going to hear us? Then, how do we launch programming across Oregon’s trades? How do we generate the buy-in we need in order to make this launch successful? Finally, how do we assess our effectiveness in order to sustain a successful prevention initiative over time?

This adaptation report strives to answer these questions through focus group findings, research, and experience and expertise in the field of violence prevention. We offer many recommendations for prevention programming and strategy in the report; ultimately, our hope would be to fully adapt Green Dot for the trade industries in Oregon.
Focus groups, made up of key stakeholders from a diverse cross-section of the trade industries across Portland, provided integral insight into the lived experience of working in the trades. Focus group findings provide extensive information we hope to use to adapt the Green Dot Violence Prevention Strategy to address harassment, bullying, hazing, and other forms of aggression currently present on work sites across the trades.

First, participants identified behaviors that can cue bystanders to these kinds of aggression (**concerning or red dot behaviors**). The main forms of aggression communicated were: harassment, bullying, and hazing. According to participants, harassment in the trades includes: using stereotypes, telling offensive jokes about race, gender, or sexuality, assigning undesirable tasks only to workers of color, using racial, gender-based, homophobic slurs, and other behaviors that can constitute harassment. Bullying behaviors identified by participants included: insulting or condescending orders from supervisors, leaving someone out of social plans, yelling and/or cursing, denying breaks, lying or spreading rumors, name calling, and other detrimental behaviors. Finally, participants identified several examples of hazing, including, but not limited to: name calling, assigning dangerous work, leaving an apprentice alone with no supervision, assigning apprentices the lightest or lowest paid work, denying opportunities for apprentices to learn skills, having a worker complete by hand what should be done with equipment, and making a big deal out of an apprentice asking how to do something.

After identifying concerning behaviors that could cue bystanders, participants were asked to share **barriers** that might make it difficult for a bystander to act or intervene in the face of different forms of aggression. Participants identified four main categories of barriers: (1) Work-related barriers, which included the fear of job loss or transfer, fear of greater or more difficult workload, difficulty advancing or receiving proper training, lack of supervisor follow-through if behavior is reported, and lack of accountability for person responsible; (2) Social and cultural barriers like the fear of “rocking the boat,” pressure to fit in, social isolation or alienation from peers, fear of peer reaction or retaliation, and that aggressive behavior is socially acceptable, but it is not socially acceptable to “call the hall;” (3) Personal barriers, such as the fear of embarrassment, fear of behavior turning on bystander, “none of my business;” being busy, focused on job tasks, and apathy; and (4) Other/miscellaneous barriers like looking around to see how other bystanders react, holding the target responsible for the aggressive behavior, and waiting to see if the target thinks the behavior is a big deal or not. All participants identified bystander barriers, but none reported that race and gender played a role in the risks associated with bystander intervention.

Next, focus group participants generated practical **reactive solutions for bystanders** (green dots) to intervene when observing concerning behavior. Green Dot uses three categories of solutions to help bystanders feel confident in reacting despite the barriers they may be facing: direct, delegate, and distract. Specifically, for individuals in the trades, these are the identified viable options for intervening:

➤ **Direct:** Subtle observations or calling someone out after an incident, checking in with a target, offering to help a target, giving a resource or reporting option to a target, or directly calling out a person exhibiting aggressive behavior.
Delegate: Ask someone else to intervene, engage other bystanders to intervene as a group, tell a trusted foreman, manager, or supervisor, file a formal complaint, or report to “higher ups.”

Distract: Change the subject, redirect attention to another task or topic, or use humor.

Bystanders also play a role in shifting the cultural norms that currently sustain aggressive behaviors in the trades. They can do this through proactive solutions for bystanders (green dots that make it less likely that the concerning behavior ever happens in the first place.) Proactive options identified by participants and Green Dot staff members that might work in the trades include having conversations about the issue with peers, wearing pins on clothing or stickers on hardhats, addressing topics in company or union newsletters, talking points in orientation content, team meetings, subtle non-verbal reactions, jobsite signage, social media posts, etc. Proactive solutions will be different for workers and employees based both on social status and formal leadership or position.

Finally, recommendations for the most effective sequencing of prevention content, Green Dot core values, program distribution, implementation planning, and a proposed evaluation plan are outlined in greater detail in the adaptation report.
RECOGNIZING CONCERNING BEHAVIORS

One of the first steps in preventing violence and harassment in the trades is identifying the behaviors that can cue bystanders to these kinds of aggression. We asked focus group participants what they had seen and heard about, with the goal of getting as many specific, concrete examples as we could. We found three major themes or types of aggression experienced by trades workers in Portland: hazing, bullying, and harassment.

Hazing is constituted by hostile or discriminatory actions taken against young or new workers (usually apprentices) to initiate or test them. Examples of hazing include assigning apprentices the lightest or lowest paid work, not being paired with someone more experienced so an apprentice can learn, making a big deal out of the fact that an apprentice does not know how to do something rather than teaching them, calling apprentices stupid, assigning a physically strenuous task that should be done with equipment rather than human labor, giving dangerous work to an apprentice, or leaving an apprentice alone with no other workers, supervision, or transportation. One form of hazing mentioned frequently by participants was refusal to train apprentices or assign them tasks that allow them to develop in their trade. The result is that workers will complete enough hours to journey out in their trades, but will not have the skills necessary to actually function as a journey worker. As a result, these workers have difficulty finding or keeping jobs. One participant stated:

"I would like be a flagger, instead of working in my trade. I would get the broom, instead of being able to lay pipe. I was very stagnated...when I journeyed out I was able to push a broom really well."

- Journey-level Laborer

Bullying includes, “any behavior initiated by a worker that is intended to harm another individual at work” (Dillon 2012). Examples of bullying given by trades workers include insulting or condescending orders from supervisors, social isolation, being assigned the work no one wants to do, calling journey-level workers apprentices, yelling at someone, cursing at someone, denying breaks, lying or spreading rumors, refusing help for a task that should be done by more than one worker, name calling, put downs, and threats. The most common kinds of threats recounted by workers were threats to find someone at home or outside of work, to eliminate someone by “workforce reduction,” to eject someone from the union, or to blacklist a worker from a company. One worker described threats related to finding or maintaining work as “pocket violence,” because the prospect of losing income is dire for many trades workers. Unlike hazing, which is directed at new workers in a trade or on a job site, the experience of bullying is much more generalized. Examples of bullying provided by participants included men, women, apprentices, and journey workers as targets. As one participant stated, “the apprentice thing, they try to hide behind that, because they do it to everybody.”

The third form of aggression described by participants – harassment – includes behaviors that demonstrate hostility related to race, gender, or sexuality. Examples of harassment based on race include using racial stereotypes, racist jokes, racial slurs or name calling, claiming someone got a job only because of their race, and assigning undesirable tasks only to workers of color. One participant told us,
“Being a black woman in the trades just felt a lot like slavery...you would be working in the hot sun and someone would be standing over you like they had a whip. They would be standing up there drinking a cool water and saying ‘it needs to be six feet over there, I’ll be right back’ and sitting in the truck if it starts raining. I was like – you know what master, you can keep your little twenty dollars an hour. I’m going to be a waitress.”

-Female Worker

Harassment related to gender includes women being treated as peripheral to a crew rather than a part of it, assuming journey-level women are apprentices, claiming a man could do the job better, putting down men who talk about doing traditionally female activities (like cooking or child care), sexist slurs or name calling (like “slut” or “bitch”), and claiming women don’t belong on a worksite because it is a “man zone.” Finally, examples of harassment related to sexuality include behaviors like pressure to date or engage in sexual activity, comments about physical attributes, derogatory sexual jokes, homophobic slurs, jokes about assigning a worker to the nudist camp as their job site, indecent exposure, whistling, and sexually inappropriate calls or texts. Because it is common for trades people to find work through other workers, phone numbers are often exchanged. One woman told us that she had given her phone number to a foreman who promised to send work her way. Instead, he sent excessive text messages about ending his marriage and pressuring her to date him. Another woman who similarly shared her phone number received nude pictures in return. Women are not the only targets of sexual harassment though. We heard examples of men being called homophobic slurs and men who were pressured to engage in sexual activity.

Table 1: Aggressive Behaviors Bystanders Can Notice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aggression</th>
<th>Concerning Behaviors Bystanders Could Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazing</strong></td>
<td>Name calling&lt;br&gt;Assigning dangerous work&lt;br&gt;Leaving an apprentice alone with no supervision&lt;br&gt;Assigning apprentices the lightest or lowest paid work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bullying</strong></td>
<td>Insulting or condescending orders from supervisors&lt;br&gt;Leaving someone out of social plans&lt;br&gt;Repeatedly assigning one worker undesirable tasks&lt;br&gt;Calling a journey-level worker an apprentice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harassment</strong></td>
<td>Using stereotypes&lt;br&gt;Telling offensive jokes about race, gender, or sexuality&lt;br&gt;Calling someone a “diversity hire”&lt;br&gt;Assigning undesirable tasks only to workers of color&lt;br&gt;Using racial, gender, or homophobic slurs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While we’ve defined terms for the purpose of identifying themes in participants’ accounts, these are not necessarily the terms used or preferred by trades workers themselves. One participant told us that because the term harassment carries racial and gender connotations that might put people off, we should instead only use the term bullying. Another participant felt bullying was inappropriate because it sounded like “playground antics,” and instead we should use a more serious term like “verbal violence.” Many participants though told us they had never seen “violence” at work, yet recounted stories of harassment, hazing, and bullying described above. These terms – harassment, bullying, violence, hazing – are laden with pre-existing meanings. Any trades workers who might be part of prevention efforts have already developed associations with these terms, for better or worse.

Rather than carry-over negative associations into a new prevention effort, (and because there was no broad consensus on which of these terms would be preferred), we recommend starting with a less value-laden, more inclusive term for which workers are not likely to have preexisting associations – **Power-Based Personal Aggression** (PBPA). This term, defined by Green Dot as *any behavior that uses power, control, and/or intimidation to harm another*, has the benefit of novelty. Because it is not a term workers have likely heard before (it is a modified version of the term power-based personal violence used in Green Dot’s high school, college, and community programs), they are less likely to engage in prevention efforts with the negative associations some other terms carry. Furthermore, because most workers described dissatisfaction with education they have previously received around these issues (more detail in the Deliberate Distribution section), there is an opportunity to set the tone that this effort is different. By starting with the term power-based personal aggression and giving trades workers many examples of what this aggression looks like, we increase the likelihood that bystanders recognize and subsequently be cued to intervene.

We must also deal with the reality that these behaviors can sometimes be difficult for bystanders to recognize. While some of the behaviors described above are clearly aggressive, many of them could also easily be described as common workplace interactions. Consider this bystander challenge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerning Behaviors that Could Constitute Aggression</th>
<th>Common Behaviors on a Work Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yelling</td>
<td>Yelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning an apprentice broom duty</td>
<td>Assigning an apprentice broom duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling rude jokes</td>
<td>Telling rude jokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work force reduction</td>
<td>Work force reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing</td>
<td>Cursing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is imperative that we recognize and normalize this lack of clarity workers face when identifying PBPA for at least three reasons. First, it allows us to gain credibility with workers by acknowledging that this is difficult and even we cannot give them a clear-cut set of criteria that will always allow them to distinguish. Thompson, in his 2003 study on bullying prevention with factory workers, found that it was necessary to recognize the lack of clarity between fun joking behaviors and bullying in order to reduce worker defensiveness around prevention efforts. Second, we can help workers, as bystanders, identify subtle signs and cues that will actually help them tell the difference between concerning and common behaviors (like the reaction of the target, persistence or escalation over time, and power imbalances). Finally, by recognizing this difficulty, we can help workers reconsider the role they might play as bystanders in ways that make intervention feel more manageable. While very often people think bystander intervention means a big confrontation, one of the most common stories we hear is about bystanders who just check-in when they are not completely clear about what is going on. Just checking-in can be a powerful intervention.
BARRIERS TO INTERVENTION

Focus group participants were able to label clear behaviors that bystanders at worksites can identify as concerning or disruptive. The challenge for bystanders working in the trades is the choice to do something or do nothing in the face of this PBPA. For bystanders, finding realistic solutions, given the reality of work-related, social, and personal barriers that make it difficult to intervene, can seem impossible when the worksite culture is not necessarily supportive of bystander intervention. Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012) identify four worksite dynamics that can make intervention difficult: (1) Naturalization, which occurs when workers are repeatedly exposed to abuse or talk about abuse and come to believe managers are abusive by nature; (2) Neutralization, which occurs when workers assume that hostility is inevitable; (3) Individualizing, which occurs when workers place responsibility on targets and; (4) Topical avoidance, whereby organizational sanctions and rewards (formal and informal) discourage employees from ever expressing concerns about negative behavior. In a 2003 study about workplace “busting” (behaviors that include jokes, pranks, bullying and harassment based on age, race, sexual orientation and other differences), Thompson discovered serious distrust between workers. In focus groups, workers told Thompson that busting was not a big problem, but privately disclosed being seriously affected by busting. Barriers to doing something about the busting included fear of “looking like a rat,” making the situation worse, or having the person doing the busting turn on them (Thompson, 2003). Similarly, when asked what might keep someone from intervening or what makes it difficult, several themes emerged from focus group participants in the present study: work-related barriers, social and cultural barriers, personal barriers and other/miscellaneous barriers.

Work-related Barriers

First, according to focus group participants, the most persistent barrier that can keep bystanders from acting is work-related: consequences relating to job loss or transfer off of a worksite. Both male and female participants, particularly laborers, shared examples and real concerns about the potential effects of bystanders reporting behaviors to supervisors or calling coworkers out for their behavior. One participant explained that reporting a co-worker’s behavior or standing up to them is “like gambling” and the risk to workers’ livelihoods keeps many bystanders from acting. A female laborer described the conditions relating to contract labor,

“The fact that a reduction in workforce is right around the corner. That is a really significant factor. If you’ve never worked under that kind of condition, I don’t think you can understand how big an influence that is.”

Some participants explained that supervisors, the training center, and the union can lay workers off without any reason or they can give workers a Reduction of Force (ROF). A male laborer explained “everybody has a protection on their job… they don’t want to be all out there [as a bystander], so they don’t.” It is typical for a bystander to remain silent to protect their position or in other words, “if they make any little ripple in the pond, they may get a last slip.”

For participants, race and gender also played a role in the fear associated with job loss. White women and women of color described the need to prove themselves on a jobsite, to not stand out as a problem, and to contribute on an equal level with men. One participant added, “You don’t have to be perceived as being strong, you have to be strong.” This need can also keep workers from reporting or saying something in the face of witnessing PBPA. The necessity to “fit in” can be a paramount obstacle to bystander intervention. One female laborer stated that if women complain, they are “identified as the problem and kicked off the job site,” adding that the men who are doing the concerning behavior get to stay, because they are a part of the “boy’s club.” However, another woman
acknowledged that even men who “stand up” would be risking their job as well and several men corroborated that concern in other focus groups. One example shared by a focus group participant:

“There’s this one guy working on the bridge with us that is super, super offensive. Super offensive, like stuff that I never even repeated at home. I just chalked it up to be mentally ill and avoided him… Another gal came to work with us for a little while. She would go ahead and have conversations with the dude… Then she would argue with him. I would walk by and hear part of it and it was like – oh, it’s not good. Well she went and complained. Then later she was run off… She was good enough. She was another laborer, so she was good enough to hang around until the end of the job and she didn’t. That guy did. He was never let go… She wasn’t allowed to come back to the company.”

-Female Worker

Men of color all agreed that they need to work twice as hard as their white counterparts in order to stay on a jobsite. Rocking the boat by standing up to a peer or reporting concerning behavior to a supervisor did not feel like a safe or realistic option to the men in this group; this is particularly salient considering the potential risk to their job and their predisposition to stand out in general, working in a predominantly white environment. “This dude who said the N word… The black who overheard it is the one who ended up losing the job.”

In general, according to several participants, when behaviors are reported, often there are no consequences for the person responsible. One worker described a situation where a laborer was using the N word and “it got to the higher ups, and surprisingly so, there was no repercussions behind that. So that made it seem almost ok, because ‘that is just the way [he] talks.’” These attitudes from leaders can encourage silence on behalf of workers. Why should they risk their job, their social status, or the aggression turning on them if there is not accountability or support? One participant shared that the exception to this is when behaviors affect productivity and then the company may take action. Unfortunately, some workers who have been around for a long time and work hard can get away with using offensive language and some aggression, because “they don’t mean it personally” and according to participants, the company does not see it as affecting productivity. Another laborer’s experience was that “if you scream loud enough” unions will definitely do something about it. Meanwhile, others had received the message, “it’s very frowned upon. Don’t ever call the hall.”

Social & Cultural Barriers

The second most-mentioned type of bystander barrier relates to social interactions and the established culture on jobsites. Some social barriers are connected to work-related barriers, in that if a worker is not well-liked by peers, their job could be on the line or they risk being socially ostracized by the dominant group on a worksite, i.e. “You’re eating lunch alone.” Another participant stated:

“The carpenters is a clique to me. It’s just a flat out clique. You will be labeled as a trouble maker, labeled as lazy… They label you and so you know to speak up on anything that goes on, I mean, I almost sit back and let people hang themselves on things.”

-Male Worker

In addition, if a worker decides to call out a peer or report their behaviors, they cannot be sure that anyone will have their back. They run the risk of having the harassing or bullying behavior turn on them in a sort of retaliation. Additionally, workers face the possibility of being socially isolated from other workers. Several participants even described feeling pressure to join in on the behavior or risk becoming a target. One male laborer described a group mentality that creates cultural pressure to join in the behavior
or risk becoming a target or being called out for “tattling” or “being a rat.” Another male laborer explained the social pressure to ignore the behaviors, rationalizing that “maybe this person does really deserve this treatment; ‘maybe its not too bad or they need to have a thicker skin; ‘or ‘maybe that is just how that bully operates, that is just them. I think there is a lot of writing off and ignoring that happens. Benefit of the doubt.” The pressure to “just keep working” and ignore the aggression is often present and in some cases, workers will “jump on board” to avoid standing out. As one participant explained:

“It’s so social. You have to get on the job and have people like you and get along. Because you have to work with everybody. I was in a lift with my foreman today, leaning on him. You’re there, you want to get along. That helps you keep your job. But then there’s fear of speaking up or repercussions or just having a really shitty time at work. Like being kept around to be the kid they pick on – that sucks.”

-Female Worker

Many jobsites also have well-established cultural environments that make it difficult for a bystander to intervene. Some participants spoke about the established social or cultural customs that exist on a worksite, where giving peers a hard time, joking, and pushing peers is normal and acceptable, “people get used to it; the culture kind of accepts what’s going on.” In fact, workers who are repeatedly exposed to abuse or talk about abuse, come to believe that the environment or leadership is intrinsically abusive or that the negative environment is inevitable (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). In other words, workers can begin to see the negative behaviors as normal or unavoidable. One participant explained the experience of starting at a new worksite:

“There’s a whole lot of poking and prodding when people first work with you to see if you’re cool or not. And if

you’re cool, then they can push the envelope and make jokes at your existence or make jokes at somebody else’s work and you can take it and you’re not going to go tell on them. But at first you might be a threat, so it’s scary to them, because you could be somebody that makes them lose their job for running their mouth too much. They like to run their mouth. They like to make jokes all day. They like to make it light. That’s how they work. That’s how they know how to work.”

-Female Worker

Another participant, a male laborer of color, described a situation where he was new to a jobsite and was required to carry 100 heavy pieces of plywood up a stack of stairs, a job that could have easily been completed by machinery, in a much more efficient manner. Bystanders observed the situation, even showed discomfort, but no one acted, because the request was seen as an act of “initiation.” “And that same boss, he constantly, on a daily basis, screamed, yelled, cussed, anything he could do to try to break me or else make me a stronger worker.” This particular jobsite had established a culture tolerance of subtle and more overt forms of PBPA.

Personal Barriers

Several participants also mentioned personal barriers as affecting their decision to act. One personal barrier experienced and observed by several participants was the attitude that the behaviors or conflict between other workers was none of their business. One participant explained, “It’s between them. It’s their deal. Like those electricians better figure their shit out.” One participant felt like this attitude to “mind your own business” was a part of “American culture.”

One participated pointed out, “I think fear is really the biggest barrier... because they’re afraid of me sometimes, I’m afraid of them sometimes. Most of the time, no one needs to be
afraid of the other person, but it’s like… are you going to be a jerk?” Other workers corroborated this fear, adding that the fear of the aggression turning on them compounded the discomfort in saying something. Another participant observed that “people are easily offended, even if you roll your eyes or go ‘pfft’ and walk away…” Workers might be worried about the consequences of their reaction and the fear of personal backlash can silence some bystanders. For some individuals the risk of embarrassment, if the aggressive behavior was not perceived by others to be a big deal, might stop some workers from acting. This overlaps with social and cultural barriers, where the environment of a worksite might be established through the tolerance of certain negative behaviors.

Another personal barrier observed as prevalent on jobsites is the focus on the task at hand. Many workers may not want to be distracted from their own duties and only care if it affects their ability to do so. One participant observed:

“I think it has to do with how the jobsite is going. If this jobsite is hectic, they have to worry about their own matters ‘cause they don’t want to have that same issue maybe with their trade within themselves conflicting with other people, so let’s just say like two electricians are having a disagreement with one another, if the jobsite is being hectic the painters are just going to keep walking; he’s going to want to get done with his stuff, he’s going to do his stuff, but if the morale is up, the jobsite’s going well, then this painter might let the foreman know of those two electricians, ‘Hey, you know, foreman, the electricians, I saw this and this, you know, these two employees…’”

-Management Level Participant

One more personal barrier, as several participants observed, was apathy. It seems that many workers are on a jobsite only to work. While this might seem like an obvious stance for a worker to take, many get caught up in the social atmosphere of a jobsite. “There are a lot of people that I work with that just show up. That’s it. They just show up. They put in their eight for eight and they are gone. Anything else is too much for them.” Another participant observed:

“I think the bystanders just don’t care if it is not happening to them. A lot of apathy, where people just don’t want to get involved or don’t care to get involved. They are just there. For them, stepping up might seem like shaking up their world for whatever reason and they don’t want to get it shaken up.”

-Female Worker

Other Barriers

Some other barriers that affected participants’ initiative to act or intervene as bystanders included looking around to see if other bystanders are reacting to a situation of PBPA. If others do not react, they are less likely to act. This is a bystander dynamic that affects people in many situations, often referred to as pluralistic ignorance. Research shows that when an individual is faced with a potentially high-risk situation, one that they may not be sure is an emergency, they look around to see how others are reacting before deciding whether or not to respond (Clark & Word, 1974; Latane & Darley, 1970).

Finally, several participants shared that they would probably default to the target’s reaction to decide if they should act or not. If the target does not think it’s a big deal, they will not intervene. In other situations, bystanders might place responsibility on the target or blame the target for their own misfortune (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). For example, one participant spoke about rationalizing the behavior of the aggressor:
“There is a Stockholm syndrome of sympathizing with the abuser, writing it off, coming up with excuses. Thinking that ‘oh yeah, maybe this person does really deserve this treatment,’ or, ‘maybe its not too bad or they need to have a thicker skin,’ or ‘maybe that is just how that bully operates, that is just them.’ I think there is a lot of writing off and ignoring that happens. Benefit of the doubt.”

-Female Worker

Table 2. Common Bystander Barriers in the Trades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Common Bystander Barriers</th>
<th>What makes it difficult for a bystander:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work-related</td>
<td>▶ Fear of job loss or transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Fear of greater or more difficult workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Difficulty advancing or getting proper training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Lack of supervisor follow-through if behavior reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Lack of accountability for person responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Cultural</td>
<td>▶ Fear of “rocking the boat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Pressure to fit in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Social isolation or alienation from peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Fear of peer reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Bullying, harassing behavior is socially acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Not socially acceptable to “call the hall”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>▶ Fear of embarrassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Fear of behavior turning on bystander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ None of my business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Busy, focused on job tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Apathy, some people don’t care unless it is happening to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>▶ Look around to see how others react, if they don’t, you don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Default to target’s reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Hold the target responsible for their misfortune</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, there are many barriers that can silence workers, even supervisors and foremen, or make it difficult to intervene as a bystander. Currently, many jobsites are not supportive of bystander intervention and therefore do not host an atmosphere of workers looking out for one another. Despite these very real barriers, the next section will address possible solutions for bystanders to consider when faced with the observation of PBPA, despite the barriers they may face.
BYSTANDERS: SOLUTIONS TO PBPA

**Realistic Reactive Solutions**

Considering the variety and abundance of bystander barriers experienced and observed by workers in the trades, it is not surprising that many participants shared that it was rare for a bystander to actually intervene or report aggressive behavior. Though the assumption is that participants will not overcome their barriers immediately, and the generation of solutions is based on that assumption, we recommend embedding each educational component within the context of individual values, ideals, identity, and changing jobsite norms. This is an important part of shaping participants toward the ideal of individual responsibility for community well-being. It is important to plant seeds with the hope that as people change and grow, they will increase the percentage of time they can actually overcome their barriers to action rather than simply avoid them.

Often when we consider bystander intervention, the assumption is that it looks like a direct confrontation. While that can certainly be an example of bystander intervention, it is not the only option bystanders have at their disposal. One goal of the Green Dot strategy is to help bystanders generate realistic solutions that they can actually see themselves doing in real life, despite the ever-present work-related, social, and personal barriers. The following solutions will outline relevant and realistic solutions for individuals working in the trades.

**Direct Approach**

Participants made it clear that a direct confrontation is not a safe or relevant option for many bystanders on a jobsite. The consequences and risks are too high. However, that is not to say that it does not happen. Often the bystanders in the best position to directly intervene either have high social standing or are in formal leadership positions. Others, including apprentices, can directly intervene, but do so in the face of more risks. In fact, one participant observed:

“I’ve seen a couple of cases of guys sticking up for their guys, where it worked out really well. But the way it worked out was that… There’s this guy that was getting… He was just hard to get along with. He was just a weird, awkward guy. He was an apprentice and his [trainer] was just fucking ruthless. He was really mean to him. This other guy stepped up for him and was like ‘hey, why don’t you leave him alone? At least give him real work to do.’ But the way that he did it was he totally alpha-dogged… That’s like the only way I can think about it is he was like [makes mean sounding noises] and the other guy was like ‘okay!’”

-Male Worker

This laborer and others made it clear that in order for a direct callout to be effective, the bystander has to have some established social status or be higher in the chain than the person responsible for the aggressive behavior. Another participant shared:

“I’ve often screamed in the journeymen’s faces. I know that is the wrong way but it angers me so much. Just telling them to keep their mouth shut. Where is your respect? Where is your dignity? We are supposed to be the best in the business. I let them know sometimes the truth. We are the most paid and the best in the industry and you want to act and talk like this on the jobsites. That works for a little while.”

-Male Electrician

It is worth noting that the participant above is a white man, which may mean that he holds a more privileged position than his female or men of color counterparts. However, he did note that, “I’m also usually one of the first to get run off a job for standing up for other people and myself,” sharing that he knows the risk of
directly intervening and is willing to face the consequences.

A bystander taking a direct approach also has the option to have a conversation with the person exhibiting aggressive behavior away from the crowd, possibly after hours. This can be a more disarming approach because the social setting has disappeared, at least for the moment. The bystander can also check in with the target of the behavior. They can offer support to the target, in the form of resources, names, or phone numbers of individuals to call who may be able to help. Or the bystander can model support by not participating in the aggressive behavior or by having lunch with the target.

Delegate Option
Another viable option for bystanders, given their barriers, is to delegate. Delegating can look several different ways. Bystanders can ask another bystander to intervene, perhaps one with greater social standing or formal leadership. They could also share their concerns with peers, like one participant suggested, “I could put something in somebody’s head and make them think, ‘wow, he’s kind of right, you know?’” In fact, in one situation, this participant did just that and he concluded, “I think if I didn’t, those bystanders would not have intervened, you know? Maybe everybody would have tolerated it,” but because he raised their awareness of the situation, they were able to effectively intervene, even though the original bystander was not comfortable directly confronting the situation.

Another option is for bystanders to come together to confront a situation or hold an individual responsible for their actions. Sometimes there is “power in numbers,” especially considering the barrier of going against the dominant social “clique.” As one participant pointed out:

“You know, I would like to see something where there were no repercussions. If we could, maybe somehow talk to the [contractors] somehow, and put together some kind of plan. If we see this happening and we go to the contractors, the person being bullied and the person reporting it will be safe. There are two people there saying this is happening.”

-Male Worker

Another participant added that “banding together” could stop a lot of things, knowing that you have the support of peers.

Several participants did say that if one person reacts or reports something, it is more likely that another worker would feel comfortable following suit. A participant from the general contractors, HR, project management group explained that when more than one worker reports an incident, there is more reason for management to be concerned. In a case like this, “maybe I’ll watch it for a while instead of saying okay, let’s address it.” This is reiterated in a study that found that organizations are more likely to hold individuals accountable for aggressive or bullying behavior when a contingency of workers acts collectively (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012).

Yet another delegate approach a bystander can take is to report aggressive behavior. However, several participants shared an anxiety about actually reporting aggressive behaviors as a bystander. Some reasons are outlined above (e.g. fear of aggression turning on them, no accountability for person responsible, getting transferred or losing job, etc.). Because of these barriers, one participant suggested:

“It depends on who the bully is. And in our particular case, he is very intelligent. He is very articulate. He is smart. People are afraid to challenge him. And the odd thing is, if people were to kind of band together against him… You know he is wrong in virtually all of the instances where he is abusing people. He is wrong. But, I guess people don’t get the aggravation of it. They just avoid it.”

-Male Worker
Other participants reiterated the need for confidence in accountability and follow-through on the part of management or “higher-ups” to be in place in order for bystanders to feel comfortable reporting concerning behavior.

**Distract Alternative**

Last, but certainly not least, bystanders have the option to distract a situation. In fact, this might be the most practical or workable solution, considering all of the potential barriers a worker might experience in the face of high-risk aggressive behaviors. Some promising research on the effective inclusion of bystanders to address PBPA in the workplace shows that one encouraging tactic for bystanders is “resourcing” or redirecting negative communication to a neutral or positive topic from a previously aggressive or negatively framed statement (Foss & Foss, 2003). In other words, when a bystander makes the choice to distract a situation by changing the subject or redirecting the person exhibiting aggressive behavior, it can often deescalate potential harm. For example, if a foreman is targeting an apprentice by using degrading language on a construction site, another laborer can call out to everyone, “hey, the lumber shipment just arrived!” This can distract all parties from the aggression long enough to focus on a new task.

Another distract option that several participants suggested was humor. Finding a way to throw in a disarming joke or good-natured poke at either party can diffuse the progression of aggressive behavior. One example a participant shared:

“I had a fellow walk up to me and make fun of me about the truck I was driving. It was somebody else’s, so it’s painted. It had a rainbow flag on it. It was really badly painted. It wasn’t mine. I couldn’t rip it off or anything. It’s the only vehicle I had access to at the time. So some guy walks up to me and says, ‘is that your rig out there?’

I felt blood rush up to my head and I was about to answer ‘yes…’ and the guy I’ve been working with for the last several years, actually one of these guys I consider to be a buddy walks up and says ‘it’s my fucking truck. You have a problem with it?’ Dude walked away. I was like – thanks, [man].”

-Female Worker

The worker and her friend laughed. The truck was so obviously not his. This humor was a clear bystander intervention, yet resulted in the aggressor not having much to say in return.

Bearing in mind, the intense barriers faced by workers, distract may be the only option some workers have, particularly those with low social status or at the apprentice level. This may also be even more pertinent for white women and men and women of color. Often with the distract approach, one can diffuse a situation and leave the person using aggressive behavior confused or redirected. The people in the situation and other bystanders may not even know an intervention occurred. Imagine if enough bystanders distracted concerning behaviors every time they noticed something; in little time, they could create an environment that is inhospitable to PBPA, without any obvious or overt effort.
Table 3. Realistic Solutions for Bystanders in the Trades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Realistic Solutions [Considering Bystander Barriers]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Direct** | - Subtle observation/callout after incident ("I noticed this, makes me uncomfortable")  
- Check in with target  
- Offer to help target report  
- Give a resource to target (phone number to union, HR, management, etc.)  
- Direct callout |
| **Delegate** | - Ask someone else (with more social status or in a higher position) to intervene  
- Engage other bystanders, intervene together  
- Tell a trusted foreman, manager or supervisor  
- Filing formal complaints with HR, management, company or union  
- Report to foreman, contractors, company, union, etc. |
| **Distract** | - Change subject  
- Redirect attention to another task or topic  
- Use humor |
Proactive Approaches to Shifting the Cultural Norms

Green Dot expands the traditional approach to bystander intervention in two ways. (1) It expands the definition of who a bystander is. The traditional conceptualization of a bystander is an individual witnessing a potentially high-risk situation, facing the choice of whether or not to intervene. Green Dot broadens this definition to include anyone who is aware PBPA is present in his/her worksite, company, or organization. An awareness of systematic aggression (e.g. bullying, harassment, hazing, etc.) poses the same decision as watching a specific situation unfold in front of you: “am I going to do something within my sphere of influence to make it less likely the next act of aggression happens?” This definition suggests that the foreman who has seen the orientation video on current rates of sexual harassment in the trades has the same responsibility and choice as the laborer at a jobsite watching a buddy catcall a new female apprentice. (2) It expands the definition of what a bystander does. When we limit the bystander role to reactive, we limit the capacity of each individual to contribute to substantive culture change and we render ourselves powerless until the next potential act of aggression crosses our path. However, when we understand the power cultural norms have to create environments that are less conducive to PBPA happening at all, we can forge an expanded, proactive role for bystanders. In addition to being equipped to respond when a potential act of aggression unfolds in our line of vision, we can take small actions each day to reset norms in two important ways:

1. PBPA will not be tolerated in the trades.
2. Everyone is expected to do their part.

Through small, everyday acts (conversations, wearing pins on clothing or stickers on hardhats, addressing topics in company or union newsletters, talking points in orientation content, team meetings, subtle non-verbal reactions, jobsite signage, social media posts, etc.), it is up to all members of Portland’s trades community to communicate to current and new members what is expected. When it is clear PBPA is not tolerated and most will step in – the norms become incompatible with aggression, cutting it off before it starts. With these expanded definitions, Green Dot can become a broad-scale community mobilizer, engaging the previously silent majority toward visible action. A mobilized population drives broader change, such as:

- Putting pressure on trades systems, companies, unions, and policy makers to increase accountability.
- Creating visibly supportive jobsites so more targets feel comfortable reporting – thus allowing greater opportunity for enforcement against people responsible for the aggression and healing for those who have been targeted.
- A community that is visibly intolerant of PBPA erodes key risk factors associated with aggression, among them: weak workplace sanctions against PBPA, general tolerance of PBPA within jobsites, social norms that support PBPA, and high tolerance levels of bullying, harassment, and other forms of aggression
- Creating a community that supports workers, investment in social cohesion among workers, upward mobility, worker productivity, and positive work experiences.

While proactive bystander behaviors can work to shift social norms that currently sustain high rates of PBPA, they are not without their own barriers. For workers in the trades, calling attention to oneself outside of the current dominant social environment can be risky. It can be awkward to bring up or support bystander intervention and PBPA if that is not a popular topic of conversation. A worker may be perceived as a “suck up” or a “union guy” if they put too much emphasis on trying to change the established cultural practices. All of these barriers can be especially true if a worker has low social status, is new at a jobsite, or is in a less advanced
position (i.e. apprentice). Therefore, proactive bystander barriers need to be considered when determining practical options for all levels or workers in the trades. For example, a well-liked foreman or contractor may get away with bringing up the issue of PBPA during a lunch break or wearing a Green Dot sticker on their hard hat, while an apprentice may receive backlash for doing the same thing. Individuals with social influence and in formal leadership positions have fewer risks and can therefore be more overt in their proactive bystander behaviors. Laborers and apprentices in less advanced positions or with less social influence can still contribute in proactive ways, but may want to utilize more subtle techniques, like conversations with close peers, a small pin on their jacket, or indirect non-verbal behaviors, like a head nod to a bystander who intervenes or talks about PBPA prevention.

### Table 4. Proactive Bystander Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Level</th>
<th>Proactive Bystander Behavior Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Pre-apprentices/ Apprentices** |▫️ Conversations with peers  
▫️ Small pin or symbol on clothing  
▫️ Non-verbal gestures to show support (e.g. head nod, pat on the back, etc.)  
▫️ Social media posts |
| **Journeymen** |▫️ Conversations with peers  
▫️ Speaking to a well-liked foreman or contractor about addressing the topic with larger team  
▫️ Small pin or symbol on clothing  
▫️ Non-verbal gestures to show support (e.g. head nod, pat on the back, etc.)  
▫️ Social media posts |
| **Foremen** |▫️ Conversations with peers and workers  
▫️ Talking points about PBPA prevention and support in team meetings  
▫️ Pin, sticker, or other symbol on clothing or hard hat  
▫️ Verbal support for bystanders who act  
▫️ Non-verbal gestures to show support (e.g. head nod, pat on the back, etc.)  
▫️ Social media posts |
| **Contractors/ Project Managers/ Supervisors/ Superintendents** |▫️ Conversations with peers and workers  
▫️ Incorporating PBPA prevention and bystander efficacy into orientation content/procedures  
▫️ Pin, sticker, or other symbol on clothing or hard hat  
▫️ Providing clear instructions for reporting PBPA (and following through)  
▫️ Jobsite signage  
▫️ Verbal support for bystanders who act  
▫️ Non-verbal gestures to show support (e.g. head nod, pat on the back, etc.)  
▫️ Social media posts |
| **Unions/Company Leadership** |▫️ Addressing PBPA prevention in company/union newsletters  
▫️ Incorporating PBPA prevention and bystander efficacy into orientation content/procedures  
▫️ Providing clear instructions for reporting PBPA (and following through)  
▫️ Providing support to targets of aggression  
▫️ Jobsite signage  
▫️ Letters to the editor  
▫️ Provide training for all levels of leadership to enforce new community norms  
▫️ Social media posts  
▫️ Advocating for PBPA prevention with state-wide and national decision-makers like BOLI and OSHA |
Considering the high incidence of PBPA on worksites around Portland, as well as the impact these forms of aggression have on worker productivity, safety, turnover, and morale, there is an urgent need to shift the cultural landscape that currently works to sustain high rates of PBPA. Some studies have shown that organizations with cultures that support fair working conditions and implement zero-tolerance policies for aggression alleviate some level of PBPA (Dillon, 2010; Burd-Sharps, Lewis & Kelly, 2014). However, organizational policies and procedures can also play an unintentional role in contributing to PBPA on worksites (Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012). Confusing policies and procedures can silence workers who have experienced PBPA (Meares et al., 2004) and pose challenges to an effective intervention process for supervisors, management, and HR (Cowan, 2009). Currently, efforts to engage bystanders to effectively shift the worksite environment have been minimal in the trades industries. One study determined that bystanders can play a role in “discouraging negative behaviors” and modeling and encouraging positive behaviors in the workplace (Scully & Rowe, 2009). Other efforts to improve worksite harassment and aggression, especially when the aggression is based on race, gender, or sexuality, suggest an emphasis on improving workplace equality and attitudes towards tolerance and acceptance. Therefore, we recommend paying more attention to the social influence the workers themselves possess as both proactive and reactive bystanders with the power to shift norms.

There is evidence to suggest that personal growth in these areas (attitudes on race, gender, sexuality, etc.) is not a prerequisite to engaging in positive, prosocial bystander behaviors. This is not, however, to suggest that we give up the pursuit of engaging individuals in more comprehensive culture change in order to erode some of the constructs that support PBPA in the trades. The ultimate goal is not to simply react to potential aggression as it is occurring, but rather to simultaneously shift the cultural norms that support the aggression. This leads to the question of when and how the content is best introduced to workers, in order to solicit the most effective and efficient behavior and norms changes.

The theory of Planned Behavior suggests that there are three key factors when predicting behavior change: (1) Attitudes, (2) Subjective Norms, and (3) Perceived Behavioral Control (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

### Attitudes

Research on attitude change suggests that the optimum conditions to shift deeply held beliefs include: (1) an intrinsic motivation to do so; (2) adequate time to process; and (3) manageable increments of change between starting position and desired position. Persuasive communication is dependent on the discrepancy between the position advocated in the message and the recipient’s initial attitude (Siero & Doosje, 1993). Most ideal is a moderate distance between the two. Further, research suggests that when these conditions are not in place, and educators try to shift attitudes too quickly beyond a manageable increment – the very attitudes we are trying to change become more entrenched, and more difficult to change at the next attempt. In other words, if we attempt to stand in front of a training group of plumbers, required to be there and entrenched in an environment that allows for PBPA to thrive, and we suggest that they stand up to their co-worker the next time they engage in a microaggression that might suggest a sexist attitude – it is likely we not only lose their interest in prevention at all – but we deepen their belief that such things are not a big deal and we are overreacting to their normal environment. If instead, we start by asking if they’d be willing to distract someone who was screaming racial slurs in an apprentice’s face, we’re more likely to keep them engaged because there is greater consensus that the offensive behavior is wrong and the intervention feels more manageable.
Subjective Norms

Another key factor for creating behavior change in an individual is perceived social pressure. The strength of this factor is multiplied when an individual highly values the opinions of those around him/her and has a strong desire to comply with such norms (which is clearly present on worksites according to focus group participants). Even if we are able to create personal attitude change in our desired direction (i.e., sexist jokes are bad) – the likelihood that the individual will actually translate those personal attitudes to behaviors is heavily mediated by approval from others (Fife-Schaw, Sheeran, and Norman, 2007). This means that even if we are able to persuade our typical worker to shift attitudes about sexist or racist jokes – the likelihood of him actually calling out a buddy is significantly predicted by his perception that his co-workers are also offended by the jokes. In other words, it is of limited value to look at individual attitude change outside of the social context of the worksite.

Perceived Behavioral Control

The more control an individual perceives themselves as having, the more options, resources and opportunities they think they have, and the more people feel confident in their ability to perform a certain behavior (self-efficacy), the more likely they are to behave in a certain way. Conversely, even if an individual has attitudes supporting a given position (i.e., is anti-sexual harassment) – if they do not believe they have the personal resources to effectively act, they won’t (Madden, Ellen and Ajzen, 1992). There is strong empirical evidence that people’s behavior is strongly influenced by the confidence they have in their ability to perform the behavior (Bandura, Adams, Hardy, and Howells, 1980). Therefore, assuming our target worker holds attitudes that are consistent with stopping worksite harassment and aggression AND they believe their peers are also against it – we maximize the likelihood they will actually intervene if they are equipped with as many options as possible that feel manageable and realistic in their daily reality. If the only option they are given is some direct confrontation with a buddy that requires “calling them out” – they likely will not have the confidence to pull off such an intervention. So, when conceptualizing intervention options, we must be guided by the individual’s own sense of ability and confidence in performing the behavior in the social context of the worksite.

Based on the above research, outlining how attitudes, subjective norms, and behaviors shift, we recommend that any prevention initiative in the trades seeks to meet people where they are. While this may pose a challenge, it is the only way to incrementally and manageably move people to create a new environment, inhospitable to PBPA. Again, given the urgency associated with stopping PBPA, it can be disappointing to experience an insufficient level of commitment and engagement on the part of the workers we are attempting to change. The reality is that one person might commit to intervening in a physical assault, but thinks that verbally taunting a new apprentice is just a part of initiation. Meanwhile, someone else will commit to intervening if they hear a racist joke, but will not check-in when a female laborer is being targeted because of her gender. When attempting to shift the culture, it may seem essential that we move everyone along at the same pace, with the “right” level of buy-in and the “right” intentions. In our desire to do so, we may even succumb to the impulse to push harder, confront, and challenge our participants. However, when navigating how hard to push, we need to consider the following:

First, directly attacking someone’s attitudes without considering motivation, processing time, and manageable increments, may lead to no noticeable change. At times, this can even create a space for participants to feel less favorable toward the advocated position than they did before being given the new message (Abelson & Miller, 1967; Brehm, 1966) or it may work to strengthen their original, undesirable attitude, holding stronger to their original beliefs, while rejecting the new message (Tormala & Petty, 2002).
Second, individuals are driven to be consistent with their previous behaviors and commitments. People have a strong need to enhance their self-concepts by behaving consistently with their actions, statements, commitments, beliefs, and self-ascribed traits (Cialdini & Trost 1998). In other words, it is an important first step when we can create a manageable point of entry into “power-based personal aggression prevention” – and are successful at getting a participant to make a public commitment to act and begin to self-define as someone who cares about this issue. Once the personal and public commitment is made – we trigger internal drives to act consistently. We create internal conflict when the individual begins to notice discrepancies between their newly espoused values – and the choices s/he is noticing around him/her. So, while the initial point of entry may be “physical assault is not okay, but catcalling women is just good fun,” by allowing them to enter at that point, we increase the likelihood that over time, the person may begin to see the incongruence of continued cat-calling.

Finally, we must be clear about the repercussions of our stances. When we begin our passionate confrontation with someone who doesn’t agree with us on the relationship between sexist jokes and a disruption to worksite productivity – we are more consciously connected to the importance of our point and the teachable moment we must seize. What we are not often connected to is the reality that, while we may be “right” and may “win” the argument – the result could be alienating someone who might have otherwise been engaged to intervene in an act of aggression later that week. Since prevention can only happen if we get lots of people who are not currently involved to get involved, it’s important that we are prepared to accept the contributions that people have to offer – even if they are not “perfect” and even if they don’t go as far as we might like.

As desperate and passionate as we may feel about jobsite productivity, safety, and healthy interactions – we don’t just get to will our way to culture change. More thoughtful attention to the sequence with which we present prevention-related content to target audiences is not about devaluing underlying cultural conditions or over-simplifying the complexity and magnitude of PBPA. Instead, it is about controlling our content – refusing to indulge in the outrage and satisfaction of being right at the expense of alienating those we most need to engage – and instead, channeling the desperation we feel into the decades of science that give us the data-supported steps to the most effective ways to create the very change we are seeking.

Connecting Workers to the Stakes
In the trades industries, there are many aspects that can be regulated through mechanisms external to the worker. Work performance can be shaped by delegating prime duties and positions based on ethic and productivity; individual behavior can be influenced by policies and procedures; attendance can be regulated through leave policies and terminations; and safety can be regulated through policies and protocol. Caring, however, cannot be forced. Caring enough about a fellow worker to take a personal stance and social risk by intervening cannot be mandated or otherwise externally enforced. There are countless examples of “mandatory” programming or training that never translated to behavior change, because “mandatory” was used as a shortcut to genuine engagement. Since much of the PBPA that happens in the trade industries happens outside the view of those in supervisory positions, effective intervention ultimately requires engaging intrinsic motivation within each individual participant and worker.

Green Dot Core Values in the Trade Industries
When determining the most effective implementation for Green Dot in the trades industries, we focus as much on “how” the strategy is implemented as we do on “what” is implemented. In other words, Green Dot would infuse six distinct core values into the strategy that will help to establish a foundation and clear philosophical goals.
Core Value #1: Most people are fundamentally good and don’t want others to be hurt

The program is based on the simple premise that there are more individuals on any given jobsite or within any given company or organization who are not committing PBPA than those who are. As long as this holds true, it is not a matter of “if” a reduction in the targeted aggression can happen – only “how.” Rather than a pathological conceptualization of bystander inaction in the face of PBPA – such as apathy, indifference, character deficiencies, or selfishness – Green Dot is based on the premise that most individuals in any given community are decent and don’t want anyone to experience PBPA.

The approach taken by Green Dot in the trade industries presumes most members of the target population are potential allies in prevention efforts. But, despite good intentions, everyone faces difficulties in acting or stepping up, even when they know they should. These “barriers to action” (described in the “Barriers to Intervention” section) keep well-intended people silent – and often feeling bad for their silence. Green Dot avoids some historically ineffective approaches to these barriers to action such as: using shame or guilt to try and push through the barriers; trying to “force” the barriers, out through rules and threats, trying to eradicate the barriers with a pep-talk, or simply pretending these barriers don’t exist. Instead, we acknowledge the legitimacy and universality of barriers to action, and provide several possible approaches to dealing with them.

There is the presumption that whatever barriers individuals have when they come into training, they will also leave with the same barriers. Rather than pretending we can eradicate things like social pressure or fear of retaliation with a good pep talk or guilt trip, instructors should work to create a safe space for participants to acknowledge these barriers. When a participant feels safe enough to acknowledge what makes it hard to step up in a potentially high-risk or aggressive situation, he or she can then begin to explore realistic alternatives to intervening that would avoid triggering their specific barriers.

Core Value #2: Solution Focused

An important aspect of the Green Dot approach is that we are focused on solutions. We want to help reduce PBPA in the trades by working with the good in people and giving them practical skills to make their world safer and more productive. A part of this value is that we do not focus on blame or root causes of aggression. Instead, we redirect the conversation to practical solutions for community members (i.e. apprentices, workers, foremen, contractors, etc.) to look out for each other and help keep people from getting hurt in the first place.

Core Value #3: Include Everyone

We need men and women from diverse backgrounds and experiences to work together to help reduce PBPA. Workplace aggression is a human issue. It directly and indirectly has an impact on people of different ages, genders, races, socio-economic statuses, education levels, etc. No one in any given workplace, including in the trades, is completely free from PBPA or fear of it. A key value of Green Dot is that any prevention effort must involve diverse men and women.
working together to help make their community safer. We believe that all people who are affected by this issue deserve community care and understanding. Two main ways we demonstrate this value: (1) we openly talk about and honor the victimization of individuals across lines of gender, race, and sexual orientation and (2) we actively work to involve all individuals across lines of gender, race, and sexual orientation as part of the solution.

We need people to help us reduce PBPA even if they don’t agree with everything we say. At Green Dot we believe that the only thing people need to agree on is that PBPA is bad. We know in any community there is a big range in terms of how people feel about broader social justice issues like gender and racial equality. We welcome anyone who is willing to look out for members of their community and make it less likely that people get hurt.

Core Value #4: Messenger Matters
A key element to effective engagement is the relationship between educator and participant. Green Dot Programs are predicated on instructors creating an environment that is non-judgmental, respectful, and honest. No one does well on the defensive. No one is eager to join when they feel judged, criticized, or shamed. Three key messages for creating the necessary learning environment for participants with regard to their role as bystanders include: (1) honoring the legitimacy of barriers to action, (2) instructor’s sharing their own vulnerabilities, connections, and/or failures as a bystander, and (3) predicting and normalizing “failure” – acknowledging that no-one will do it right all the time. These messages help create a sense of shared ownership between instructors and participants, decreasing resistance and defensiveness. It will be important in the trade industries to train instructors who are well-liked, influential, and engaging in order to create the impact necessary to engage workers.

Core Value #5: Authenticity
We believe that we will be maximally effective in engaging others when we are able to establish a genuine connection based on authentic interaction – whether it be in a formal orientation training, a team meeting, or a one-on-one conversation. In our professional roles, however, we often do the opposite. We put on our professional persona, hide behind our desk and our title, and often we create a chasm of “us and them.” In the trades, this may look like a contractor vs. laborers, a foreman vs. a group of apprentices or a representative from HR vs. a group of electricians. These distinctions can be incredibly divisive.

What is the cost of this professional distance? What do we communicate to those we are hoping to engage when we can approach an issue as damaging and personally devastating as PBPA with a distant “professionalism”? What function does it serve for us to make such a drastic (if totally artificial) distinction between professional and personal? What would happen if we didn’t? What would happen if we actually showed up to a presentation or a meeting as a person – fully present, without the armor of our “professional identities”? What would be the impact if they saw we were connected? Vulnerable? Hopeful? Scared?

This core value is the simple idea that we cannot expect others to do what we are not willing to do ourselves. If we are going to ask those in our community to take a personal stance against PBPA, to make themselves vulnerable as bystanders, to risk believing that things can be different – the instructors who bring the message to workers must do the same.

Core Value #6: Hope
Martin Seligman did seminal research suggesting that when individuals believe they have no control over their environment, they will quit making any effort to change or improve it. If current experiences of PBPA in the trade industries is perceived as “inevitable,” there will be little motivation on behalf of individuals to change it. It’s not so much that individuals in each
community don’t know that PBPA is a problem. It’s not so much that people don’t realize they should do something. It is simply hopelessness; a sense of resignation that PBPA, is just a part of daily experience. They just don’t believe it can be different. They just don’t believe their actions matter. But, beneath the externally imposed layers of apparent indifference and inaction – people do care and it’s our job to help peel back the layers of hopeless inaction and reconnect our communities to the renewed possibility that current rates of PBPA are not inevitable. With renewed hope will come a resurgence of action. Inducing hope and optimism that significant improvement can be accomplished is a foundational pre-requisite to successful engagement of a targeted population.

And the good news is that when focus group participants were asked if they believed things could change, almost all responded with resounding, Yes! While there were some participants who believed some level of PBPA is inevitable, a vast majority felt at least that things could be improved. Hope is present in the trade industries.
IMPLEMENTING THE PREVENTION STRATEGY: DELIBERATE DISTRIBUTION AND PROGRAM LAUNCH PLAN

Green Dot recommends a specific, deliberate distribution of all prevention content, informed by research in the areas of social diffusion and public health. Social diffusion theory (Rogers, 1983) demonstrates that new behaviors quickly become social norms when enough natural and influential opinion leaders (called early adopters by the theory’s pioneer Everett Rogers) within the population visibly adopt, endorse, and support an innovative behavior. Based on this model, early adopters in a given population must be systematically identified, recruited, and trained to serve as behavior change endorsers within their sphere of influence, resulting in a shift in the targeted attitudes and behaviors within the community. In other words, opinion leaders shape social/behavior changes by making it easier for others to initiate and maintain certain new behaviors. Social diffusion theory and the influence of early adopters to establish new behavioral trends has been studied extensively for decades and proven widely successful across settings and content areas (see Kelly et al. 1997, Kelly 2004, Sikkema 2000). In focus groups, we found that most workers believed there were socially influentialy individuals on every job site. They offered ideas for identifying these individuals like surveying workers, asking key informants (like foremen, supervisors, and union stewards), and asking workers to self-identify as socially influential in order to receive “leadership training.”

Applying public health theory to prevention efforts in the trades, we can understand worksite aggression as an adverse health condition given its multiple, negative affects on wellbeing (Denissen 2009, Dillon 2012, Fitzgerald et al. 2009, McCormack et al. 2013, National Women’s Law Center 2014, and Zapf & Gross 2001). Public health frameworks for prevention hold promise to reduce aggression in the trades because they have proven their ability to address and eliminate negative conditions that foster health problems (Prothrow-Stith, 2010). The World Health Organization (2010) contends that prevention of adverse conditions requires action at each of the four, interrelated spheres of the social ecology:

Figure 1: Social Ecological Model

![Social Ecological Model](image-url)
For the trades in Oregon, these spheres would look something like:

- **Individual:** Each worker
- **Relationships:** Workers connections with each other (peer to peer, journeyman to apprentice, foreman to crew, superintendent to supervisor, etc.)
- **Organization:** Companies, union halls, apprenticeship programs, community-based organizations, etc.
- **Community/society:** Oregon trades as a whole (all members, stakeholders, and institutions)

Work in addressing other public health issues clearly indicates that an effective prevention strategy is going to include addressing aspects of the issue that intersect with each level of the social ecology. We recommend accomplishing this by applying the broad lens to “bystander” that incorporates individuals with the ability to affect not only a high risk situation at a work site— but also individuals with decision making power that can affect policies, enforcement, and resources. Proactive bystander interventions at each of the four spheres might include:

- **Individual:** A carpenter puts an anti-aggression sticker on his hard hat.
- **Relationship:** A foreman tells his crew that he doesn’t tolerate aggression on the job.
- **Organization:** A company requires all supervisors to include a 1-2 minute anti-harassment talk in their morning meeting with workers.
- **Community/Society:** BOLI issues a recommendation that all companies include PBPA in their safety training for workers

To develop effective distribution recommendations for PBPA prevention in Oregon trades, we started by asking focus group participants about the current information or education they receive about violence, harassment, hazing, and bullying. We identified two primary areas of concern to address with current efforts: program content and mechanisms for delivery.

Almost all content described by participants addressed workers as potential victims or potential perpetrators of work site aggression. This is consistent with our historical approach to prevention, which has told the story violence as if these were the only two characters present. The problem with addressing individuals as potential perpetrators of violence is three-fold. First, this approach raises defenses in many of our potential allies. Second, if the only thing we tell workers to do to reduce aggression is not perpetrate, they can wash their hands of the problem at the end of the class if they are among the majority who are not aggressive; we have given them no other role to play or way to be involved. Finally, and perhaps most salient, evidence suggests this approach is ineffective. In the areas of youth violence, sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, and gang violence prevention where this approach has been applied for over a decade, there is no evidence that addressing participants as potential perpetrators does anything to reduce rates of perpetration. There is no reason to expect the result would be different in the trades.

Addressing participants as potential victims is also problematic. These kinds of approaches involve either teaching workers what to do after aggression has occurred (which is intervention and not prevention) or teaching workers risk reduction strategies to decrease the likelihood they experience violence in the first place. Risk reduction strategies, like potential perpetrator approaches, have been used in efforts to prevent other forms of violence for over a decade and have similarly proven ineffective. Evidence from developmental psychology suggests why this approach may have proven so ineffective. In order for risk reduction to work, participants must believe they are vulnerable to aggression (that it could happen to them) and they must be willing to listen to someone in authority tell them what to do about it. Most focus group participants told us that their training on these issues occurred in pre-apprenticeship training or during their apprenticeship. Many workers in this stage are young, some late teens and many
in their early twenties - the late-adolescent stage of development. This stage is marked by a sense of invulnerability (the belief that bad things would not happen to me) and a desire to be independent from authority figures, the precise opposite of what is required for risk reduction strategies to be effective.

Our recommendation is to address all workers and stakeholders as potential bystanders to PBPA. By applying the bystander lens, we can avoid raising defenses while still providing workers with all the information they need to know what counts as PBPA. Furthermore, bystanders (unlikely potential perpetrators or victims) are more immediately malleable to behavior change and easier to mobilize trade-wide because their numbers are greater and the message to bystanders is positive and proactive. Rather than telling them what not to do, we can give them the knowledge and skills they need to take action.

The other major problem with content described by participants was that it was not engaging. Participants described trainers reading from PowerPoints, giving materials with no training, or using legalistic or threatening language. Interactive training with opportunities for skills practice is necessary to mobilizing bystanders into action. In his study with factory workers, Thompson (2003) found that interaction and varied teaching methods were key to engagement. He also found that the trainer was effective when he explained why the training was important to him, shared personal vulnerabilities, and connected workers to the issue of violence through their own experiences or concerns. In order to engage workers as bystanders in a way that will move them to action, we recommend that all content be presented with authenticity. Trainers should show up not just as titles, but as human beings who have personal reasons for caring about the issue of PBPA. They have to show workers not just that they know about the problem, but that they care. Some focus group participants told us that the only reason supervisors or trainers gave for caring about aggression at work was the fear of lawsuits. This made the workers feel like they only cared about their bottom lines and not about the workers themselves. Others told us that those who present content about these issues on a job site do not seem to mean what they are saying and that many workers assume they are only doing so because a woman or person of color is on the job.

In terms of delivery mechanisms, most participants told us they received education on harassment, hazing, or bullying one time during their pre-apprenticeship training or in their apprenticeship. The problem with this means of delivery is two-fold. First, one-time only education has proven insufficient for prevention with other forms of violence. In their 2005 meta-analytic review of 69 studies on sexual assault prevention programs, Anderson and Whiston found that one-time only education programs somewhat increased participants’ knowledge about assault, but did little or nothing to change attitudes or behavioral intentions. The second major problem with this means of delivery is the audience. Pre-apprentices and apprentices do not have the kind of social influence necessary to change norms around aggression and bystander action in the trades. While they may be taught what the norms should be on a worksite, when an apprentice actually steps on the job and sees people behaving differently, those are the norms they are most likely to adopt, not what was taught in the classroom. Even if those apprentices are dissatisfied with those worksite norms, they do not generally have the kind of influence it would take to change the norms. When asked what kinds of interventions a bystander could use to stop harassment or aggression, one electrician told us,

“\textbf{The apprentice shouldn’t be put in positions like that. You should be focusing on your education and getting to learn from the journeyman and foreman the right way to do things.}”

- Electrician
If pre-apprentices are going to learn that intolerance for aggression and bystander intervention are the norm, they have to step onto to work sites where that is already the case.

So, how do we get there? We asked focus group participants what they thought the best methods, places, messengers, times, and lines of delivery might look like in order train people on PBPA prevention and establish new norms. One participant told us to start by training workers at small firms or on small job sites because it is easier to establish and maintain new norms in those settings. Another felt we should focus on large contractors because they have a broader reach across trades and more investment in safety and productivity. Yet another told us that working company by company would be ineffective because companies pull workers from all over the place – we should find a way to go trade-wide. Many felt we should focus on training pre-apprentices because contractors, union reps, and older workers just don’t care or want things to change.

Based on what we learned about relationships and buy-in in the trades as well as what we know is effective for most quickly and effectively shifting norms to increase positive bystander behaviors, we recommend the following launch process.
GREEN DOT LAUNCH IN FOUR STAGES

STAGE ONE: Adapt Green Dot to address PBPA in the trades in Portland.

ESTIMATED LENGTH: 5 Months

• Curricula will include:
  ▶ 3-hour Leadership Training for early adopters and foremen
    ✨ We know that there are informal, social leaders – early adopters – in any given environment. We also learned from focus groups that foremen exercise a great deal of influence over worksite behavior and culture.
  ▶ 30-60 minute Overview Talk for Office Staff
  ▶ 30-60 minute Overview Talk for Superintendents and Supervisors
  ▶ 15 minute Worksite Talk

• Supporting program materials will include:
  ▶ Social marketing items: poster and sticker designs, logos, pocket cards, etc.
  ▶ Toolkits: for union representatives, for supervisors and superintendents, for office staff, for community-based organizations, for apprenticeship programs, and for project managers
  ▶ Assessment tools to evaluate the basic effectiveness of the strategy and the experiences of participants

STAGE TWO: Pilot Green Dot with one Large Portland Contractor

ESTIMATED LENGTH: 6 Months

• Train facilitators (4 days)
  ▶ Establish foundational knowledge and practice program content and training skills.
  ▶ Facilitators should primarily be employees of the pilot site, with some representatives from community-based organizations to support.
  ▶ Consider best messengers across the company and recruit accordingly.
  ▶ At the end of training, facilitators will be able to launch Green Dot in the company and will be equipped to deliver the curricula (Leadership Training and Overview Talks). They will be able to train worksite supervisors, HR representatives, and anyone else who may deliver the 15-minute Worksite Talk to do so.

• Monthly Technical Assistance calls with Facilitators (on-going after training)

• Green Dot staff return at 6 weeks and 3 months post-training for content boosters and further skill development.
  ▶ The remaining tasks in the launch plan will be completed by the trained facilitators. Green Dot will provide monthly technical assistance calls to answer questions, address challenges, and provide support.
• Facilitators personalize and practice curricula (2 months).

• Identify first Leadership Training participants (1 month, overlapping with 30-minute overview talks with office staff).
  ▶ With company leadership, select one new, large worksite on which to begin the launch of Green Dot.
  ▶ Identify foremen from the worksite as they are selected, build relationships with them, and invite them to training.

• Begin 30-minute Overview Talks with Office Staff (1 month, overlapping with identifying leadership training participants).
  ▶ Start with senior-most leadership in the company, then safety trainers and human resources, then procurement staff, then administrative office staff.

• Conduct first Leadership Training with worksite Foremen (3 hours).

• Identify next Leadership Training participants (2 weeks).
  ▶ Interview foremen and union steward(s) (if present) to identify early adopters on the worksite.
  ▶ Conduct short, incentivized surveys with workers in each trade represented on the worksite to identify early adopters.

• Build relationships and personally invite early adopters to next Leadership Training (1 month).

• Conduct second Leadership Training (3 hours).

• Hold company-wide Green Dot launch event (2 weeks, overlapping with Worksite talks).

• Begin 15-minute Worksite talks (2 weeks, overlapping with launch event).
  ▶ Incorporate into Orientation for new workers.
  ▶ Incorporate into Safety Talks or Stand-Up meetings with existing worksite workers.

**STAGE THREE: Scale Efforts**

**ESTIMATED LENGTH: 1-1.5 Years**

• Conduct facilitated debriefings and assess pre- and post-training surveys. Make revisions and additions to content.
• Share implementation successes with BOLI, unions, other large contractors, and community-based organizations to generate support and buy-in
  ▶ Consider getting endorsements from organizations.
  ▶ Would any of these organizations be willing to recommend a Green Dot certification for contractors and sub-contractors?
  ▶ Would large contractors be willing to add a Green Dot training requirement for all subcontractors?
• Expand within company to additional job sites.
• Plan social marketing campaigns and action events to occur company-wide, 2-4 times annually.

• Expand to additional companies
  • Prioritize large contractors with greatest reach across trades.
  • Create opportunities for union and community-based organization involvement.

• Organize social marketing campaigns and action events to reflect the scope of Green Dot efforts over time, expanding from initial company to Portland-wide action events.

STAGE FOUR: SUSTAIN EFFORTS

On-Going

• Continually assess efforts and work with Green Dot to make programmatic improvements.
GENERATING NECESSARY BUY-IN

The success of any launch plan is contingent on generating necessary buy-in from key stakeholders. In our review of the literature and through focus groups, we identified four primary points that can connect key stakeholders to the issue and foster buy-in for prevention efforts: retention, safety, productivity, and financial incentive.

Retention of Good Workers

Workers who experience PBPA often quit working in their trade as a result. Kelly found that hostility was the third leading cause of low representation among women and workers of color in the trades in Oregon. We heard over and over again from participants of follow workers who had quit their trade because of PBPA. One laborer told us:

“I have a really good friend, she’s a hard worker and she was in the plumbing program and she said they were just very disrespectful to women. They would always downgrade her. They would always put her in bad situations and leave her there. As an apprentice, you should always have a foreman. So that right there is just not appropriate. So she ended up quitting the program. She just didn’t feel like she had any support. There’s no women.”

--Female Laborer

Failure to retain workers hurts large and small companies, apprenticeship programs, unions, workers, and the trades as a whole. This is particularly salient when it comes to increasing diversity in the trades since many of those lost are women and workers of color. One electrician told us,

“I think for LGBT persons, or people of color, or women, if they are in high school and thinking about what they want to do after high school, maybe they are thinking that the trades could be a good place for them. But, if they hear that the trades are a hostile environment, then we are going to miss out on all they bring to the table.”

- Male Electrician

Unfortunately, the workers lost because of PBPA are generally the targets rather than those engaging in the behavior.

Safety

Participants repeatedly told us that PBPA on a job site creates safety hazards. One person stated, “nine times out of ten it eventually leads to injury; it has in the past.” Research bears out this concern. Safety risks are generally not associated with direct physical violence. Rather, participants told us that safety risks created by PBPA were related to assigning workers unsafe tasks or denying equipment as a form of aggression, targets, or bystanders becoming distracted to the extent they forget to take some safety precautions, and a diminished ability among targets to make decisions.

Work site safety is a significant concern for community-based organizations, unions, companies, and workers alike. To generate buy-in and support, PBPA should be positioned as a safety issue and opportunities for companies and apprenticeship programs to integrate PBPA prevention into existing safety measures should be offered. One participant suggested:

“Just like there are safety posters put up on the job...about we’re a safe workplace, we’ve gone 130 days or 600 days without a lost-time accident – we’re a positive work culture where we’ve gone 600 days without a red dot incident.”

- Apprenticeship Program Trainer

Construction firms and unions were pioneers in instituting job-related safety measures just a few decades ago. There is no reason to believe they could not have as significant an impact on work site violence and harassment today.


Productivity
In as much as the hostility and distractions caused by PBPA create safety issues, they also diminish worker productivity. One participant recounted,

“a couple of apprentices I have worked with have experienced terrible treatment by a foreman. Well, not just two, more of them. They all said they were just left feeling like they had to question every decision they made because they weren't sure how it was going to be perceived. Even simple stuff, where there is no wrong answer, they felt like whatever they did was going to be wrong...your focus is away from your job. You’re being distracted by conflict.”

Another told us the distress caused by PBPA causes good workers to perform poorly, adding, “happy workers are more productive.”

Reducing PBPA on any job site will increase worker productivity not only among those on the receiving end of aggression, but also among other workers distracted by the behavior, supervisors responding to reports of harassment, HR representatives investigating incidents, and any others involved in the response or disciplinary process. Increased productivity translates into greater financial savings for project owners, contractors, and subcontractors alike.

Financial Incentive
Ultimately, PBPA has an impact on the financial bottom line of companies large and small. Costs associated with PBPA include lower productivity, lost time accidents, worker turnover, injury-related healthcare costs, and lawsuits. Lawsuits in particular were frequently mentioned by focus group participants. Though no research is available on the costs incurred by businesses for PBPA in the trades, the Occupational Safety and Hazards Administration estimates that businesses lose $3-5 billion annually to workplace violence alone.

Implementing strategic, effective PBPA prevention initiatives will help companies reduce these potential costs. In addition, proactively addressing PBPA and promoting safe work places could prove a marketable, and therefore financially rewarding, measure. One focus group participant envisioned something like a LEED Gold Standard for PBPA-free work sites. Another told us that advertising or promoting efforts to prevent hazing, harassment, and bullying on job sites, “that’s good business for any publically, and I argue privately-financed construction project. So it’s one less thing for the owner to worry about, so that’s a sell point.”
EVALUATION PLAN

We recommend partnering with key personnel on the pilot implementation team to develop an evaluation plan. Both process and outcome evaluation activities are recommended to track the implementation and outcomes of Green Dot in the trades. There is an emphasis on process evaluation so that the pilot implementation of Green Dot in the trades can be appropriately documented and improved for more widespread distribution. Green Dot would work with Oregon Tradeswomen, Inc. and other local partners to adapt Green Dot specifically for the trades industry. Therefore, process evaluation data becomes paramount to understanding the recommended implementation and adaptations and that would be made to the strategy, and will help to understand how Green Dot can be adapted for implementation in other trades contexts. The following evaluation plan is a tentative outline.

Process Evaluation

The process evaluation is intended to track how Green Dot is implemented in the pilot phase, including: instructor trainings, distribution of program components, implementation of program components on worksites, implementation and content fidelity, lessons learned, successes and challenges.

Data Collection:
Six sources of data will be used to document and understand the implementation of Green Dot in the trades:
1. Process evaluation surveys post instructor trainings
2. Process evaluation surveys post bystander trainings
3. Instructor/implementation team debriefing logs
4. Focus groups with instructors and participants
5. Implementation fidelity tools
6. Bystander training and overview talk fidelity tools

Process Evaluation Questions:
The following questions will be answered by analyzing the data collected for process evaluation:
1. Process evaluation surveys post instructor trainings:
   a. To what extent do instructors feel prepared to implement Green Dot?
   b. To what extent do instructors feel prepared to present Green Dot content?
   c. What portions of the training were useful? Not useful?
2. Process evaluation surveys post bystander trainings:
   a. How useful are the proactive and reactive bystander skills for participants?
   b. How effective was the timing and length of the program content?
   c. What were the most effective components of the content (interactive, practice, videos, etc.)?
   d. How engaging and effective were the instructors?
   e. What improvements need to be made?
3. Instructor/implementation team debriefing logs (post bystander trainings/on-going)
   a. To what extent did the instructor(s) feel confident in their skills and ability to facilitate the components of the training?
   b. What activities were completed? Skipped? Why?
c. What were the challenges in the training?
d. What were the successes in the training?

4. Focus groups with instructors and participants (post/during implementation)
   a. What were the successes of implementation?
   b. What were the challenges of implementation?

5. Implementation fidelity tools (on-going)
   a. To what extent is Green Dot being implemented with intended fidelity to the implementation plan?

6. Bystander training and overview talk fidelity tools (on-going)
   a. To what extent are instructors providing content with fidelity?

Outcome Evaluation
The following outcomes are being proposed to measure the effectiveness of Green Dot implementation components:

1. Instructor Training
   a. The majority of participants will report an increased level of confidence in delivering Green Dot and PBPA prevention content.
   b. The majority of participants will report an increase in pro-social bystander behaviors (reactive and proactive).

2. Bystander Trainings
   a. Participants will report an increase in knowledge and understanding of behaviors that may constitute PBPA.
   b. Participants will report increase in pro-social bystander behaviors (reactive and proactive).
   c. Participants will report an increase in the knowledge and skills necessary to engage peers through role modeling and conversations to join in prevention efforts.
   d. Participants will report an increase in understanding connection between PBPA prevention and worksite productivity.
   e. Participants will report an increase in help seeking behavior (comfort in reporting and/or delegating).
   f. Participants will report improved attitudes about PBPA prevention.

3. Overview Talks
   a. Participants will report an increase in knowledge and understanding of behaviors that may constitute PBPA.
   b. Participants will report and increase in pro-social bystander behaviors (reactive and proactive).
   c. Participants will report an increase in help seeking behavior (comfort in reporting and/or delegating).
   d. Participants will report improved attitudes about PBPA prevention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Audience *</th>
<th>Short-term Outcomes (3-6 months)</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes (6-12 months)</th>
<th>Long Term Changes (1-5 years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Green Dot Instructors | Increase in capacity to implement prevention strategies  
Increase in prosocial bystander behaviors | Increase in skills to implement prevention strategies  
Increase in skills and confidence needed to facilitate prevention messages and activities | Reduction in PBPA behaviors  
Increase in social norms that support an intolerance of PBPA and community-level response  
Increase in prosocial bystander behaviors (reactive and proactive) |
| Bystander Training Participants | Increase in pro-social bystander behaviors  
Increase in knowledge and understanding of PBPA behaviors  
Increase in knowledge and skills to engage others in prevention efforts  
Increase in understanding connection between PBPA and workplace productivity  
Improved attitudes on PBPA prevention | Increase in capacity to provide leadership for PBPA prevention  
Increase in confidence and active role in supporting social norms: PBPA is not tolerated and everyone is expected to do their part  
Increase in actions to incorporate prevention messaging into leadership role  
Increase in prosocial bystander behaviors  
Increase in help-seeking behaviors | Increase in peer modeling of prosocial bystander behaviors  
Increase in help-seeking behaviors |
| Overview Talk participants | Increase in pro-social bystander behaviors  
Improved attitudes on PBPA prevention | Increase in pro-social bystander behaviors  
Increase in help-seeking behaviors | |
Outcome Evaluation Design and Data Collection

The use of a pre/post/follow-up surveys, designed to measure the outcomes of implementation over time will be most beneficial.

Table 6. Data collection timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Data Collection Method &amp; Time Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Trainings</td>
<td>Pre survey/Post survey (one month) / Follow-up survey (two months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Trainings</td>
<td>Pre / Post (one month) / Follow-up (two months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview Talks</td>
<td>Pre / Post (one month)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative data collected through participant focus groups or interviews may also be valuable to assess outcomes during and after implementation.
NEXT STEPS

This adaptation report concludes:

**Phase One** of four phases of the original proposal to adapt the Green Dot Strategy to address PBPA in the trades. The following three phases are the next steps on the road to full implementation in the trades around Portland. The remaining phases are contingent on funding and can be modified depending on the funding available:

**Phase Two: Development**
Based on the present findings, Green Dot will adapt our core Green Dot content. This will include adapting examples for relevancy, finalizing a distribution plan, and writing curricula needed to address PBPA in the trades, which is not currently included in our core content. We will produce a prevention program which includes a social marketing campaign, overview sessions, and in-depth bystander training. We will also produce a professional training for those who will facilitate the program in Oregon.

**Phase Three: Training**
Green Dot staff will conduct training with everyone in Oregon who will implement the PBPA prevention program, starting with carefully selected pilot site(s). Training will focus on foundational knowledge of the issue, relevant research, understanding the program, and developing skills to facilitate the program. Training may last 2-4 days depending on the strategy developed.

**Phase Four: Continuing Technical Assistance**
Green Dot will provide all technical assistance needed to ensure the success of the program. This will include phone calls, meetings, web-based booster training, resource sharing, possibly in-person site visits, etc.


