

CASE STUDY



Protection Approaches, London's Active Upstanders

 Email

 Website

OVERVIEW

A joint initiative by Protection Approaches and the British East and Southeast Asian Network, London's Active Upstanders is a schools- and workplace-based bystander intervention project targeting secondary education students (aged 13–16) and adults. The project employs a mixture of in-person and online workshops. These workshops present beneficiaries with a series of real-life scenarios of on- and offline hate incidents for them to discuss and model effective bystander responses. Through these activities, the project works to increase Londoners' ability and intention to conduct safe, effective and victim-centric bystander interventions when they encounter intolerance and hate.

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Bystander Intervention Workshops – These highly interactive 3-hour workshops use real-life scenarios of on- and offline hate incidents to model effective intervention strategies with small groups of 20–30 beneficiaries. The workshops explore the importance of individual responsibility; the principles of effective intervention (safety first, de-escalation and victim-centred approaches); and how to report hate incidents. Beneficiaries also learn techniques for challenging intolerant and hateful views among their peers, such as constructive questioning, building empathy and alternative messaging.

BENEFICIARIES

- **551** adults
- **684** secondary education students
- **4** schools
- **16** boroughs

PROJECT RESULTS

10%

students' ability and intention to conduct bystander interventions

adults' ability and intention to conduct bystander interventions

12%

TESTIMONIAL

'I was on the tube with friends... there was a woman on her own, and there was a group of men taking an interest in her and making rude comments. My group went and sat with her and acted like we were her friends. She got what we were trying to do straight away and moved to us. We did something. [Before] I would have thought that it's not any of my business or that I would have made the situation worse. The training has made me feel more confident that even if people aren't asking for help, you can offer it; if they don't want it, then they can tell you. I'd rather do something than go away wishing that I had.' – Beneficiary

- a. **Knowledge and self-efficacy:** 'I know how to prevent [insert name of problem] through my [insert name of profession].'
- b. **Norms and intent:** 'I believe it is normal for [insert name of profession] to have discussions about increasing [insert name of solution] and reducing [insert name of problem] with young people' and 'I intend to prevent [name of problem] through my [insert name of profession].'
- c. **Skill of instruction:** 'The training presenter/facilitator modelled effective teaching strategies.'

Beneficiaries' capacity to engage in prevention activities rose by 21.5% ($\pm 1.9\%$) between their pre- and post-survey responses, climbing from an average score of 0.67 to 0.88, a statistically significant improvement in this outcome. Table 26 summarises the changes in this outcome overall and for each of the constituent subscales.

Table 26: Capacity of Shared Endeavour Fund beneficiaries to deliver prevention initiatives before and after project activities
($n = 498$; $F [1, 497] = 873.44$; $p < .01$)

Survey instrument	Pre-score	Post-score	Percentage difference	Margin of error (99% CI)	Effect size η^2_p
Capacity-building assessment	0.67	0.88	21.5%	$\pm 1.9\%$	0.64 (Very large)
Knowledge and self-efficacy	0.58	0.85	27.1%	$\pm 2.3\%$	0.66 (Very large)
Norms and intent	0.76	0.92	16.0%	$\pm 2.0\%$	0.47 (Very large)

The capacity-building assessment also includes a subscale on skill of instruction. This measure consists of three item statements and affords beneficiaries an opportunity to rate the quality of their training experiences. For this subscale beneficiaries are only asked to provide their views on the item statements at one timepoint, after the project activities are completed.

The evaluation found that, on average, beneficiaries 'agree[d]' that the training they received provided them with opportunities for interaction and reflection (5.35/6.00 on a rating scale; $SD = .83$; 99% CI = 5.25–5.45); the training facilitator modelled effective teaching strategies (5.23/6.00; $SD = .84$; 99% CI 5.14–5.33); and the training facilitator efficiently managed time and pacing of activities (5.30/6.00; $SD = .86$; 99% CI = 5.19–5.40).