

**Evaluation of California's MyStrength Campaign and MOST Clubs:
Summary of Preliminary Findings on Attitudes and School Climate**

Allegra N. Kim, PhD

Mina L. White, MPH

California Department of Public Health
Epidemiology and Prevention for Injury Control Branch

May 2008

Summary of the MyStrength Campaign Social Climate Evaluation

In September 2005, the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA) launched the MyStrength Campaign, a statewide social marketing campaign designed to engage high school-age males (14-18 years) as allies in preventing sexual violence. The campaign had a statewide media component, and a second component consisting of Men of Strength (MOST) Clubs, limited to six “pilot sites”. The California Department of Public Health, Epidemiology and Prevention for Injury Control (EPIC) Branch, Rape Prevention and Education Program, funded the campaign and conducted this evaluation of the campaign, with particular attention to the MOST Clubs, arguably the main distinguishing feature of pilot sites. Five of the six pilot sites and one comparison school participated in this study. School personnel assisted us by collecting survey data at the end of the academic year to ascertain exposure to components of the MyStrength Campaign, and to measure selected aspects of student attitudes and school social climate. The majority of respondents recalled at least some components of the MyStrength Campaign, such as MOST Clubs or some media images with the message “My strength is not for hurting.” Students at the pilot sites where the MOST Clubs existed were more likely to be familiar with the campaign and its message.

The majority of respondents reported that they disapproved of non-consensual sexual behavior and other disrespectful behavior. Respondents who recalled the MyStrength Campaign were more likely to report favorable attitudes than those who did not recall the campaign. As expected, the differences are modest and not always statistically significant, but they consistently suggest that MOST Clubs are associated with favorable attitudes.

We also attempted to measure school social climate with questions about five demeaning behaviors that students might have observed at school to determine the impact that MOST Clubs had on these behaviors. Many respondents saw or heard these disrespectful behaviors among their peers at school. However, these behaviors were less common at pilot sites; the highest reported prevalence of every negative behavior assessed was at the comparison school. The results of the survey also showed that the less approving of the behavior the student was, the more likely he/she was to act accordingly and tell the person exhibiting the behavior to stop or to get help from someone else, as opposed to not doing anything, or reinforcing the behavior. So, attitudes seemed to be associated with subsequent actions.

The MyStrength Campaign was successfully implemented and delivered its message to its intended audience in our sample of schools. MOST Clubs appear to increase the campaign’s reach and show promise for favorably influencing high school-age males towards more equitable and respectful attitudes and affecting a healthier social climate in high schools.

Introduction

This report presents preliminary findings from an evaluation of a social marketing campaign intended to reduce sexual violence by engaging young men as allies in violence prevention. This project examines selected aspects of student attitudes and

school social climate for differences among pilot sites, *i.e.*, schools that hosted Men of Strength (MOST) Clubs, compared with schools that did not have MOST Clubs, given that the statewide media campaign was intended to reach students at all schools. This evaluation study is only one of several distinct components of the overall social marketing campaign evaluation.

California's *MyStrength* Campaign

In September 2005, with funding from the Epidemiology and Prevention for Injury Control Branch of the California Department of Health Services, the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA) launched the MyStrength Campaign. Men Can Stop Rape (MCSR), a Washington, D.C. non-profit, originally developed the Strength Campaign and CALCASA adapted it for use in California as the MyStrength Campaign, through collaboration and a licensing agreement with MCSR. CALCASA implemented MyStrength as a statewide social marketing campaign to engage high school-age males (14-18 years) in preventing sexual violence.

Men of Strength (MOST) Clubs

The most important distinction between pilot sites and other sites was that rape crisis centers started MOST Clubs in a high school at each pilot site. MOST club activities usually included weekly sessions with high school boys and were facilitated by rape crisis center representatives who were trained by MCSR to implement MOST Clubs. MOST Clubs complement the campaign message by raising awareness of the "dominant story" of masculinity, and building participants' capacity to challenge the harmful aspects of this dominant story. The Clubs then help members develop masculine "counterstories" and mobilize them as visible allies in preventing men's violence against women and girls. Although originally designed to run approximately 16 weeks, California's MOST Clubs ran for nearly the full 2005-2006 academic year. Each Club concluded with a community action project (CAP) that was conceived and implemented by the club members. These projects provide a chance for the members to take a public stand and take action in support of treating women with respect.

Findings

Attitudes at each school

The respondents from the pilot schools reported high levels of agreement with gender equity in relationships, the idea that males can play a role in preventing sexual and dating violence, and that they themselves could do something to prevent this violence. In addition, they seemed to think it is acceptable for guys to talk about feelings. They generally disagreed with harmful stereotypes such as what a girl's clothing means, or the expectations around paying for a date, and they disapproved of non-consensual sexual behaviors. Only one of the questions showed a very large proportion (half) accepting a sexist remark ("throws like a girl").

Although most respondents at all sites tended to report favorable attitudes, the Comparison School's respondents were the least likely to choose the favorable answers for 9 of the 12 attitude questions. Also noteworthy is that School 5 had the highest proportion of favorable attitudes for 5 of the 12 questions.

Is the MyStrength Campaign associated with more favorable attitudes?

Summarizing exposure to the campaign

For this analysis, we conceptualized two dimensions of exposure to the MyStrength Campaign. One dimension of exposure is the *statewide media campaign*, roughly indicated by whether the respondent recalled seeing or hearing the message "My strength is not for hurting." The second dimension of exposure is the addition of MOST Clubs (and potentially other aspects of full implementation at pilot sites, such as campaign launch events). Exposure to MOST Clubs was indicated by whether respondents had heard of MOST Clubs or knew someone in a MOST Club.

For this section, there are four categories of exposure (not mutually exclusive):

- *No exposure* means that the respondent had not heard of MOST Clubs (and did not know of anyone in a MOST Club) and did not recall the message "My strength is not for hurting." Respondents who reported no exposure are also called *unexposed*.
- *Incomplete exposure* means one dimension of exposure or no exposure.
- *Any exposure* means at least one dimension of exposure, *i.e.*, the respondent had heard of MOST clubs or knew someone in a MOST Club, or recalled the media campaign message, or both.
- *Full exposure* means that the respondent had both dimensions of exposure.

Measuring the association between campaign exposure and attitudes

To quantify the associations between the campaign and attitudes, we calculated *relative risks* (RRs). [The use of the term "risk" is counterintuitive here, because it usually refers to an unfavorable outcome, such as an injury. However, in this case the outcomes are favorable attitudes, because we hoped the MyStrength Campaign would result in more favorable attitudes and behaviors.] The RRs reported here represent *the risk of having a specific attitude, vs. not having that attitude, for those exposed to the campaign, relative to those who were not exposed to the campaign*. We explain how to interpret these RRs in the next paragraph. Table 4 shows RRs for all the attitudes we measured, using three different exposure comparisons. The three RR columns (second through fourth columns) represent these exposure comparisons: 1) any exposure vs. no exposure, 2) full exposure vs. incomplete exposure, and 3) full exposure vs. incomplete exposure again, but the sample is limited to male respondents because they were the focus of the campaign.

Attitudes and any exposure (vs. no exposure)

Taking an example to illustrate, the first number in the table is a RR of 1.09. This RR tells us that the risk (or chance) of agreeing that males and females should have equal

say in relationships is 1.09 times as great among respondents who had any exposure to the MyStrength Campaign, compared to those who had no exposure. Another way to express it is that respondents who had any exposure to the campaign were 9% *more* likely to agree that males and females should have equal say in relationships,¹ compared with those who had no exposure to the campaign.

In the same column, the next RR of 1.19 suggests that, compared with respondents who had no exposure to the campaign, respondents who had any exposure to the campaign were 1.19 times as likely, or 19% *more* likely, to disapprove of 'having sex with someone who agrees to it just because they are drunk or high.'² The largest difference was for disagreement with 'telling a guy that he "throws like a girl,"' with a RR=1.33, or a 33% greater likelihood of a favorable attitude among those with any exposure to the campaign. This RR was statistically significant. Many of the RRs were *not* statistically significant; however, it is also important to note that there were no inverse associations, *i.e.*, having any exposure to the campaign was not associated with unfavorable attitudes.

Attitudes and full exposure (vs. incomplete exposure)

The second column of RRs compared respondents who reported full exposure to the campaign with those who had incomplete exposure to the campaign. In our sample, respondents who were fully exposed to the campaign were 4% more likely to agree that "males and females should have equal say in relationships." Students who were fully exposed to the campaign were 14% more likely to disagree that "it is OK to have sex with someone who agrees just because they are drunk or high," and 12% more likely to disagree with, "if a girl dresses in sexy clothes, it means she wants sex." Again, the largest difference was for 'telling a guy that he "throws like a girl,"' with a RR=1.33, or a 33% greater likelihood of disagreeing with the statement among those with full campaign exposure. These RRs were statistically significant.

The RRs were also significant for full campaign exposure and many other attitudes, including: relating to males talking about their feelings (RR=1.14), playing a role in preventing sexual and dating violence (RR=1.13), and confidence that the respondent can do something to prevent sexual violence (RR=1.11). Respondents with full exposure to the campaign were also more likely to disagree with the following statements: "If someone pays for a date, they have the right to expect sex" (RR=1.06); "If you're joking, It's okay to touch or grab someone in a sexual way..." (RR=1.08); and "If someone is making out with me, it's okay to pressure them to have sex" (RR=1.09).

¹ Many of the RRs reported are *not* statistically significant at the alpha=0.05 level. This means the observed RRs could occur in a sample at least 5 times out of 100 *just by chance*, *i.e.*, without a truly elevated likelihood. Because of the many comparisons made in this study, many would argue that a much more conservative threshold should be used.

² Most of the attitudes were presented as unfavorable statements on the questionnaire. In these cases, *disagreement* with the statement was our desired outcome.

Although the magnitude of RRs for full campaign exposure and attitudes generally appear similar to those for any campaign exposure, more of the RRs for full campaign exposure were statistically significant.

Attitudes and full exposure (vs. incomplete exposure), boys only

Because the campaign aimed to engage boys, we repeated the *full exposure* analysis, limiting the sample to boys. These RRs are shown in the final column of Table 4. For most attitudes the RRs are slightly larger than for the full sample, but fewer were statistically significant (which is expected when the sample size is reduced). These male respondents who were fully exposed to the campaign were 23% more likely to both disagree with the statement that it is “okay to have sex with someone who agrees because they’re drunk or high” and to believe that guys can play an important role in preventing sexual and dating violence.”

Campaign exposure is associated with better attitudes

Overall, these analyses suggest that the campaign is associated with small but consistently favorable differences in students’ attitudes. This general pattern is seen whether we compare complete vs. incomplete campaign exposure, or any vs. no campaign exposure.

Social Climate

To measure schools’ social climate, we asked if students had seen their peers engaged in specific behaviors at school in the past two weeks.

Table 5 shows that a great majority of the sample had heard their peers calling boys and girls pejorative names. About 86% of the pilot school sample and 95% at the Comparison School reported hearing people calling girls names such as “slut,” “bitch,” or “ho,” at school within the past 2 weeks. The lowest proportion reported was at School 4, with 75%.

Hearing boys called “fag” or “gay” was also very common, with 85% of the pilot school sample and 90% of the Comparison School reporting observing this behavior in the past 2 weeks. Again, the lowest proportion was reported by School 4’s respondents (50%), and the highest proportion by Comparison School.

Another observed behavior we assessed was the only behavior that involved direct physical contact: grabbing or touching someone sexually without their permission. Just over one-third of the entire sample reported having seen this behavior at school in the prior two weeks. At School 4, 13% of respondents, and similarly, 15% of respondents from School 3, reported having seen this behavior. About 35% and 40% of respondents from Schools 5 and 1, respectively, reported seeing unwanted sexual contact at school. The highest proportions of respondents who reported recently seeing unwanted sexual touching were at School 2 (45%) and the Comparison School (49%).

Reactions to observed behaviors

We also followed up the questions on behavior observed at school during the past 2 weeks with questions about whether the respondent thought that the behavior was “okay” or “not okay”, and also what they did when they observed the behavior. For this question, they could answer that they either “did nothing”, “walked away”, “told the person to stop”, “got help from others”, or “smiled or laughed”. For purposes of analysis, we considered telling the person to stop or getting help to be “positive” reactions to the behaviors, so these responses were aggregated together. If the respondent smiled or laughed at the behavior, this was considered a “negative” response, and if they did nothing or walked away, this was a “neutral” response. For everyone who observed a demeaning behavior, answered the question about whether they approved of the behavior or not, and also indicated that they had any sort of reaction to the behavior, the students who did not approve of the demeaning behavior generally backed up their attitudes with positive behaviors themselves. As shown in Table 6, while only 2% of the students who heard someone calling a girl a “slut”, “bitch”, or “ho” and thought it was okay went on to tell the person to stop or got help, 26% of students who did not think the behavior was okay told the person to stop or got help. Along the same lines, 48% of students who approved of the behavior reacted by smiling or laughing, while only 6% of students who did not approve of the behavior reacted in this way, which we considered to be a “negative” response because it reinforces the behavior. Interestingly, about the same proportion of respondents who approved or disapproved of the behaviors had the “neutral” reaction of doing nothing or walking away from the observed behavior. These responses ranged from 50% to 69%.

Conclusion

For many reasons, most importantly because we were unable to collect data before the intervention and because we lacked adequate comparison groups, we are unable to attribute our results to the MyStrength Campaign. However, this study does show:

- the MyStrength Campaign reached high school students in our sample;
- students at pilot sites, i.e., MOST Club schools, had a more intense exposure to the campaign;
- students are receptive to the campaign and to MOST Clubs;
- students who were exposed to the campaign are slightly more likely to have favorable (more respectful and equitable) attitudes;
- social climate at the five MOST Club schools was more favorable compared with the school that had no MOST Club;
- the MyStrength campaign is consistently associated with small but positive differences in social climate and attitudes
- disapproval of demeaning behavior is associated with positive reaction, such as intervening to stop the negative behavior

In short, this evaluation finds that the MyStrength campaign is a very promising strategy for engaging young men in preventing sexual violence. More rigorous evaluation of subsequent implementations of the MyStrength campaign are needed to establish its effectiveness. Further implementation of MyStrength should ensure collection of baseline data and, if possible, data from non-intervention sites. Over time, we hope and expect to see stronger associations with favorable attitudes and social climate, and measurable changes in behavior.

With regard to students' attitudes and social climate, independent of the campaign, we see that:

- Respondents generally reject sexist and disrespectful attitudes when asked for their own opinions
- Behaviors such as calling people disrespectful names, unwanted sexual touching, bragging about sex, spreading sexual rumors are quite common on secondary school campuses.

Young men might find it heartening to know that when asked about their attitudes, most of their peers do not approve of behaviors such as bragging about sex, even though this behavior is common. The MyStrength Campaign seeks to engage young men as allies, and this includes intervening when others are behaving disrespectfully. Young men might be more likely to intervene and take other visible actions if they understand that they belong to a majority of peers who want people to treat one another with respect.

Tables

Table 1

Characteristics by school								
	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	All pilot	Comparison	Comparison
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	schools (n)	school (%)	school (n)
Age								
< 15 years	10.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	45.3	67	5.0	2
15 years	32.2	34.7	0.0	12.5	52.0	172	30.0	12
16 years	22.6	51.0	18.4	25.0	2.7	145	42.5	17
17 years	22.6	8.2	55.3	43.8	0.0	146	20.0	8
18+ years	12.3	4.1	26.3	18.8	0.0	74	2.5	1
Grade								
9th	30.8	4.0	0.0	6.3	98.7	171	37.5	15
10th	27.8	83.8	12.3	31.3	0.0	185	42.5	17
11th	21.1	9.1	48.3	43.8	1.3	135	20.0	8
12th	20.4	3.0	39.5	18.8	0.0	112	0.0	0
Gender								
Female	54.8	48.0	51.9	37.5	68.0	320	36.8	14
Male	45.2	52.0	48.2	62.5	32.0	270	63.2	24
Preferred Language								
English	94.0	86.9	84.2	31.3	96.0	541	69.2	27
Spanish	1.7	9.1	13.2	68.8	2.7	42	18.0	7
Other	4.3	4.0	2.6	0.0	1.3	21	12.8	5

Table 2A

		Exposure to MyStrength, by school							
		School					All pilot schools	Comparison school	
		1	2	3	4	5			
Heard of MOST Clubs									
Yes	n	219	39	61	11	54	384	4	
	%	72.8	39.4	53.5	68.8	72.0	63.5	10.0	
No	n	57	49	43	3	20	172	28	
	%	18.9	49.5	37.7	18.8	26.7	28.4	70.0	
Missing/ invalid	n	25	11	10	2	1	49	8	
	%	8.3	11.1	8.8	12.5	1.3	8.1	20.0	
Total	n	301	99	114	16	75	605	40	
Know anyone in MOST Club									
Yes	n	204	24	42	13	45	328	3	
	%	67.8	24.2	36.8	81.3	60.0	54.2	7.5	
No	n	72	64	61	1	29	227	30	
	%	23.9	64.7	53.5	6.3	38.7	37.5	45.0	
Missing/ invalid	n	25	11	11	2	1	50	7	
	%	8.3	11.1	9.7	12.5	1.3	8.3	17.5	
Total	n	301	99	114	16	75	605	40	
Heard or saw "My Strength is not for hurting"									
Yes	n	275	66	93	13	68	515	20	
	%	91.4	66.7	81.6	81.3	90.7	85.1	50.0	
No	n	13	31	19	3	7	73	17	
	%	4.3	31.3	16.7	18.8	9.3	12.1	42.5	
Missing/ invalid	n	13	2	2	0	0	17	3	
	%	4.3	2.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	2.8	7.5	
Total	n	301	99	114	16	75	605	40	
I've seen students from my school take action to prevent sexual violence									
Disagree	n	143	56	64	8	31	302	23	
	%	47.5	56.6	56.1	50.0	41.3	49.9	57.5	
Agree	n	150	43	47	8	43	291	15	
	%	49.8	43.4	41.2	50.0	57.3	48.1	37.5	
Missing/ invalid	n	8	0	3	0	1	12	2	
	%	2.7	0.0	2.6	0.0	1.3	2.0	5.0	
Total	n	301	99	114	16	75	605	40	
I personally know guys who have taken action to prevent sexual violence									
Disagree	n	135	55	54	5	47	296	22	
	%	44.9	55.6	47.4	31.3	62.7	48.9	55.0	
Agree	n	159	44	57	11	28	299	17	
	%	52.8	44.4	50.0	68.8	37.3	49.4	42.5	
Missing/ invalid	n	7	0	3	0	0	10	1	
	%	2.3	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.7	2.5	
Total	n	301	99	114	16	75	605	40	

Table 2B

Where have you seen/heard "My strength is not for hurting"?								
		School					All pilot schools	Comparison school
Media		1	2	3	4	5		
Poster	n	246	52	88	7	58	451	13
	%	89.8	78.8	95.7	53.8	85.3	87.9	68.4
Billboard	n	53	16	30	3	19	121	5
	%	19.3	24.2	32.6	23.1	27.9	23.6	26.3
Radio ad	n	56	12	20	3	1	92	6
	%	20.4	18.2	21.7	23.1	1.5	17.9	31.6
T-shirts	n	229	48	53	10	60	400	5
	%	83.6	72.7	57.6	76.9	88.2	78.0	26.3
Postcards	n	17	5	8	1	6	37	2
	%	6.2	7.6	8.7	7.7	8.8	7.2	10.5
TV ad	n	44	17	18	1	5	85	6
	%	16.1	25.8	19.6	7.7	7.4	16.6	31.6
TV news	n	25	9	6	3	1	44	3
	%	9.1	13.6	6.5	23.1	1.5	8.6	15.8
Internet	n	58	14	17	2	9	100	4
	%	21.2	21.2	18.5	15.4	13.2	19.5	21.1
Another student	n	210	44	51	11	52	368	3
	%	76.6	66.7	55.4	84.6	76.5	71.7	15.8
Teacher, school employee	n	157	47	50	7	41	302	2
	%	57.3	71.2	54.3	53.8	60.3	58.9	10.5
Other	n	63	11	14	2	26	116	1
	%	23.0	16.7	15.2	15.4	38.2	22.6	5.3
Total that recalled message*	n	274	66	92	13	68	513	19
School Total	n	301	99	114	16	75	605	40
% that recalled message*	%	91.0	66.7	80.7	81.2	90.7	84.8	47.5

*Saw/heard message from 1 or more sources
 [Did not recall message n = 113]

Table 2C

Any exposure to MOST Clubs or media campaign, by school								
Exposure		School					All pilot schools	Comparison school
		1	2	3	4	5		
No recall or exposure	n	4	24	12	1	3	44	14
	%	1.5	27.6	11.7	7.1	4.1	8.0	43.8
1 type	n	46	24	32	0	18	120	13
	%	16.8	27.6	31.1	0.0	24.3	21.7	40.6
2 types	n	34	19	19	4	11	87	4
	%	12.4	21.8	18.5	28.6	14.9	15.8	12.5
All 3 types	n	190	20	40	9	42	301	1
	%	69.3	23.0	38.8	64.3	56.8	54.5	3.1
Total	n	274	87	103	14	74	552	32

Types of exposure: Heard of MOST Clubs; Know someone in a MOST Club; Heard message from media campaign

Frequency Missing = 61

Table 1

Attitudes related to sexual assault: Agreement with statements, by school								
Statement		School					All pilot schools	Comparison school
		1	2	3	4	5		
Males and Females should have equal say in relationships	n	270	91	109	12	75	557	35
	%	91.2	91.9	95.6	80.0	100.0	93.0	87.5
It's OK to have sex w/ someone who agrees just because they're drunk or high	n	39	6	10	0	1	56	16
	%	13.2	6.1	8.8	0.0	1.3	9.3	40.0
If a girl dresses in sexy clothes, it means she wants sex	n	43	7	11	3	7	71	14
	%	14.6	7.1	9.7	18.8	9.3	11.9	35.0
It's OK to tell a guy that he "throws like a girl"	n	166	52	66	3	25	312	22
	%	57.0	53.6	58.9	20.0	33.3	52.9	56.4
It's OK to have sex w/ someone who is passed out or asleep	n	25	5	2	1	0	33	4
	%	8.5	5.1	1.8	6.3	0.0	5.5	10.0
If someone pays for a date, they have the right to expect sex	n	32	6	4	1	1	44	9
	%	10.9	6.1	3.6	6.3	1.3	7.4	23.1
If you're just joking, it's OK to touch or grab someone in a sexual way w/o...	n	47	9	11	0	4	71	10
	%	16.0	9.1	9.7	0.0	5.3	11.9	26.3
If someone is making out with me, it's OK to pressure them to have sex...	n	46	11	10	2	3	72	12
	%	15.7	11.3	8.8	12.5	4.1	12.1	30.0
It's OK to brag about having sex w/ someone you are going out with	n	69	12	16	1	5	103	11
	%	23.6	12.1	14.0	6.3	6.7	17.3	28.2
A guy will lose respect if he talks about his feelings	n	64	17	12	3	16	112	12
	%	21.7	17.5	10.7	18.8	21.6	18.9	30.0
Guys can play an important role in preventing sexual & dating violence	n	239	78	87	10	62	476	24
	%	80.7	79.6	77.7	66.7	82.7	79.9	61.5
I am confident that I can do something to prevent sexual violence	n	224	77	96	11	61	469	30
	%	76.5	77.8	85.7	68.8	82.4	79.0	76.9

Table 2

Associations* between exposure** to the MyStrength Campaign and attitudes related to sexual assault			
Relative Risk (RR) for favorable attitude***			
Attitude	Any exposure vs. no exposure	Full exposure vs. incomplete exposure	Full exposure vs. incomplete exp., Boys only
Males and Females should have equal say in relationships	1.09	1.04	1.04
OK to have sex w/ someone who agrees just because they are drunk or high	1.19	1.14	1.23
If a girl dresses in sexy clothes, it means she wants sex	1.15	1.12	1.20
It's OK to tell a guy that he "throws like a girl"	1.36	1.33	1.23
It's OK to have sex w/ someone who is passed out or asleep	1.01	1.05	1.04
If someone pays for a date, they have the right to expect sex	1.18	1.06	1.09
If you're just joking, it's OK to touch or grab someone in a sexual way w/o...	1.08	1.08	1.11
If someone is making out with me, it's OK to pressure them to have sex...	1.19	1.09	1.18
It's OK to brag about having sex w/ someone you are going out with	1.03	1.04	1.07
A guy will lose respect if he talks about his feelings	1.15	1.14	1.20
Guys can play an important role in preventing sexual & dating violence	1.14	1.13	1.23
I am confident that I can do something to prevent sexual violence	1.10	1.11	1.16

* Associations presented are *relative risks*, *i.e.*, the relative likelihood of an outcome (favorable attitude) given exposure to the MyStrength Campaign, compared to the same outcome for the unexposed (or less exposed). *E.g.*, for the first cell, the figure 1.10 means that those who had any exposure to the campaign were 1.10 times as likely (or 10% more likely) to agree that males and females should have equal say in relationships. **Bold** RRs are statistically significant at the alpha=0.05 level.

** Exposure categories: "Any exposure" means exposure to the media campaign, MOST Clubs, or both, compared to no exposure at all. "Full exposure" means exposure to both media campaign *and* MOST Clubs, compared to less exposure.

*** Outcome is agreement with favorable attitudes or disagreement with unfavorable attitudes

Table 3

Social Climate Indicators, by school								
Behavior observed at school in the past 2 weeks		School					All pilot schools	Comparison school
		1	2	3	4	5		
Heard someone calling girls "slut," "bitch," "ho"	n	261	87	91	12	62	513	38
	%	88.5	90.6	79.8	75.0	83.8	86.2	95.0
Heard someone calling boys "fag," "gay"	n	262	75	68	8	62	475	36
	%	88.5	80.6	60.7	50.0	83.8	80.4	90.0
Heard someone spreading sexual rumors about another person	n	180	51	36	3	25	295	28
	%	62.7	53.1	31.9	20.0	33.3	50.3	71.8
Seen a student grabbing or touching someone sexually w/o permission	n	117	44	17	2	26	206	19
	%	40.3	44.9	15.0	12.5	35.1	34.9	48.7
Heard someone bragging about sex with another person	n	132	42	52	3	14	243	27
	%	45.2	42.4	46.0	18.8	18.7	40.8	69.2

Table 6

	Heard someone calling girls slut/bitch/ho and thought that it was		Heard someone calling boys fag/gay and thought that it was		Heard someone spreading sexual rumors and thought that it was		Seen someone grab, touch sexually w/o permission and thought that it was		Heard someone bragging about sex and thought that it was	
	OK	Not OK	OK	Not OK	OK	Not OK	OK	Not OK	OK	Not OK
Told the person to stop or got help	2.2%	26.3%	2.2%	29.2%	5.3%	36.1%	3.0%	27.4%	2.2%	22.6%
Smiled or laughed	47.7%	5.8%	31.4%	3.0%	40.7%	5.3%	32.3%	4.0%	36.7%	6.3%
Did nothing or walked away	50.0%	67.7%	66.3%	67.7%	53.9%	58.5%	64.6%	68.5%	61.0%	71.0%
Total (n)*	178	360	226	270	76	246	99	124	136	128

*Total that indicated on the survey that they saw/heard the behavior, they approved or did not approve of it, and had a response to the behavior (whether a negative, positive, or neutral reaction)