Empowering Bystanders to Prevent Campus Violence Against Women : A Preliminary Evaluation of a Poster Campaign

Sharyn J. Potter, Mary M. Moynihan, Jane G. Stapleton and Victoria L. Banyard

Violence Against Women 2009 15: 106
DOI: 10.1177/1077801208327482

Advocate/Activist Note

Violence Against Women
Volume 15 Number 1
January 2009 106-121

10.1177/1077801208327482
http://vaw.sagepub.com
hosted at
http://online.sagepub.com

Empowering Bystanders to Prevent Campus Violence Against Women

A Preliminary Evaluation of a Poster Campaign

Sharyn J. Potter
Mary M. Moynihan
Jane G. Stapleton
Victoria L. Banyard
University of New Hampshire

Researchers at a midsized public northeastern university evaluated the efficacy of a poster campaign to determine if students increase their knowledge of prosocial bystander behaviors and willingness to intervene in instances of sexual violence after viewing a series of campaign posters where student actors model appropriate bystander behaviors. During the last week of the campaign, undergraduates were invited to participate in a Web survey. The results of this preliminary evaluation indicate promising variation in the awareness of students who reported seeing the campaign compared to those who did not.

Keywords: *bystanders; campus violence prevention; poster campaign*

Sexual assault is the most common violent crime committed on college campuses today (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Female victims of sexual assault often suffer long-term psychological and physical effects and are more likely to drop out of college than other female students (Finn, 1995; Romeo, 2004; Söchting, Fairbrother, & Koch, 2004). Despite widespread awareness of the problem of sexual violence, campus prevention programs have been slow to take hold (Fisher et al., 2000; Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005). Fewer than two thirds of U.S. colleges offer sexual assault prevention programs, and only one third of those offer broad-based campus safety programs that address acquaintance rape (Fisher et al., 2000; Karjane et al., 2005).

Historically, universities have attempted to reduce the incidence of rape by offering programs such as providing self-defense training and escort services for women

Authors' Note: This project was supported by Grant 2003-WA-BX-0011 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

(Söchting et al., 2004), a focus that is problematic for its emphasis on stranger rape rather than the more prevalent acquaintance or date rape (Fisher et al., 2000; Karjane et al., 2005; Parrot & Cummings, 1994). Other programs that focus on stereotypical gender roles have been critiqued because men are targeted as potential perpetrators and women are targeted as potential victims (Romeo, 2004; Söchting et al., 2004) and because few of the implemented programs have been evaluated for participant attitude changes (Söchting et al., 2004).

A recent paradigm shift in sexual violence prevention has relocated the focus from victims and perpetrators toward the community as a mechanism for reducing the numbers of victims and perpetrators (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, 2005; Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003). A number of prevention strategies have now begun to focus on the role of bystanders in intervening in situations related to violence against women (e.g., Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Foubert, 2000). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has recommended adoption of a public health approach that focuses on the responsibility of all community members to reduce sexual violence and emphasizes evaluating the effectiveness of prevention strategies before they are widely disseminated (CDC, 2004). Comparable shifts from individual-centered to community-centered prevention programs also characterize other public health prevention programs, such as drinking and driving (Wandersman & Florin, 2003). Public health and health psychology researchers have found that because public health problems have multiple causes, prevention programs that target a single cause or segment of the population are less effective than those that address multiple causes and populations (Wandersman & Florin, 2003). Thus, effective sexual violence prevention programs must utilize different strategies and mechanisms to educate the public (CDC, 2004). Media campaigns are an important component of community-wide prevention efforts because they reach a large and varied audience (Cavill & Bauman, 2004; Nation et al., 2003) and have been used as a primary prevention tool to educate targeted public audiences on numerous health issues (for a review of these campaigns, see Potter, Stapleton, & Moynihan, 2008). The current note presents exploratory work on one such poster campaign designed to model prosocial bystander behaviors in the context of risk for sexual violence on a university campus.

Media campaigns are typically used to educate the public to elicit behavior change among the target audience (Cavill & Bauman, 2004; Randolph & Viswanath, 2004). For example, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Women's Health (2001) used a poster campaign to educate community members on the value of breast-feeding. Alternately, the *truth* campaign initiated by the American Legacy Foundation's explicit use of stark images such as coffins and body bags to vividly portray the perils of smoking is credited with reducing the prevalence of smoking among youth (e.g., Farrelly, Davis, Haviland, Messeri, & Healton, 2005).

This medium has also been used for sexual violence prevention. Some campaigns have targeted broad peer norms and victims of sexual violence (e.g., Texas

Association Against Sexual Assault, 2003). Other campaigns specifically target men, urging them to look at their behaviors (e.g., Men Can Stop Rape, 2003). Other campaigns have taken a social norms intervention approach to violence against women on college campuses (Fabiano et al., 2003). For instance, in the Texas campaign noted above, victims' photographs are featured on posters with their stories "hand written" next to their pictures. A number of the "men can stop rape" posters advise men that their "strength is not for hurting." With the exception of a few campaigns, such as the Stimulate Conversation initiative of the Colorado Coalition Against Violence Against Women (2002) and Voices Not Victims (Chrismer, 2001), there has generally been a lack of evaluation and direct focus on college students.

We used posters in our campaign because they are a commonly found medium on campuses. Although today's college students are immersed in media through the internet, posters continue to represent an important form of cultural expression and a point of contact with community members. For example, residence hall staff post flyers on dorm walls and bulletin boards to inform students who physically travel within campus communities from building to building where posters advertising community events or promoting healthy behaviors may be observed. Indeed, one of the most popular social marketing tools on campuses, the social norm program, also relies on posters to disseminate its message (e.g., Mattern & Neighbors, 2004).

The purpose of the current project was twofold: to design a media campaign on sexual and intimate partner violence that would overcome historical limitations of rape prevention programs in general (e.g., viewing men as perpetrators and women as victims) and to employ program evaluation tools to assess its community impact. The poster campaign that we designed and evaluated draws on the Bringing in the Bystander program, a peer-facilitated bystander education program that trains participants to identify situations that could lead to sexual violence and to intervene in safe, nonviolent, and prosocial ways before, during, and after an incident with friends, acquaintances, or strangers (Banyard et al., 2005). The message is that everyone has a role to play in ending violence against women. The poster campaign is based on extensive empirical and theoretical work that finds sexual and intimate partner violence rooted in larger cultural, community, and peer norms that support coercion in relationships (e.g., Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2001). Experimental and longitudinal evaluations of a prevention program to empower bystanders indicate the intervention program increased participants' knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors regarding prosocial bystander behaviors (Banyard et al., 2007). Because of the success of the in-person intervention program, we designed a poster campaign to "model" this bystander role and reach the larger community. The student actors in the campaign posters model prosocial community-oriented behaviors similar to some of those presented in the bystander education program. This emphasis on the community's role is fundamental to engaging both men and women in this effort and is in keeping with the CDC's recommendations for rape prevention programs (CDC, 2004).

Method

Poster Development

The goal of this phase of our overall poster campaign was to model prosocial intervention behaviors in a series of campaign posters that would be displayed throughout campus. Results from focus-group feedback and a pilot study provided evidence that the posters were working. Pilot study results, utilizing a pretest–posttest design, indicated that students residing in the residence hall exposed to the posters for 10 days demonstrated significantly greater awareness of effective bystander behaviors than the residents in the dormitory not exposed to the campaign (see Potter et al., 2008, for a detailed discussion of the campaign development and evaluation).

Poster Description

The four posters portray typical campus scenarios and explicitly model preventive bystander behaviors. One of the posters shows a young man forcing a young woman up against the desk in her dorm room as she protests that he is hurting her. Outside the room, two dorm residents prepare to intervene. Another poster features a triptych of friends listening to and caring for friends who have experienced sexual violence (see Potter et al., 2008, for a description of all four posters). All four posters feature the campaign tagline, "*Know your power. Step in, Speak up. You can make a difference*," and provide specific advice about what to do in a situation similar to the one depicted. For example, the first poster above offers the following advice: "*Intimate partner abuse is everyone's problem. Intervene when you see it or hear it.*"

Poster Display and Distribution

We chose to display the posters during the 4 weeks immediately following spring break. Even though research shows that first-year and sophomore women are most at risk for sexual assault during the first weeks of the fall semester (e.g., Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997), studies of college students' drinking behavior report an increase during spring break and the weeks immediately following it (Berkowitz, 2002). Increased drinking is in turn correlated with an increase in the incidence of sexual assault (e.g., Finn, 1995; Parrot & Cummings, 1994).

Prior to initiating the poster campaign, we secured permission to hang posters in 285 sites throughout campus including all residence halls, campus recreation facilities, student centers, and dining halls. The team also received cooperation to display posters at 65 locations surrounding the campus, including Greek houses and local businesses frequented by students (e.g., bars, banks, coffee shops). The goal was to ensure that students would see the posters on a regular basis; thus, most of the posters were placed in residence halls and other locations where students spend the bulk of their out-of-class time. During the posting period, work-study students and

interns visited posting sites twice a week, hung approximately 400 posters, and replaced missing or damaged posters.

Poster Evaluation

Determining whether the poster campaign is conveying the creator's message in an effective manner is an important component of the poster evaluation (Wallack, 1990). Yet many teams that create media campaigns are unable to evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign (see Cavill & Bauman, 2004, for a discussion of how this is a problem for media campaigns focusing on physical activity). Prior research has documented the difficulty of determining the effect of a poster campaign on a college campus, citing the problem in trying to expose one sector of the campus while not exposing the other sector in an effort to compare those students who are and are not exposed to the message (McKillip, Lockhart, Eckert, & Phillips, 1985). Determining whether and how the poster campaign influences students also poses a challenge.

In this phase of our study, we used a posttest-only design (Witte, Meyer, & Martell, 2001) to assess student awareness of the bystander role in reducing sexual violence. Given that we wanted to measure the campaign's impact on a broad segment of the student population, we administered a Web survey that had the potential to reach a diverse sample of the student body. University officials cooperated in our evaluation efforts by giving us authorization to advertise a student awareness survey on the homepage portal where students log on to their university e-mail accounts and Blackboard sites. As an incentive, survey participants were given the chance to win an iPod Video. Flyers featuring the same advertisement were distributed to students at high-foot-traffic campus sites and at the adjacent downtown. Students who clicked on the link were taken to our institutional review board–approved online survey that took approximately 5 minutes to complete, were inquired first about their attitudes regarding sexual violence prevention, were then inquired about whether or not they had seen the posters, and were last asked for relevant demographic information.

Participants

Participants answered a series of questions on bystander behaviors and expressed their views on the extent of violence against women on campus. Participants were then shown photos of the four posters and asked whether they had seen them. Participants who answered no advanced to the outcome and demographic questions; those who answered yes went to the outcome questions and then to a series of questions about their familiarity with the poster content before the demographic questions.

Outcome Measure

The three dependent variables use a Stages-of-Change Scale developed by Banyard et al. (2005) that is based on Prochaska and DiClemente's transtheoretical model (TTM)

of health behavior change (e g., Grimley, Prochaska, Velicer, Blais, & DiClemente, 1994). Berkowitz (2002) noted its potential importance in sexual assault prevention, and there have been a number of recent efforts to apply the TTM to the field of interpersonal violence (e.g., Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005; Shurman & Rodriguez, 2005).

The Banyard et al. (2005) readiness-for-change measures, modeled directly on those of Prochaska and DiClemente (Grimley et al., 1994), are specific to assessing attitudes about prosocial bystander behaviors in response to possible sexual violence. The Stages-of-Change Scale consists of three subscales that assess the participants' express willingness to engage: Precontemplation, Contemplation, and Action. The Precontemplation subscale assesses participants' awareness of the problem of sexual violence on campus. The Contemplation subscale assesses willingness to get involved in reducing violence against women. The Action subscale assesses whether or not participants have taken action accordingly. We hypothesized that respondents who had seen the posters would score higher on each subscale than respondents who had not seen them.

On each of the three-item subscales, participants responded on a 5-point scale ranging from *very much true* to *not true at all*. The three items on the Precontemplation subscale are (a) "I don't think sexual assault is a big problem on campus," (b) "I don't think there is much I can do about sexual assault on campus," and (c) "There isn't much need for me to think about sexual assault on campus. That's the job of the crisis center." The three items on the Contemplation subscale are (a) "Sometimes I think I should learn more about sexual assault but I haven't done so yet," (b) "I think I can do something about sexual assault and am planning to find out what I can do about the problem," and (c) "I am planning to learn more about the problem of sexual assault on campus." The Action subscale consisted of these three statements: (a) "I have recently attended a program about sexual assault," (b) "I am actively involved in projects to deal with sexual assault on campus," and (c) "I have recently taken part in activities or volunteered my time on projects focused on ending sexual assault on campus" (see Banyard et al., 2005, for the Cronbach's alphas calculated for each of the three subscales).

Results

In all, 372 undergraduate students completed the online survey. Of them, 62% were female, 27% were first-year students, 87% were White, and 28% lived off campus. With the exception of the percentage of students living off campus, these demographic statistics are representative of the university undergraduate population during the same semester: 57% of the students enrolled at the university were female, 24% were first-year students, 85% were White, and 42% lived off campus. Finally, participants reported involvement in an average of 1.32 ($SD = 1.15$) university-recognized activities. Table 1 presents the summary statistics for the variables

used in the analysis. Of the respondents, 78% (291) reported seeing the posters. In addition, we corroborated findings from our earlier pilot study by including the same statements that assessed students' reactions to posters as had been included in focus group sessions at the initial poster development as well as during the pilot study (Potter et al., 2008). Web survey results were similar to previous findings indicating that media campaigns can increase community awareness**.**

Regression Analysis: Outcome Variables

Next, we examined whether there was a difference in outcome measures for students who did and did not report seeing the posters. That is, did students who had seen the posters have more knowledge about sexual violence (i.e., higher precontemplation scores), greater willingness to get involved in reducing violence against women (i.e., higher contemplation scores), and greater likelihood to have taken action to reduce violence against women (i.e., higher action scores) than students who had not seen the posters?

To answer these questions, we compared the scale scores of participants who reported having seen the posters with those who did not. Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used to test the models because our dependent variables were additive indexes. We used SPSS to perform the OLS regression calculations. In all of the models we controlled for covariates found in prior research to affect college students' attitudes toward sexual violence: gender, year in college, race, residence (residence hall, university apartment, or off campus), involvement in university-recognized activities, and previous participation in a program aimed at reducing violence against women on campus (Berkowitz, 2002). The results for each of the three scales are presented in Table 2.

Model 1 shows the results for the Precontemplation scale. The scale was structured so that the higher the score, the greater the participant's view that sexual violence is a problem on the campus. Exposure to the poster campaign had no significant effect on the participants' Precontemplation scores; the scores of those who had seen the poster campaign and those who had not did not differ. Model 2 presents the results for the Contemplation scale. Higher scores indicate greater willingness to take action. Participants who reported having seen the poster campaign had significantly ($p < .01$) higher Contemplation scores than did those who had not seen the campaign. The results for the last Readiness-For-Change subscale, the Action stage, are presented in Model 3. Once again, the higher the score, the more likely the participant has been involved in an activity aimed at reducing violence against women. Participants who had seen the poster campaign had significantly ($p < .05$) higher action-stage scores than did those who had not.

Given the exploratory nature of the study, we were unable to conduct a pretest–posttest design for this phase of the study. Instead, we investigated whether there was a difference in the frequency of exposure to the posters and participants' views on sexual violence on campus. We subdivided participants who had been

Table 1
Research Participants' Demographic Information and Campaign Viewing Frequencies

	All Participants ($N = 372$)		Did Not See Posters ($n = 81$) a1[a]		Saw Posters ($n = 291$) a2		Participant Campaign Viewing Frequency: Once a Day or More ($n = 220$) b1[b]		Several Times a Week ($n = 36$) b2		Once a Week or Less ($n = 35$) b3	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Class standing												
First year	100	27	12	15	88	30	78	35	5	14	5	14
Sophomore	75	20	10	12	65	22	56	25	4	11	5	14
Junior	83	22	25	31	58	20	41	19	9	25	8	23
Senior	114	31	34	42	80	27	45	20	18	50	17	49
Gender												
Male	141	38	32	40	109	37	82	37	13	36	14	40
Female	231	62	49	60	182	63	138	63	23	64	21	60
Race/ethnicity												
White	299	87	71	88	254	87	193	88	31	86	30	86
Non-White	47	13	10	12	37	13	27	12	5	14	4	8
Residence												
Residence hall	169	45	6	7	163	56	146	66	14	39	3	8
University apt	44	12	3	4	41	14	33	15	6	17	2	6
Off campus	103	28	70	86	86	30	40	18	16	44	30	86
Participated in VAW program												
Yes	103	28	15	19	88	30	63	29	15	42	10	29
No	269	72	66	81	203	70	157	71	21	58	21	71

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

	All Participants ($N = 372$)		Did Not See Posters ($n = 81$) a1[a]		Saw Posters ($n = 291$) a2		Participant Campaign Viewing Frequency: Once a Day or More ($n = 220$) b1[b]		Several Times a Week ($n = 36$) b2		Once a Week or Less ($n = 35$) b3	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Number of activities participated in	1.32	1.15	0.91	1.04	1.43	1.16	1.44	1.15	1.67	1.24	1.11	1.10
Stages-of-Change Scales												
Precontemplation	10.66	2.49	10.40	2.40	10.73	2.52	10.72	2.49	10.83	3.02	10.69	2.22
Contemplation	6.33	2.46	5.57	2.62	6.57	2.36	6.60	2.42	6.64	2.33	6.34	1.99
Action	5.73	3.61	4.38	2.94	5.91	3.74	5.95	3.74	6.67	4.20	5.49	3.26

Note: Students who reported having seen the poster campaign were coded 1; those who had not were coded 0.

a. a1 + a2 = 372.

b. b1 + b2 + b3 = 291.

Table 2
Ordinary Least Squares Regression Results Assessing the Impact of Frequency of Viewing the Poster Campaign on Stages of Change Scale Scores

	Model 1 Precontemplation	Model 2 Contemplation	Model 3 Action	Model 4 Contemplation	Model 5 Action
Class standing					
First year	–0.63	0.88*	–0.04	0.88*	–0.05
	(0.39)	(0.39)	(0.52)	(0.40)	(0.52)
Sophomore	0.15	0.32	–0.08	0.34	–0.07
	(0.39)	(0.40)	(0.52)	(0.40)	(0.46)
Junior	0.20	0.54	0.80**	0.54	0.78*
	(0.34)	(0.35)	(0.45)	(0.35)	(0.46)
(Senior)					
Gender					
(Male)					
Female	1.35***	0.81***	0.08	0.81***	0.08
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.33)	(0.26)	(0.34)
Race/ethnicity					
(White)					
Non-White	–0.20	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.62
	(0.37)	(0.37)	(0.49)	(0.37)	(0.49)
Residence					
Residence hall	0.05	–0.28	–0.38	–0.36	–0.61
	(0.35)	(0.35)	(0.47)	(0.38)	(0.51)
University apt	–0.50	–0.81*	–0.56	–0.94	–0.76
	(0.42)	(0.42)	(0.56)	(0.44)	(0.58)
(Off-campus residence)					
Number of activities participated in	0.06	0.20*	0.61***	0.20*	0.60***
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.15)	(0.12)	(0.15)
Participated in violence against women program					

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

	Model 1 Precontemplation	Model 2 Contemplation	Model 3 Action	Model 4 Contemplation	Model 5 Action
Yes	1.21***	0.47	3.26***	0.46*	3.24***
	(0.29)	(0.30)	(0.40)	(0.30)	(0.40)
(No)					
Research participant saw the poster campaign					
Yes	0.27	1.04**	0.80*		
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.45)		
(No)					
Participant saw the campaign multiple times (Did not see the poster campaign)					
Once a day or more				1.12**	1.04*
				(0.38)	(0.51)
Several times a week				1.16*	0.96
				(0.51)	(0.66)
Once a week or less				0.84*	0.29
				(0.48)	(0.63)
Constant	9.36***	4.35***	3.36	4.36***	3.40***
	(0.36)	(0.36)	(0.29)	(0.37)	(0.48)
R^2	.17	.12	.29	.12	.29

Note: Unstandardized regression coefficients. Standard errors are in parentheses. Reference categories are in parentheses. Given that our hypothesis stated that people who reported viewing the campaign would have higher Precontemplation Scale, Contemplation Scale, and Action Scale scores than those who did not report viewing the outreach campaign, we used a one-tailed test of significance.

*$p < .05$, one-tailed. **$p < .01$, one tailed. ***$p < .001$, one-tailed.

exposed to the posters into three categories: (a) those who had seen them once a day or more, (b) those who had seen them several times a week, and (c) those who had seen them once a week or less. Of the 291 participants who reported seeing the posters, 220 (76%) had seen them once a day or more, 36 (12%) had seen them several times a week, and 35 (12%) students had seen them once a week or less.

Models 4 and 5 present the results of our examination of exposure to the poster campaign. Students who did not see the posters compose the reference category. In Model 4, we find that although students who reported having seen the posters several times a week or more ($p < .05$) and those who reported seeing the posters once a week or less ($p < .05$) were found to have higher Contemplation scale scores than those who did not see the posters, the difference was not as significantly different as those students who reported seeing the posters once a day or more ($p < .01$) compared to those who had not seen the posters. Model 5 indicates that students who reported seeing the posters once a day or more had a significantly ($p < .05$) higher action-stage scale score than those who reported not having seen the posters.

Regression Analysis: Covariates

Following findings from previous research, we looked at a number of covariates that may influence our outcomes. With respect to gender, females had significantly ($p < .001$) higher Precontemplation and Contemplation scale scores than did males. Students who reported prior participation in a program aimed at preventing violence against women also had significantly ($p < .001$) higher Precontemplation and Action scale scores than did students who had not done so. Finally, the greater the number of university-recognized activities a student participates in, the higher his or her Contemplation score ($p < .05$) and Action scale score ($p < .001$). As noted above, all the models shown in Table 2 control for gender, race/ethnicity, class year, and location of residence. In addition, by controlling for prior participation in a program aimed at reducing violence against women on campus, we were able to proxy for participants who already have an interest in this topic.

Discussion

Colleges have begun to develop policies and practices to reduce sexual violence on campus in conjunction with victim assistance and procedures for informing the community about incidents of sexual violence. Yet administrative action represents only one component of the multifaceted approaches needed to reduce sexual violence on campus (Karjane et al., 2005). The results of our analysis indicate that poster campaigns can be an important tool in raising awareness of sexual violence on the college campus even though poster campaigns should not be the only tool that college communities use to facilitate change. Participants who reported seeing the posters exhibited greater

awareness of the problem (contemplation) and greater willingness to participate in actions aimed at reducing sexual violence (action) compared to those students who did not report seeing the poster. Furthermore, we find some evidence of dose effect resulting from increased exposure to the posters. When comparing the three stages of change scale of students who reported seeing the posters with those who participated in the in-person Bringing in the Bystander training session, it is not surprising that the training session participants had higher Action scale scores (see Banyard et al., 2007). Cavill and Bauman (2004) note similar findings in their review of media campaigns promoting physical health. They concluded that media campaigns are more successful for increasing awareness of the issue rather than having a population-level effect on behavior and suggest that media campaigns be seen as being part of a broader strategy (Cavill & Bauman, 2004). In-person programs enable participants to practice their learned skills but require a time commitment from both facilitators and students. Our poster campaign offers college students a reason to think about sexual violence on campus and to consider actions to reduce it. Provocative imagery can stimulate contemplation, an important step in reducing sexual violence on campuses where prevailing norms and culture too often facilitate rather than discourage sexual violence. Colleges and universities should also take responsibility to provide students with in-person programming or other strategies to enable them to practice their skills at intervention in safe prosocial ways.

Study Limitations and Future Directions

This exploratory study has limitations that should be addressed. First, our sample is a convenience one; we were not able to use an experimental design to test the effect of the campaign posters on the general population of students. However, it is important to acknowledge that the majority of poster campaigns are generally not evaluated in *any* systematic fashion, and we are in the process of helping to fill that gap. Second, trying to evaluate a poster campaign under real-world conditions with a limited budget for evaluation makes decisions about how to conduct an evaluation difficult. In spite of this limitation, our preliminary findings encourage us to develop an experimental design with control groups and randomization of assignment into groups, and better evaluation tools for future research.

Third, given the likelihood that students have different levels of knowledge regarding sexual violence, those at different stages of thinking about the issues at hand were more or less likely to notice the posters. Students interested in the problem of sexual violence were probably more likely to notice (and stop to read) the posters than those who were ignorant or indifferent to the matter. We used past participation in in-person programs aimed at reducing violence against women or being trained as an advocate or educator for the campus rape prevention program as a proxy for interest and prior knowledge in the topic. Our results indicate that previous participation in such a program significantly affected the three dependent variable scores.

Another study limitation may be the short campaign duration. Posters were up for 1 month. Cavill and Bauman (2004) indicate that it may be necessary to have campaigns last for years to determine their effects. We did not have the benefit of longevity for this exploratory study, but our future research plans include a longer campaign.

Finally, although we recognize that a poster campaign is not a substitute for in-person training and intervention, it can still be seen as one of many tools to raise awareness about an issue especially when funding is limited. Previous research indicates passive intervention methods tend to be more effective when they are combined with community education programs (DeJong & Winsten, 1998; Lazarsfeld & Merton, as cited in DeJong & Winsten, 1998). Yet our findings indicate that the poster component of the Bringing in the Bystander program raises awareness about the incidence of sexual violence on campus and the importance of taking action to reduce sexual violence on campus even when controlling for previous participation in a prevention program. Unlike a bystander intervention training program, a bystander poster campaign requires minimal funds and administrative time and therefore can serve as one method or a first step in a multimethod program (Mudde, Hoefnagels, Van Wijnen, & Kremers, 2007).

In addition to the efforts put forth by campus crisis centers, we must continue to look for new ways to make community members recognize that sexual violence is a community problem and therefore a community responsibility. We also plan to develop public service announcements and an Internet tool that uses social network programs. We believe that these technologies in addition to the posters and the increasing utilization of the in-person prevention program will provide us with new opportunities to continue to educate men and women alike that everyone in the community has a role to play in reducing sexual violence.

References

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

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *32*, 61-79.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). *Rape prevention through bystander education: Final report to NIJ for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009*. Available from www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf

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

Cavill, N., & Bauman, A. (2004). Changing the way people think about health-enhancing physical activity: Do mass media campaigns have a role? *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *22*, 771-790.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2004). *Sexual violence prevention: Beginning the dialogue.* Atlanta, GA: Author.

Chrismer, E. (2001, April 21). Bold rape-awareness posters spark interest worldwide. *Dateline UC Davis.* Retrieved July 30, 2004, from http://wwwdateline.ucdavis.edu/042701/DL_posters.html

Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Violence. (2002). *Stimulate conversation*. Retrieved July 7, 2004, from http://www.whynotask.org

DeJong, W., & Winsten, J. A. (1998). *The media and the message: Lessons learned from past public service campaigns*. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy.

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

Farrelly, M. C., Davis, K. C., Haviland, M. L., Messeri, P., & Healton, C. G. (2005). Evidence of a dose-response relationship between "truth" anti-smoking ads and youth smoking prevalence. *American Journal of Public Health*, *95*, 425-431.

Finn, P. (1995). *Preventing alcohol-related problems on campus: Acquaintance rape, a guide for program coordinators*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women: Findings from two national-level studies.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Foubert, J. D. (2000). The longitudinal effects of a rape prevention program on fraternity men's attitudes, behavioral intent, and behavior. *Journal of American College Health*, *48*, 158-163.

Grimley, D., Prochaska, J. O., Velicer, W. F., Blais, L. M., & DiClemente, C. C. (1994). The transtheoretical model of change. In T. M. Brinthaupt & R. P. Lipka (Eds.), *Changing the self: Philosophies, techniques, and experiences* (pp. 201-227). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). *Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Mattern, J., & Neighbors, C. (2004). Social norms campaigns: Examining changes in perceived norms and changes in drinking levels. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *65*, 489-493.

McKillip, J., Lockhart, D. C., Eckert, P. C., & Phillips, J. (1985). Evaluation of a responsible alcohol use media campaign on a college campus. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, *30*, 88-97.

Men Can Stop Rape. (2003). *Men Can Stop Rape Website Homepage* Retrieved July 7, 2004, from http://www.mencanstoprape.org

Mudde, A., Hoefnagels, C. J., Van Wijnen, L. G. C., & Kremers, S. P. J. (2007). Bystanding an abused child: Testing the applicability of the stages of change construct. *Health Education Research*, *22*, 128-138.

Murphy, C. M., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2005). *Treating the abusive partner: An individualized cognitive-behavioral approach.* New York: Guilford.

Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrisey-Kane, E., et al. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist*, *58*, 449-456.

Parrot, A., & Cummings, N. (1994). A rape awareness and prevention model for male athletes. *Journal of American College Health*, *42*, 179-185.

Potter, S. J., Stapleton, J. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2008). Designing, implementing and evaluating a media campaign illustrating the bystander role. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 36,* 39-55.

Randolph, W., & Viswanath, K. (2004). Lessons learned from public health mass media campaigns: Marketing health in a crowded media world. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *25*, 419-438.

Romeo, F. (2004). Acquaintance rape on college and university campuses. *College Student Journal*, *38*, 61-65.

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

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

Shurman, L. A., & Rodriguez, C. M. (2005). Cognitive-affective predictors of women's readiness to end domestic violence relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*, 1417-1439.

Söchting, I., Fairbrother, N., & Koch, W. J. (2004). Sexual assault of women: Prevention efforts and risk factors. *Violence Against Women*, *10*, 73-93.

Texas Association Against Sexual Assault. (2003). *Speak up. Speak out*. Retrieved July 1, 2004, from http://www.taasa.org

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Women's Health. (2001). *Health and Human Services blueprint for action on breastfeeding.* Washington, DC: Author.

Wallack, L. (1990). Mass media and health promotion: Promise, problem, and challenge. In C. Atkin & L. Wallack (Eds.), *Mass communication and public health: Complexities and conflicts* (pp. 41-50). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wandersman, A., & Florin, P. (2003). Community interventions and effective prevention. *American Psychologist*, *58*, 441-448.

Witte, K., Meyer, G., & Martell, D. (2001). *Effective health risk messages: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sharyn J. Potter, PhD, MPH, prevention innovations codirector, is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of New Hampshire. Trained as a medical sociologist, she has studied how policy change affects organizations, providers, and clients. In addition, she has more than 10 years of experience in conducting evaluation research. Her most recent research efforts have been focused on creating and evaluating the bystander media campaign.

Mary M. Moynihan, PhD, prevention innovations coordinator, is a research associate professor in the Women's Studies Program and is affiliated with the Justice Studies Program at the University of New Hampshire (UNH). Working with the UNH police department, she currently comanages a grant to reduce violence against women on campus and has more than 11 years of experience conducting research relating to preventing violence against women on campus. In addition, she has conducted research evaluations for off-campus organizations.

Jane G. Stapleton, MA, prevention innovations coordinator, is a research instructor in the Women's Studies Program and Family Studies Department at the University of New Hampshire (UNH). Working with the UNH police department, she currently comanages a grant to reduce violence against women on campus and coordinates a statewide campus consortium to end violence against women. As an activist, administrator, policy maker, service provider, and researcher, she has worked in the field of ending violence against women on university campuses for 20 years.

Victoria L. Banyard, PhD, prevention innovations codirector, is an associate professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of New Hampshire with affiliations with the Women's Studies and Justice Studies Programs. Trained as a clinical and community psychologist, she has been conducting research on the consequences of interpersonal violence and trauma and the prevention of sexual and intimate partner violence for more than 12 years.