Table 1. Existing models of bystander behavior, following the terminology used by Paull et al. (2012) [16], of passive, active, constructive, and destructive processes.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Purpose | Theoretical framework | Main contributions | Shortcomings |
| Niven et al. (2020) [24] | To describe the cognitive-emotional process triggered by witnessing an act of bullying that ignites a set of active/passive constructive/destructive responses driven by emotions. | Classic theory of action readiness (Frijda, 1986) [37]/Appraisal theory of emotions (Lazarus, 1982) [38] | Identification of the conditions under which particular types of bystander responses emerge.  Identification of various personal and situational factors that influence how bullying incidents are appraised and the extent to which emotional reactions determine bystander behavior.  The model is focused on workplace bullying.  .  - | The authors overlooked the dynamic nature of emotions as a trigger to an active set of responses, as described by Dolev et al. (2020) [25].  The authors overlooked the possible implication of bystanding on future events beyond the bully-perpetrator repeated interaction, namely hypervigilance of the bystander in future unrelated events.  The model is centered on some factors such as the time course of bullying and culture that can’t be addressed in mitigation processes.  The model does not incorporate risk and health risk behaviors of bystanders. |
|  | | | | |
| Ng et al. (2020) [23] | To describe the sensemaking process of bystanders leading to four behavioral response types, inspired by Paull et al. (2012) [16]. | Sensemaking  (Weick et al., 2005) [39] and moral disengagement (Bandura et al., 1996) [26] literatures. | The model contributes to the existing literature by providing a dynamic perspective on bystander behavior.  Prediction of conditions under  behavioral responses are enacted,  accounting for moral disengagement mechanisms.  Accounting for change in bystander behaviors over time.  Accounting for social contextual factors.  Accounting for bystanders’ afficacy. | The authors overlooked emotions in their model.  The authors overlooked the possible implication of bystanding on future events beyond the repeated bully-perpetrator interaction, namely hypervigilance of the bystander in future unrelated events and different social contexts.  The model does not incorporate risk and health risk behaviors of bystanders. |
|  | | | | |
| Paull et al. (2012) [16] | To create a typology of bystander roles . | No framework was suggested – based on qualitative data from two separate studies. | The model contributes to the existing literature by providing a framework of bystanders’ reactions.  The model is based on empirical data while other models are theoretical.  The model is focused on adolescents while other models focused on employees. | The authors overlooked emotions in their model.  The authors overlooked the possible implication of bystanding on future events beyond the repeated bully-perpetrator interaction.  The model does not incorporate risk and health risk behaviors of bystanders  The model does not have predictive mechanisms - it provides a typology. |