

I. INTRODUCTION

During the 2000-2001 academic year, the Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) Program underwent its second year of program evaluation. This report describes the Year 2 evaluation methods and findings and places them in the context of the multi-year evaluation strategy to which MVP has committed. In the pages that follow, the first year of evaluation activity is briefly summarized. Goals of the Year 2 evaluation are then explicated, followed by a description of the research methods employed. Evaluation findings are discussed with attention to gender differences and are compared to Year 1 results.

Year 1: Evaluation Activities and Lessons Learned

The first-ever evaluation of the MVP Program was conducted during the 1999-2000 academic year. That mixed-methods evaluation had three major goals. First, to use qualitative, case study research in an effort to understand the need for the MVP Program, understand student experiences, and to describe Program activities to stakeholders unfamiliar with its approach. Second, to collect quantitative baseline data measuring Program impact in terms of participant knowledge, attitude change, and change in self-efficacy. Finally, to pay careful attention to gender differences in terms of students' reactions to the MVP Program.

Several important findings emerged from the Year 1 MVP evaluation. Qualitative data clearly supported the argument that adolescent gender violence education and prevention programs such as MVP are sorely needed. Multiple observations of MVP training sessions and in-depth interviews demonstrated the ways in which gender violence impacts students on a daily basis. Quantitative survey data suggested that the Program had the desired impact on students. Overall, statistically significant changes in student knowledge, awareness, attitudes, and self-efficacy were demonstrated. Specifically, students knew more facts about gender violence upon Program completion, sexist attitudes diminished, and students' confidence to intervene in and prevent gender violence improved. Student and "key informant" interview data confirmed these results and further suggested that student behaviors changed as a result of Program participation. As well, students reported a high level of satisfaction with the MVP Program. Finally, differences between girls' and boys' reactions to the Program were realized.

For more descriptive information concerning the first year of evaluation activity as well as the MVP Program and its training approach, refer to the 1999-2000 MVP evaluation report¹.

Goals of the Year 2 MVP Evaluation

The first year of evaluation activity provided a wealth of descriptive information about MVP Program activities, the Program's impact on participants, and the ways students experience gender violence in

¹ To get a copy of the 1999-2000 MVP Evaluation Report, contact the MVP Program at Northeastern University's Center for the Study of Sport in Society at (617) 373-4025.

their daily lives. The qualitative focus of that study ensured that student voices were well represented throughout the evaluation. Almost no studies of teen dating violence prevention programs reported in the literature include qualitative data from student participants; thus, the 1999-2000 evaluation of MVP was unique and made important contributions to the field in terms of understanding student responses to these types of prevention programs. Additionally, the *MVP Survey* was created specifically for the MVP Program and is shown to be a valid and reliable measure. This, too, is a relative strength of the MVP evaluation.

The Year 1 evaluation was limited, though, by a quantitative design that did not incorporate control groups. The current evaluation attends to that limitation as it bolsters the quasi-experimental design by including comparison groups. The second year of evaluation was structured by taking into consideration lessons learned from the baseline study of MVP. As well, evaluation activities were predicated on available resources. The decision was made to use second year evaluation resources for three main purposes:

1. To strengthen the quantitative evaluation approach by employing a quasi-experimental, pre-test/post-test design with comparison group.
2. To evaluate Program outcomes, paying attention to gender differences, including:
 - change in levels of student knowledge and awareness;
 - change in student attitudes concerning gender violence and ability to be an active bystander;
 - student satisfaction with the MVP Program.
3. To continue to explore the experiences and well-being of young women who participate in the MVP Program through focus group research.

The specific advantage of the Year 2 design to incorporate comparison groups is that it lends increased confidence that observed changes are the result of Program training and not some other influence.

II. SURVEY EVALUATION METHODS

As mentioned, a quasi-experimental, pre-test/post-test survey design with comparison groups was used to evaluate the impact of the MVP Program on student knowledge and attitudes. The *MVP Survey* (see Appendix C) was administered for these purposes. This instrument was designed specifically to evaluate the MVP training curriculum, and previous validity and reliability testing has demonstrated that it is a sound measurement tool. Qualitative survey data were elicited from an open-ended questionnaire gauging student satisfaction with the MVP Program.

Sampling

Throughout the 2000-2001 academic year, MVP trained students at ten different schools. All students from the 10 schools who participated in the initial awareness-raising training were asked to participate in the evaluation by filling out the survey instrument. Thus, no sampling criteria were employed for the population of students who were in the MVP training. As described below, a convenience sample was used as a comparison group.

Students from three schools were selected to constitute a comparison group. Random sampling was not employed. Instead, these schools were chosen as a convenience sample based on their willingness to serve as comparison sites for a year in exchange for receiving MVP's services during the 2001-2002 academic year. Despite this constraint, efforts were made to select comparison sites that were comparable to treatment sites in terms of student demographics. School personnel at those sites also were asked to select student participants in the same manner (using the same leadership criteria) they would employ as if the selected students were receiving training. Students at these sites did not receive any information about or training from MVP.

Survey Administration Procedures

Pre-test surveys were administered to students on-site in a group administration setting. Student pre-testing took place prior to any exposure to the MVP Program. At treatment sites, pre-test survey administration took place on a rolling basis, as this is the manner in which MVP provides services to schools. For example, some schools began MVP training in October 2000 while others did not begin until March 2001. Typically, students in the treatment group filled out the pre-test survey immediately before their first training session. Post-test surveys were administered to students in the treatment group approximately two weeks after they completed the MVP awareness-raising training. Again, testing was on-site, in a group setting. Because of differences pertaining to training schedules at individual sites, the time in between pre- and post-testing at treatment sites varied from school to school and ranged from less than two months to almost five months.

Pre-test surveys were also administered to students at the comparison sites on a rolling basis, and the amount of time between pre- and post-test administration varied at these sites as well. Post-test surveys were administered at the comparison sites between one and four months after pre-testing.

Pre- and post-test surveys were administered on-site in a group setting. This testing condition was similar to the treatment condition and should pose little, if any, threat to validity.

Prior to any testing, students were verbally informed of the purpose of the MVP evaluation and were ensured that their responses to the *MVP Survey* would remain confidential. Students were told that their participation was voluntary, that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and that they did not have to answer any questions that made them feel uncomfortable.

Response

At pre-test, 211 students from the ten schools comprising the treatment group participated in the evaluation. Nearly 49 percent (103) of respondents from the treatment group were girls, while 51 percent (108) were boys. From the comparison sites, 72 students participated, and there was a 60-40 percent split between females and males, respectively.

A majority (61 percent) of student respondents from the treatment group identified as Caucasian. African American and Latino students represented roughly 13 percent each of the treatment sample. In the comparison group, less than half (44 percent) of respondents were Caucasian. African American students comprised nearly 21 percent of the sample, as did students who identified as coming from a mixed ethnic background. Eleven percent of comparison group participants were Latino.

Seventy-three percent of treatment group students and 95 percent of comparison group students were in the tenth and eleventh grades. This was purposeful and desirable, given findings from the Year 1 evaluation that indicated it may be most effective and efficient to target students in these grades. A quarter of students from the treatment group were in twelfth grade, but just one twelfth grader participated from the comparison group. In all, only four ninth grade students participated in the study.

At post-test, 155 students (74 percent) from the treatment group filled out a survey. Of these, 139 completed the open-ended satisfaction questionnaire ("Page 6"). Ninety percent of comparison group students completed a survey at post-test.

III. SURVEY ANALYSIS RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section details the analysis of the second year survey data and presents the results of the survey portion of the 2000-2001 evaluation. First, changes in student knowledge and awareness levels are described. Next, changes in student attitudes regarding gender violence are presented, followed by a discussion of changes in students' attitudes regarding their ability to prevent and/or intervene in situations involving gender violence. Results from the fourth survey section, added to the survey during Year 2, are then described. Finally, student satisfaction data are discussed.

Knowledge and Awareness

Five survey questions were designed to measure the level of student knowledge and awareness regarding gender violence. The five questions are factual items based on information that is underscored during MVP training and are found in Part I of the *MVP Survey*. For these questions, students are asked to respond by indicating whether they believe the statement is true or false. A third "I don't know" option has been included to minimize guessing and non-response.

In order to analyze the nominal data in the knowledge section of the survey, cross-tabulations and Pearson's Chi Square tests were conducted for each of the five variables (KV1 – KV5) using the statistical software, SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences)². Each of the five variables was analyzed separately, as the items do not form a scale. Pearson's Chi Square tests were performed at the $\alpha = .05$ and $\alpha = .10$ levels. The purpose of these tests is to demonstrate if the change in knowledge from the pre-test and the post-test differs between the treatment and comparison groups. Statistically significant treatment effects were noted for several of the knowledge variables. Group differences are presented descriptively below.

KV1: "According to MA law, it may be considered rape if a man has sex with a woman who is under the influence of alcohol or other drugs." (The correct answer to this question is true.)

For this first knowledge variable (KV1), 76.5 percent of students in the treatment group answered correctly at pre-test. The percentage of these students responding correctly to this item at post-test rose to 94 percent. Such an increase was not seen among those in the comparison group. At pre-test, 70 percent of those students answered correctly. This figure rose just 5 percent at post-test. The percentage of treatment group students who answered correctly at both pre- and post-test (95 percent) was statistically different ($p = .026$) from those who maintained the correct answer in the comparison group. Nearly 20 percent of comparison group students who answered "true" at pre-test changed their mind and answered incorrectly at post-test. Additionally, while only 58 percent of comparison students correctly changed their pre-test "I don't know" response to the correct "true" response at post-test, 88

² More complicated multinomial logistic regression models also were used to study the group effects. While similar to standard binary logistic regressions, multinomial logistic regressions are necessary when more than two nominal categories are present. In this case, three nominal categories existed (True, False, and I Don't Know). In these models, GROUP was used as the factor, and four covariates were included: PREKV, SURVIVPR, GENDER, GRADE. Results from this analysis confirm the observed patterns presented above.

percent of students in the treatment group did so. Once again, the difference between the groups was statistically significant ($p = .001$). These findings suggest a rather strong treatment effect for this variable – exposure to MVP training improved student knowledge regarding this item.

*KV2: “As long as you are just joking around, what you say or do to someone cannot be considered sexual harassment.” (The correct answer to this question is **false**.)*

Most students knew the correct answer to this question at pre-test (93 percent of treatment group participants and 87 percent of students in the comparison group), and a majority of those in both groups maintained that correct answer at post-test. At post-test, 94 percent of treatment group participants and 85 percent of comparison group students answered correctly. Eighty percent (4 out of 5) of treatment students who answered “I don’t know” at pre-test gave the correct “false” answer at post-test. In the comparison group, none of the three who answered “I don’t know” at pre-test changed their answer to the correct “false” at post-test. This weak treatment effect ($p = .076$) was the only statistically significant difference between groups for this knowledge variable.

*KV3: “People on TV and in the movies influence the ways that we act as men and women.” (The correct answer to this question is **true**.)*

At pre-test, treatment and comparison students exhibited roughly the same level of awareness regarding this question. While 75 percent of students in the treatment group knew the correct answer at pre-test, 74 percent of comparison group participants answered correctly as well. At post-test, however, 86 percent of students who had received MVP training knew the correct answer to this question, but the percentage of students from the comparison group answering correctly at post-test actually dropped to 67 percent.

Program training seems to have increased students’ knowledge regarding KV3. Specifically, treatment effects at the $\alpha = .10$ level were found in two categories. The percentage of treatment students who maintained their correct answer from pre- to post-test was significantly different ($p = .062$) from those who did so in the comparison group. As well, 61 percent of students who received Program training and answered “false” at pre-test answered correctly at post-test. This was significantly different ($p = .072$) from the 31 percent of comparison students who correctly changed their pre-test “false” answer to the correct response.

*KV4: “Men perpetrate (commit) over 90% of violent crime in the U.S.” (The correct answer to this question is **true**.)*

Treatment effects on this variable appear to be particularly strong. Just 37 percent of students in the treatment group answered correctly at pre-test. This percentage jumped to 84 percent at post-test. Comparatively, while 39 percent of comparison group students answered correctly at pre-test, this percentage dropped to just under 30 percent at post-test. Fifty percent of those in the comparison group who answered correctly at pre-test changed to an incorrect answer at post-test. This was a statistically significant difference ($p = .000$) from the 91 percent of treatment group students who

maintained their correct answer after Program completion. Similarly, the 67 percent of MVP participants who answered “false” at pre-test but chose the correct “true” response at post-test was significantly different ($p = .002$) from the 27 percent of comparison group respondents who did so. Finally, 86 percent of students in the treatment group correctly changed their pre-test “I don’t know” response to “true” upon Program completion. Only nine percent of comparison students did so. Again, this difference between the two groups was strongly significant ($p = .000$).

*KV5: “In the U.S., a man physically abuses a woman every 9 to 18 seconds.” (The correct answer to this question is **true**.)*

Important treatment effects were also found for this knowledge variable. The percentage of treatment group students who knew the correct answer at post-test jumped to 80 percent from 36 percent at pre-test. In contrast, while 43 percent of comparison group students answered correctly at pre-test, only 41 percent chose the correct answer at post-test. Moreover, while nearly 90 percent of MVP students maintained the correct answer from pre- to post-test, only 65 percent of comparison group students did so, and the difference was statistically significant ($p = .006$). Further group differences occurred among students who incorrectly answered “false” at pre-test. While 70 percent of MVP participants correctly changed their answer to “true” at post-test, no students from the comparison group did so. The statistical difference between the two was relatively weak ($p = .091$), because of the low numbers in the comparison group category ($N=2$). However, stronger effects once again emerged between students who answered “I don’t know” at pre-test but correctly answered “true” at post-test. The 74 percent of treatment group students who correctly changed their answer was statistically different ($p = .000$) from the 24 percent of comparison group students who did so.

In sum, there are important differences between treatment and comparison groups on the five knowledge variables. In every instance, a greater percentage of MVP participants answered correctly at post-test. Furthermore, strong, statistically significant differences emerged between the groups in several categories. In other categories, weaker program effects were apparent. KV2 stands out as the one knowledge variable for which there was little difference between groups and little improvement from pre- to post-test among the treatment students, likely because such high number of students knew the answer at pre-test. Overall, participation in the MVP Program seems to have heightened the level of knowledge and awareness that students have regarding gender violence. These results from the Chi Square tests were replicated using the more complex multivariate methods (see the second footnote beginning on page five of this document), so the findings are robust. Moreover, these results are consistent with Year 1 findings, which showed improvement among MVP participants from pre- to post-test on several of the knowledge variables.

Although the Chi Square tests did not control for such factors as gender, no marked differences between females and males were apparent when looking at the percentages of each who responded correctly to each knowledge variable. Furthermore, the more complex model did control for gender, and no significant differences were found between females and males on the knowledge variables.

Attitudes Regarding Gender Violence

Part II of the *MVP Survey* was designed to measure student attitudes toward male violence against women as conceptualized by the MVP Program and consistent with the literature on adolescent gender violence. In the MVP context specifically, indicators of gender violence can range from telling jokes that objectify women and possessing stereotypical ideas of gender roles to rape and battering.

The sixteen items found on Part II of the survey form a unidimensional scale (the “AV Scale”). Examples of items found on this scale include, “It is harmless to tell dirty jokes about women” and “If a guy forces his girlfriend to have sex with him when she doesn’t want to, it is rape.” Several items are reverse-worded to reduce systematic error. Statements are followed by a five-point, Likert-type scale response set ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” On this scale, higher scores indicate ignorant or sexist attitudes about gender violence.

Survey responses were coded, entered into a database, and analyzed using SPSS. The reliability of this scale was analyzed using Cronbach’s alpha³. For the pre measure, $\alpha = .79$, and for the post measure $\alpha = .85$, indicating that the scale is highly reliable and will produce consistent results over time. To help assess the construct validity of the scale, principal component analysis was implemented. Construct validity helps to ensure that one is measuring what one intends to measure. Factor loadings for the AV Scale demonstrate that it is reasonable to retain all 16 items and to maintain the scale without dividing it into subscales; however, arguments could be offered to make some changes to the AV Scale. The factor loadings for this scale are exhibited in Appendix A at the end of this document.

The principal component scale explains close to 32 percent of the variation among the 16 original AV Scale items in the post-test and 25 percent of the variation among those items in the pre-test. While the “explained” variations are somewhat low, an averaged scale score that used the mean values of the 16 scale items (computed separately for the pre- and post-test) was created to ensure that the results were robust to changes in scaling procedures.

Given the interval nature of the dependent measure, multivariate regression analysis techniques were employed to study group effects. Two regression models were run for the AV Scale using both the factor score (produced during principal component analysis) and a newly created variable that is the average across the 16 measures (described above). For the first regression model, the dependent measure was the Post AV factor score, while the independent measures included the Pre AV factor score, group assignment (treatment vs. comparison), gender, grade, and survivor status. Similarly, the second regression model used the Post AV mean score as the dependent measure, and the Pre AV mean score, group assignment, gender, grade, and survivor status were the independent measures.

Strong treatment effects were found using both the factor score and the averaged score. Using the factor score regression model, students in the treatment group had significantly lower scores than the

³ Past efforts at assessing the validity and reliability of the *MVP Survey* are described in more detail elsewhere. For more information, contact the researcher through the MVP Program.

comparison group at post-test ($p = .006$). The averaged score regression model yielded confirmatory results and demonstrated that the difference between groups at post-test was statistically significant ($p = .000$).

While the above statistics infer very strong treatment effects, it is also useful to discuss the impact more descriptively by looking at and comparing the mean scores between groups (see Table 1). At post-test, the mean score of the treatment group had dropped from 1.97 to 1.76; but for the comparison group, the mean score at post-test had actually increased slightly from 1.92 to 1.93. Recall that lower scores on the AV Scale indicate more desirable (less sexist/ignorant) attitudes about gender violence. The MVP Program appears to have a desirable impact on student attitudes regarding gender violence. At Program completion, attitudes among MVP participants are shown to have improved, while attitudes among comparison group students stayed roughly the same. As well, although MVP students began the Program with comparable attitudes to their comparison group counterparts, they displayed more positive and desirable attitudes at post-test.

Table 1		
AV SCALE		
Mean Score by Group		
<i>(Higher mean scores indicate ignorant or sexist attitudes about gender violence)</i>		
	Treatment Group Mean	Comparison Group Mean
Pre-Test	1.97	1.92
Post-Test	1.76	1.93
Change from Pre- to Post-Test	-0.21	0.01

Because of small sample sizes, gender differences among students were difficult to gauge statistically. Limited power made it hard to find both direct and indirect effects using the regression models above. Thus, gender differences are presented here descriptively (refer to Table 2). Among treatment group students, females had lower mean scores than males at both pre- and post-test. The difference is fairly pronounced at both testing instances, indicating that girls begin and end MVP Program training with more desirable attitudes than do boys. This result is consistent with Year 1 findings.

While mean scores on the AV Scale changed for both girls and boys from pre- to post-test, the change appears slightly more pronounced for boys. This, too, is consistent with Year 1 findings which indicated that boys improved significantly from pre- to post-test, while girls' improvement appeared more marginal. However, without the benefit of larger sample sizes and statistical analysis, definitive conclusions should not be drawn regarding this matter.

Table 2				
AV SCALE				
Mean Scores by Gender and Group				
<i>(Higher mean scores indicate ignorant or sexist attitudes about gender violence)</i>				
	Treatment Group Mean		Comparison Group Mean	
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
Pre-Test	1.81	2.12	1.75	2.22
Post-Test	1.62	1.9	1.81	2.12
Change from Pre- to Post-Test	-0.19	-0.22	0.06	-0.1
	Difference Between Girls' and Boys' Mean Scores		Differences Between Girls' and Boys' Mean Scores	
Pre-Test	0.31		0.48	
Post-Test	0.29		0.31	

Attitudes Regarding Self-Efficacy and Prevention

The third section of the MVP survey includes a second unidimensional scale developed to assess student attitudes about their personal ability to prevent and/or intervene in situations involving male violence against women (the “SEV Scale”). It is hypothesized that students with more confidence in their ability to effect change in these situations will be empowered to play an active role in reducing gender violence (e.g., by being active bystanders and educating their peers). An example of an item in this scale is, “A group of guys would listen to me if I confronted them about their sexist behaviors.” The eleven statements are followed by a five point, Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Higher scale scores suggest a greater level of self-efficacy.

As was the procedure for analyzing the previous unidimensional scale, survey responses in this section were coded, entered into a database and analyzed using SPSS. To begin, validity and reliability testing were conducted. The reliability of the SEV Scale was measured using Cronbach’s alpha. For the pre-test measure, $\alpha = .80$, and for the post measure, $\alpha = .82$. Principal component analysis was employed to help assess construct validity. Factor loadings for the SEV Scale suggest that the eleven individual items fit well within the scale (see Appendix A).

The principal component scale explains close to 34 percent of the variation of the 11 original items for the pre-test measure and over 36 percent of the variation for the post-test measure. Again, these “explained” variations are somewhat average, so a scale comprised of the mean values of the 11 items was created to ensure that results were robust to changes in scaling procedures for the underlying scale.

The dependent measure for the SEV Scale is of an interval nature; therefore, multivariate regression analysis techniques were employed to study between-group effects. Regressions were once again run using both the factor score and the newly created variable representing the average across the 11 measures. For the first regression model, the dependent measure was the Post SEV factor score, while the independent measures included the Pre SEV factor score, group assignment (treatment vs. comparison), gender, grade, and survivor status. The dependent measure for the second regression model was the Post SEV mean score, and the independent measures included the Pre SEV mean score, group assignment, gender, grade, and survivor status.

Table 3		
SEV SCALE		
Mean Score by Group		
<i>(Higher mean scores indicate higher levels of self-efficacy)</i>		
	Treatment Group Mean	Comparison Group Mean
Pre-Test	3.60	3.73
Post-Test	3.93	3.71
Change from Pre- to Post-Test	0.33	-0.01

Once again, strong treatment effects were found, indicating that the MVP Program achieved the desired impact of improving students’ confidence in their ability to be active bystanders. Students in the treatment group displayed higher scores than the comparison group at post-test, and the difference was statistically significant. The significance results were the same whether using the factor score model ($p = .000$) or the averaged score model ($p = .000$). Mean scores representing the change for each group are presented in Table 3. For students in the treatment group, mean scores increase from 3.60 at pre-test to 3.93 at post-test. For comparison group respondents, mean scores decrease slightly from 3.73 at pre-test to 3.71 at post-test.

Gender differences must again be presented descriptively (see Table 4). Young women and men in the treatment group both improved markedly from pre- to post-test. Mean scores for girls improved from 3.70 to 4.02; mean scores for boys increased from 3.50 to 3.83. Again, there is a difference between treatment group females and males at both pre- and post-test. Girls report being more

confident bystanders than boys before MVP training and after. This result is different from Year 1, where female and male students exhibited similar confidence levels. But again, care must be taken when drawing conclusions, since the statistical significance of these Year 2 gender differences is unknown. It is interesting to note, however, that girls in the comparison group do *not* report being more confident at post-test. In fact, their mean scores decreased slightly at post-test. This illustrates that female MVP participants appeared to have a particularly strong reaction to the Program during Year 2 in terms of their level of self-efficacy or confidence.

Table 4				
SEV SCALE				
Mean Scores by Gender and Group				
<i>(Higher mean scores indicate higher levels of self-efficacy)</i>				
	Treatment Group Mean		Comparison Group Mean	
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
Pre-Test	3.71	3.5	3.81	3.59
Post-Test	4.02	3.83	3.73	3.69
Change from Pre- to Post-Test	0.32	0.33	-0.08	0.1
	Difference Between Girls' and Boys' Mean Scores		Differences Between Girls' and Boys' Mean Scores	
Pre-Test	0.21		0.22	
Post-Test	0.19		0.04	

Student Perceptions of Attitudes Among Their Peers

In Year 2, an experimental section was added to the *MVP Survey*. While a majority of questions on the survey were the same for boys and girls, Part IV of the survey was designed to gauge girls' and boys' responses separately.

In Part IV of the survey, young women and men are asked to respond to two sets of seven statements. These statements are different in the female and male versions of the survey. Each statement is followed by a five point, Likert-type scale response set ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." The first set of statements (Part A) asks students to describe *their own* attitudes regarding gender violence. The next set of questions (Part B) includes the same seven statements as the first set, but students are asked to choose the response that indicates how they think "*the average male [or female] student at your school*" would respond. For these statements, lower mean scores correspond

with ignorant or sexist attitudes and are undesirable from a programmatic standpoint. The statements are not meant to comprise a scale.

The idea behind including this experimental section was to try to understand if students judge or perceive their peers as being more sexist, or more accepting of sexist ideas and violent behaviors, than themselves. The hypothesis is that students typically do have this perception of their peers, and that this can contribute to the pressure that many young men and women feel to behave in inappropriate ways. The idea that men do not (or should not) care about women, or that they are not (or should not be) sensitive to the sexist images, stereotypes, and behaviors around them is part of what MVP tries to deconstruct during its training. For example, MVP re-frames the issue of male violence against women as a *man's issue* and emphasizes the potential of males as helpful bystanders rather than potential perpetrators. MVP also provides young people with the opportunity to discuss their feelings about these issues with their peers. In terms of Program impact, one would hypothesize that after training, MVP participants would have more complete knowledge about (and therefore an improved perception regarding) the “real” attitudes of their peers.

Because there was such a low N for each group once the sample was split between treatment and comparison groups and further split by gender, the power of the statistical analysis of the data was low. It is likely that statistically significant results could not be detected with such small sample sizes. Thus, the results described here are purely descriptive but may be instructive nonetheless.

At pre-test, the seven variables measuring treatment group males' *own attitudes* were associated with higher mean scores than corresponding variables measuring their *perceptions of other males' attitudes*. At post-test, the same was true – after MVP Program participation, male respondents from the treatment group still felt that their personal attitudes were less sexist than the attitudes of their male peers. However, at post-test, mean scores for the variables measuring respondents' perceptions of others were higher than at pre-test. After Program participation, males in the treatment group had a more positive perception of the attitudes held by other males in their peer group. This was true for five out of the seven variables (see Table 5).

In the comparison group, the same picture did not emerge for male respondents. Mean scores on the variables measuring males' *own attitudes* were higher than the mean scores measuring *their perceptions of others' attitudes* at pre- and post-test, just as true with the treatment group. However, mean scores for the variables measuring perceptions of others' attitudes did not rise from pre-test to post-test as they did among the treatment group boys. In fact, mean scores for five of seven of these variables actually went down, meaning that at post-test, young men in the comparison group had worse perceptions of their peers' attitudes than at pre-test.

Table 5								
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELF/OTHER								
Boys' Mean Scores by Group								
<i>(Lower mean scores indicate sexist or ignorant attitudes regarding gender violence)</i>								
Treatment Group Mean Scores					Comparison Group Mean Scores			
Variable	Self Pre	Self Post	Other Pre	Other Post	Self Pre	Self Post	Other Pre	Other Post
1	4.40	4.54	2.92	2.94	4.31	4.52	3.42	3.10
2	3.62	3.88	2.84	2.83	3.85	3.84	3.28	3.08
3	3.39	3.52	2.54	2.66	3.54	3.72	3.12	2.84
4	3.72	3.88	2.52	2.46	3.58	3.88	2.96	3.08
5	2.67	3.32	1.99	2.24	2.65	3.04	2.27	2.48
6	4.07	4.24	2.79	3.17	4.08	4.28	3.23	3.12
7	2.73	2.84	1.92	1.99	3.15	2.96	2.69	1.96

For girls in the treatment group, the mean scores for variables measuring *their own attitudes* regarding gender violence were higher than the mean scores for variables measuring *perceptions of their peers' attitudes* at pre-test. At post-test, the same was true for this treatment group – girls still rated their own attitudes more favorably than the attitudes of their female counterparts. However, mean scores for five of seven variables measuring perceptions of others' attitudes increased from pre- to post-test, indicating that female MVP participants viewed their peers as less sexist and less accepting of sexist behaviors and attitudes after training (see Table 6).

Table 6								
STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF SELF/OTHER								
Girls' Mean Scores by Group								
<i>(Lower mean scores indicate sexist or ignorant attitudes regarding gender violence)</i>								
Treatment Group Mean Scores					Comparison Group Mean Scores			
Variable	Self Pre	Self Post	Other Pre	Other Post	Self Pre	Self Post	Other Pre	Other Post
1	3.31	3.55	2.70	2.58	3.43	3.43	2.98	2.68
2	3.72	3.90	3.33	3.40	3.51	3.48	3.14	3.18
3	4.34	4.44	3.51	3.60	4.39	4.30	3.75	3.38
4	3.96	4.19	3.04	2.97	4.23	4.13	3.27	3.40
5	3.62	3.78	2.89	2.90	3.68	3.65	3.09	3.18
6	3.73	3.88	2.79	2.92	4.20	3.80	3.43	3.28
7	4.17	4.16	3.34	3.49	4.00	3.95	3.36	3.43

A slightly different story played out for females in the comparison group. Mean scores for the variables measuring girls' *own attitudes* toward gender violence were higher than the mean scores for variables

measuring *perceptions of their peers' attitudes* at both pre- and post-test. However, girls' own attitudes did not improve at post-test as did the attitudes of the treatment group females. In addition, mean scores for only four of the seven variables measuring perceptions of others' attitudes increased from pre- to post-test.

Again, the differences in mean scores discussed here are merely descriptive; however, they may be indicative of an important Program impact. Upon Program completion, the young women and men who participated in MVP exhibit a better understanding of attitudes concerning gender violence held by their peer groups. With this knowledge, they potentially could perceive that their own non-sexist attitudes and behaviors would find more support among their friends; consequently, they may feel less pressure to conform to gender stereotypes or to mimic sexist or unhealthy behaviors. As well, they may be more confident to "mentor" their peers and to intervene in situations involving gender violence. Conversely, students who are not exposed to MVP education may continue to perceive their environment and their peers as more accepting of sexist and violent behavior and may act accordingly.

Student Satisfaction

Student satisfaction with the MVP Program was measured at post-test through qualitative, open-ended questions on "Page 6" of the *MVP Survey* (Appendix C). This qualitative portion of the survey includes nine open-ended questions asking students to specify such things as their favorite and least favorite Program elements and to describe a situation, if applicable, when they might have felt uncomfortable or unsafe during MVP training. Student answers to each of the nine questions were categorized by letting themes emerge from the data. Response categories for each separate question were devised and data were also coded according to gender during data analysis. Finally, the number of responses in each category was tallied. To maintain the richness of the qualitative student responses, an extensive list of quotes representing each category was kept. "Page 6" data are summarized and presented in Appendix B.

Of the 155 post-test treatment group respondents, 139 (90 percent) completed the qualitative questionnaire. Of these, 56 were boys and 54 were girls. When taking into consideration the satisfaction data, it is important to keep in mind that students were allowed to give more than one answer for each question.

High levels of satisfaction with the MVP Program were reported by 2000-2001 MVP participants. Overall satisfaction levels regarding such things as materials, trainers, and Program atmosphere were consistent with those reported in Year 1. Eighty-five percent of student respondents said that they would recommend the MVP Program to their friends, while six percent reported thinking that the Program would be a "waste of time" for their friends. Over 90 percent of "Page 6" respondents reported having spoken with at least one person about the MVP Program. Friends were identified most frequently (by 65 percent of respondents), while family members came in a close second (63 percent of respondents talked to a family member about MVP). Nine percent of students said they talked to "no one" about the MVP Program.

When asked about their favorite part of the MVP Program, the most common response was class materials and exercises. Forty-six percent of students appreciated the video clips and interactive exercises during training sessions more than anything else in the Program. This is consistent with what was reported in Year 1. Thirty percent of Year 2 respondents specifically mentioned “class discussion” as one of their favorite things about MVP. Overall, students are quite clear that they favor class activities that allow them to hear about and understand their peers’ attitudes and perspectives related to the issue of adolescent gender violence. Personal knowledge gain and an increase in skills and confidence were mentioned by 20 percent of respondents as results of Program participation that they found favorable and important.

Students appreciate that the atmosphere created by the MVP approach fosters personal sharing among the students, which in turn allows them to get to know and understand one another better. Approximately 22 percent of students ranked the interactive, co-ed, confidential atmosphere as a favorite part of their MVP experience. In fact, nearly 40 percent of students favored the mixed-gender portion of MVP training over the single-gender sessions. Students also reported that the confidential nature of the sessions contributed to the environment in that they felt safe sharing their thoughts and learning about this difficult topic. A large majority of students (83 percent) said they felt comfortable and safe at all times during MVP training sessions.

Crucial to creating and maintaining this safe atmosphere are the MVP trainers themselves. Nearly 50 percent of students were impressed with and appreciated how the trainers related to them – not as students, but as equals. Students mentioned the trainers’ honesty, respectfulness, and understanding as important factors contributing to a positive student experience in MVP. Over 40 percent of students reported liking best the trainers’ down-to-earth personalities and their sense of humor. When asked directly to name their least favorite things about the MVP trainers, over half of the student respondents (55 percent) had nothing negative to say. Moreover, 15 percent of respondents complained that the worst thing about the trainers was that they were under time constraints and were not able to spend as much time with the students as the students would like. Clearly, this is a positive reflection on the MVP trainers, not a negative one.

As one would expect, students did identify some negative aspects about their participation in the Program. Eight percent said they learned nothing or had a bad experience in MVP. Just over 15 percent of students identified at least one instance of feeling uncomfortable during MVP training sessions. These respondents specifically mentioned the graphic nature of videos, feelings of vulnerability, and male-bashing as things that made them uneasy.

While many students thought that the atmosphere was the best part of the Program, others identified it as the worst. Asked to divulge their least favorite thing about the MVP Program, almost 30 percent of respondents said that certain aspects of the atmosphere and the presentation of materials were undesirable from time to time. Specifically, some students complained about the gender separation during parts of the MVP training; others saw certain aspects of the training as “repetitive”; and some found the Program message to be “one-sided.” Close to nine percent of students complained about male-bashing – a theme more prominent in the “Page 6” data this year than last. Seventeen percent of

respondents mentioned that the trainers could be biased and too opinionated at times, resulting in a diminished amount of student participation and input.

Once again, however, data reveal that the positives outweigh the negatives when it comes to student experiences with MVP. Over 90 percent of students said they learned something new or valuable as a result of their participation in the MVP Program. Over 40 percent of these students identified skill development as most important – that is, skills about how to be an active and effective bystander. For example, after Program training students reported knowing how to get involved in order to stop or prevent gender violence, how to analyze potentially violent situations and choose the best way to respond, and how to talk to and mentor others. Fifteen percent said that gaining factual information and knowledge was the most important aspect of MVP. Almost 20 percent of students claimed that their self-confidence had increased and their attitudes had changed as a result of MVP training, and this was the most important thing for them.

IV. FOCUS GROUP METHODS

The second year of evaluation activity at MVP Program also included follow-up research concerning the experience and well-being of young women who participate in the Program. Focus groups with girls who received MVP training during the 2000-2001 academic year were conducted with the primary goal being to continue to find ways to improve MVP's work with young women. Related objectives included: exploring the safety and well-being of female participants, including understanding the presence of secondary trauma and exploring whether girls feel overwhelmed or empowered by MVP's focus on bystander training; and investigating whether MVP participation engenders support among young women.

Sampling and Response

Three of the ten schools that received MVP training during 2000-2001 were selected for inclusion in the focus group research. These three sites comprised a typical-case convenience sample chosen for the study based on the assumption that they would provide rich information that was neither atypical nor extreme. As well, geographic location, demographics, and student accessibility were selection factors. These sites were representative of the population of students with which MVP works.

The young women from each site who participated in the focus groups were selected at random, and their participation was completely voluntary. A total of 19 girls were present during the focus groups: 9 from the first site; 7 from the second; and 3 from the third. Twelve of the focus group participants (63 percent) were African American or Latina, and 7 were Caucasian. Based on demographic data from the survey, young women of color may have been over-represented in this sample.

Focus Group Format

Focus groups were conducted at the school sites and lasted from 45 to 60 minutes each. Discussion was guided by an introductory question and three key questions. All focus group discussions were tape recorded, with the permission of the participants. Participants were told the purpose of the focus groups, and ground rules were established before each session began. For example, students were asked to refrain from personal disclosures, to be respectful while others were talking, and to respect one another's confidentiality. The young women were also advised that any disclosure that revealed that someone was in danger or that something illegal was taking or had taken place must be reported. Resource sheets were handed out to all participants prior to commencing the session.

V. FOCUS GROUP RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Secondary Trauma and the “Close Your Eyes” Exercise

The first key question was meant to assess girls’ opinion of and reaction to “Close Your Eyes” (CYE), a specific exercise that MVP encourages students to do at the beginning of Program training in order to gain empathy for female victims and to underscore the importance of the role of the bystander. CYE is a visualization exercise in which students are asked to close their eyes and to picture a girl or woman they love— their mother, sister, girlfriend. Next, they are told to imagine that girl or woman being abused, beaten, or sexually assaulted by a man. With eyes shut, they are also told to imagine that there is a bystander present, and that that person could help but decides to do nothing. When participants open their eyes, they are asked how they felt about visualizing the person they loved being hurt. Then, they are asked to describe how they felt about the bystander who refused to assist their loved one. Students have remarked that this is a very effective exercise for helping them to understand the need for bystander intervention and to recognize their personal responsibility as bystanders. However, it is also thought that this exercise might subject survivors to unnecessary secondary trauma.

In order to facilitate discussion around this subject, participants were handed a piece of paper with three statements on it about the CYE exercise. The young women were asked to read the statements, choose the one they agreed with most, and explain their choice. Students were asked to write down their response before group discussion took place.

Ten of the 16 young women who wrote down their answers felt that the CYE exercise was helpful. In general, those who answered this way believed that the exercise “personalizes the problem,” provides a “common starting point for discussion,” and motivates participants to “want to do something” to prevent gender violence.

A quarter of respondents said that they felt the exercise is both helpful and problematic. Their feeling was that while CYE opens people’s eyes, it also could be potentially harmful, because there was no real system in place through MVP to address a young women’s negative reaction, should it occur. One respondent said that even though she did not actively participate in the exercise (but didn’t leave the room) the experience was painful for her. These respondents agreed that there was no real way to safeguard against this possibility and that giving people the option to leave the room or to not participate was neither realistic nor effective. As one participant put it,

“I know personally I chose not to do it, but I also chose not to leave. Especially with a group of people who you don’t really know and don’t really trust – especially the guys – leaving in the first day is weird. I wouldn’t have been able to do that. I think you need to find some balance about how much the course is about addressing the past trauma which is one of the reasons that a lot of women do things like MVP, and how much of it is an education course, simply leadership.”

Only one focus group respondent said that the CYE exercise should be eliminated. Instead, focus group respondents suggested that the exercise should take place in the all-girl portion of the training sessions, since young women are more comfortable sharing personal information in single gender settings. Further recommendations to help avoid secondary trauma or to more effectively deal with it include:

- Reinforce participants' option to opt out of the CYE visualization exercise.
- At the conclusion of the exercise, emphasize that there are school and community resources available to anyone who was disturbed by the exercise. Provide a list of these resources.
- Encourage schools to provide support groups for girls.

Empowering Female Participants

Besides secondary trauma, a concern about young women's participation in the MVP Program has been whether or not bystander education is an effective or appropriate agenda for them. Accordingly, the second key focus group question asked, "How did being in MVP make you feeling about being female in our society?" The purpose was to more clearly understand whether the young women who participate in the Program generally feel more overwhelmed or more empowered after completing MVP training.

Survey data from both the first and second years of program evaluation of MVP demonstrate that girls' self-efficacy regarding their ability to interrupt and confront gender violence increases, on the average, after Program training. Year 2 focus group data further illuminate how young women respond to MVP's unique training approach.

Young women from the three separate focus group sessions were consistent in their responses to this line of questioning. Girls reported feeling "like victims" and being scared, upset, and a little disempowered during the initial MVP training sessions when they were learning the facts and statistics about men's violence against women. One young woman stated, "It got me kind of, well, not *upset*, but just I felt *bad*, because all this stuff is happening to *us*." Another stated, "I didn't feel like I was a victim, but I felt like I was going to be a victim sooner or later."

As training progressed, however, these young women said that MVP's focus shifted to learning about options and how to help people. They said this was an important component of the Program and that it made them feel safer and more empowered. When explaining the experience, one participant put it this way:

"I think for a little while [MVP training] brings you back a little bit – like, you become hypersensitive. I think it sort of wears off, though. For a little while it makes you more sensitive, and it makes you feel a little weaker just because you're hit in the face with a lot of stuff you just skim over normally that you don't want to deal with. But then I think you kind of bounce back stronger, just because I think it's better to

know about something – I mean, even though you're more uncomfortable, you still have a better grip on what is actually going on."

Another young woman said that in itself, having the facts about male violence is not going to make you feel safer. She agreed that, to her, the most important part of the Program was learning how to do something about it:

"Without the information we got and the help we got to try and think of things to do in different situations, it's easy to feel overpowered by the pure facts, percentages, and stuff like that. So I think that in the beginning, as we were just sitting there saying, 'This is the problem. These are the issues. This is what happens. These women didn't see it coming,' I think that's really a lot to handle at one time. But then we moved more into thinking about it as, 'This is the problem. No one's denying this is a problem, but now we're going to think about how you would deal with it.' So even if at the beginning I felt a little overwhelmed, by the end I was feeling maybe not as comfortable as before, but more prepared."

One of her classmates responded:

"I sort of experienced the same thing. After one of the first or second groups we did, I remember talking to one of the guys from the group later outside, and we both agreed that it was really scary. But then later, after you go through that, when we start doing the prevention stuff, then it was a lot easier and made me more comfortable. I felt better about it."

Other participants agreed that, as young women, much of what they learned in MVP about definitions of abuse and prevalence statistics regarding male violence was review for them. What set MVP apart for them, in an important and beneficial way, was the bystander training that gave them safe options and specific training for dealing with situations involving gender violence.

Like survey respondents, focus group participants did not report feeling completely comfortable with or prepared to intervene. As was true for other Program participants interviewed during the Year 1 evaluation, focus group participants certainly felt the responsibility to be active bystanders and mentors but reported being worried about their ability to do so.

"I feel empowered, but more powerless. There's a struggle between, like, I'm prepared and I know what to do in a situation, but now I see more situations that I am not prepared to deal with. Do you know what I mean? I'm still not comfortable, and don't think I ever could be

comfortable dealing with these issues. So in a way, I'm hypersensitive to the idea of having to deal with those situations. So there's sort of a push-pull thing where I am empowered by MVP, but I don't want to use any power. I'm more worried about having to use it."

Another commented:

"There's a little bit of being scared of being called a bitch or something like that – seriously, like every time you step up to people you don't know. Not having done it yet, I can totally understand how that's petrifying. Because I see very few incidents where I would want to do anything, but the question is, would I if it got worse? And that really takes a lot of soul-searching."

To follow up on this issue, focus group participants were asked if they felt that having the training, then, or being expected to be bystanders was burdensome in any way. Several respondents did not express that they felt burdened by the idea of being active bystanders. Those who did verified that their insecurities would not necessarily inhibit them from doing the right thing. This was similar to data found during Year 1 interviews with MVP students. The following quotes from two young women best exemplify this attitude:

"I wouldn't classify it as a burden. Like, sometimes I imagine situations, and I'm like, 'I really wish I didn't have to be dealing with that.' It's not necessarily something that is discouraging, although it doesn't feel good."

"It could be a burden without being a bad burden. It's frustrating. I can't really step in unless I see something a little more concrete, but it still worries me. So that's a burden, but it's not a burden that I wouldn't choose to have."

Importantly, the girls who participated in focus groups also insisted that the array of options taught by MVP included more manageable "intervention" strategies, such as talking with friends. These students reported feeling empowered to act as a result of MVP training and to make a difference in the lives of their peer groups and friends. The first respondent quoted below states that MVP did not necessarily provide adequate preparation to physically interrupt abusive behavior, but she mentions "easier" ways to be involved as a bystander or mentor.

"I feel like I can do more, sort of, less involved things. Like, for violence prevention week here at school I did some stuff about getting information out to people about abusive relationships and hotline numbers and stuff like that. And MVP definitely makes that easier and gives me resources to use for that. But that's not personal-level

stuff, which is where it gets really difficult. I think MVP's an opening to get involved with things, but not in terms of, like, hallway dynamics and stuff like that."

Another young woman agreed that the less difficult (or less confrontational) tasks, such as mentoring, are important:

"I learned that you can talk to people – sit and talk with them and have a conversation and just tell them that there are resources for them out there... Even if it's just something little, like helping a friend through a relationship or something. Every little bit does make a difference."

Still others felt more confident in their ability to handle potentially more stressful and/or combative situations and to be potent activists:

"I feel like things can be changed, and I can be a part of that. Like, I'm not like, 'Oh, this issue is just too big for all of us.' And in the hallway, I do feel kind of uncomfortable, but at the same time, that's not really an issue. It's not fun, but I totally see myself getting involved or taking action as kind of a given at this point. And I've seen some things changing in relationships of friends of mine, just by having conversations and thinking about things like that. So I see myself having an impact."

Another important point reiterated during focus group discussion was the fact that girls do not have to act alone or take the burden on themselves. MVP stresses that a perfectly acceptable intervention option is to find help from others, which can make girls feel more comfortable in their role as bystander.

"I feel more able to get someone else to help, too – to find the right person to go to for help. I think that that's really important, too, because I have more of a sense that I don't have to stand in front of two people throwing punches in order to be helpful."

Focus group participants underscored the fact that training, practice, and preparation were helpful in terms of making them feel more empowered and capable. In one group (N=7), this issue was discussed in greater depth than the other groups. These young women reported feeling strongly that they could use more practice and more outlets to use their training, and they recommended this as a way to counteract any insecurities or lack of confidence that they may still feel about intervening. They felt this would make them less hesitant and feel more empowered to act. While many felt enthusiastic about MVP training and their potential as bystanders and mentors, they claimed that they did not have the outlets they desired to spread the word, as it were, or to be effective mentors.

Data relating to this line of questioning clearly reveal the importance of options and skill building through bystander training as a protective factor against feelings of dismay, hopelessness, or being overwhelmed. As well, they reiterate the importance of preparation and practice to further bolster self-efficacy. In future work with girls, MVP should be sure to spend significant time going over *Playbook* options to prevent girls from feeling overwhelmed and disempowered. Further, MVP should continue their efforts to provide effective follow-up with students who have received MVP awareness-raising training, including train-the-trainer and student mentor workshops. In this way, MVP students may further increase their levels of confidence and have the opportunity to effect change in their school and peer group environments.

Building Support Among Young Women Who Participate in MVP

One of MVP's goals is to encourage its female participants to be more supportive of one another and to mentor their classmates. Consequently, one of the objectives of this focus group research was to understand if and how MVP might serve as a catalyst for that support. Hence, focus group participants were asked a third key question: "How do you feel about other young women now that you've been through the MVP Program?"

Focus group participants from each of the three sites did not feel that there was a high level of support among girls in their schools, nor a great deal of opportunity for this support to be fostered. Students mentioned competition among girls and the fact that "everything has to be co-ed" as barriers to sisterhood or high levels of bonding among the female student body. At one site (N=9), the young women showed little interest in this topic and did not have much to say. They did not feel that MVP particularly helped them to be more supportive of girls, nor were they interested in exploring how MVP could help them do that.

But focus group data reveal that at other sites, MVP participation made these young women more attuned to and sensitive about the actions and circumstances of other young women. On the down side, one participant admitted that MVP training made her feel a little bit *more* judgmental about the behaviors of other girls, even *disappointed* in their actions and behaviors. Another said that what she learned in MVP magnified her sadness about the situation of young women:

"It makes me really sad about, like, I guess middle school/high school and what that does to girls. And I think MVP just magnifies that. It seems it's such a harmful time for girls. There are so many girls who are so insecure and so unhappy. I think MVP makes me notice that more, because it makes me notice what's coming out of this insecurity – and it's not just shallow. It results in some of these [gender violence] problems."

Other reactions were more positive and hopeful. Some reported that their newfound awareness left them feeling more connected with the girls in their schools and peer groups after participating in MVP. Specific MVP materials and exercises seem to have contributed to this awareness and personal

attitude change. Consistent with satisfaction data from both Year 1 and Year 2, these young women spoke enthusiastically about activities such as the “Box Exercise” and its impact on them. A couple of respondents noted that they were less apt to victim blame and began seeing themselves more in a productive, peer mentor-type role after exposure to MVP training. These attitudes are exemplified in the quotes below.

“I have always felt I look down upon girls who don’t dress appropriately or who may act different around guys and stuff. I guess I shouldn’t look down upon them, and I should be accepting and maybe tell them they shouldn’t change how they act and how they dress to please someone else.”

“I think MVP provided me with ideas or ways to be more supportive of girls. I definitely got closer to people, and I know more people now because of it. It’s easier for me to be more supportive of them, which helps me get closer to their friends and their groups and stuff. So I think that helped the actually being supportive thing – and wanting to be supportive of girls.”

One group in particular (N=7) discussed their desire for more time to discuss issues of interest and importance to girls *with just girls*. They mentioned wanting to talk more in-depth about gender violence specifically, but also just about the experience of being a young woman in today’s society and all the pressures and problems that go along with it. While this may not be something that could be directly addressed within the confines and structure of MVP basic awareness-raising training, one recommendation is for MVP to encourage schools to provide such support groups for their young women. Other suggestions for MVP to enhance its work with girls, based on this information, include using the “Box” more specifically as a way to talk about and foster support among young women. For example, perhaps part of the discussion during this exercise could focus on creating “sisterhood” and helping other, “box-type” girls. Lastly, since girls exhibit a more advanced and sophisticated understanding about gender violence than their male counterparts, MVP may inspire girls to be more supportive of one another through more advanced-level exercises and in-depth discussions than are used with boys.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Findings from this second year evaluation of MVP illustrate that the Program is effective in realizing its goals and reaching its students. Program participation increases levels of student knowledge and awareness about gender violence, improves student attitudes related to gender violence, and increases student self-efficacy regarding their ability to intervene in and prevent male violence against women. Statistical analyses of the survey sections designed to measure these changes and improvements demonstrated statistically significant differences between treatment and comparison groups in every instance. The comparison group design, new to the Year 2 evaluation, allows a greater level of confidence that these differences are the result of the MVP Program and not some other factor.

Data from the new survey section (Part IV) suggest that Program participation may also change student perceptions about peer group attitudes and norms. While statistical confirmation of these changes may be necessary before conclusions can be drawn, these results have the potential to be important given that adolescents are known to be highly influenced by their peer groups. Understanding that fellow students are not as approving of sexism and inappropriate behavior toward women may make it easier for MVP participants to act as the empowered bystanders that MVP wants them to be.

Qualitative survey data illustrate that students are highly satisfied with the MVP Program. These data clearly show that students welcome the opportunity to talk with their peers about the subject of gender violence and appreciate the knowledge and skills they feel they gain through MVP training. Overall, students are happy with MVP's philosophical approach as well as its content and use of engaging, contemporary materials.

Gender differences among participants are present here as they were in the Year 1 evaluation of MVP, but they manifest somewhat differently. First, no significant gender differences were found when analyzing the knowledge variables, as was the case in Year 1. This may result from the fact that a couple of the questions measuring knowledge on the Year 2 survey were changed due to results from the Year 1 evaluation. Second, young women exhibited a higher level of self-efficacy than young men at both pre- and post-test in Year 2. This difference did not emerge during last year's analysis. Although the difference is not statistically confirmed, these particular results do indicate that participation in the Program and the Program's emphasis on bystander education do not seem to disempower or be inappropriate for female students. These results may be the product of programmatic changes that MVP has made to be more responsive and appropriate for its female participants. Or, they could be the result of this particular population of students. Finally, young women enter and exit the MVP Program training with better attitudes than young men and, based on mean scores, their improvement from pre- to post-test is less marked than that of male participants. This finding is consistent with Year 1 results. Further program evaluation will continue to shed light on the differences between the experiences of girls and boys in MVP.

Focus groups provided evidence that, on the whole, young women are doing quite well in MVP. In fact, for the first time data allude to the fact that MVP's bystander approach is perhaps exactly what is responsible for the feelings of safety and empowerment that young women feel after training. The bystander component appears to counteract girls' initial feelings of being overwhelmed or fearful about the prevalence of gender violence. Focus group data also reinforce the need for follow-up to basic awareness-raising training such as TTT and once again show that young women may benefit from a more sophisticated level of knowledge training from MVP.

Certainly, data from this second year of evaluation activity tell their own powerful tale. Though limited by a small comparison sample, the comparison group design is an important improvement over Year 1. With this design, the positive impacts detailed above can be attributed more emphatically to the MVP Program. Added to this, results regarding knowledge, attitudes, and self-efficacy were proven to be robust using multiple analytic procedures. As well, qualitative data insert the voice of the MVP participant into the evaluation.

But the story becomes even more compelling when coupled with findings from the first year of evaluation activity. The results of the Year 1 evaluation were largely confirmed and replicated in the Year 2 study, underscoring the effectiveness and potential of the MVP Program. Similarly, Year 2 results are couched in the extensive contextual data from Year 1. The argument concerning MVP's effectiveness is strengthened by a multi-method, multi-level, and multi-year evaluation approach that provides a clearer, more comprehensive picture of the Program and its impact than could be realized through a pre/post survey or a single year of program evaluation alone. A third year of evaluation activity, which replicates the quasi-experimental design described here, is currently underway at MVP. Mounting evidence from this multi-year approach, including the impressive results reported here, builds a strong case for the support, replication, and expansion of the MVP Program. The case for MVP would be additionally strengthened with an investigation into the longer-term impact(s) of their Program. In the future, MVP should consider conducting follow-up research with participants.

APPENDIX A

Principal Component Factor Loadings for the AV Scale			
Factor Loading Values and Pre-test		Factor Loading Values at Post-test	
PRE AV1	.233	POST AV1	.433
PRE AV2	.474	POST AV2	.515
PRE AV3	.463	POST AV3	.538
PRE AV4	.272	POST AV4	.353
PRE AV5	.377	POST AV5	.495
PRE AV6	.488	POST AV6	.414
PRE AV7	.433	POST AV7	.446
PRE AV8	.544	POST AV8	.632
PRE AV9	.494	POST AV9	.530
PRE AV10	.459	POST AV10	.631
PRE AV11	.646	POST AV11	.693
PRE AV12	.586	POST AV12	.692
PRE AV13	.715	POST AV13	.696
PRE AV14	.675	POST AV14	.691
PRE AV15	.458	POST AV15	.594
PRE AV16	.461	POST AV16	.473

Principal Component Factor Loadings for the SEV Scale			
Factor Loading Values and Pre-test		Factor Loading Values at Post-test	
PRE SEV1	.621	POST SEV1	.592
PRE SEV2	.458	POST SEV2	.481
PRE SEV3	.654	POST SEV3	.605
PRE SEV4	.554	POST SEV4	.635
PRE SEV5	.594	POST SEV5	.553
PRE SEV6	.491	POST SEV6	.664
PRE SEV7	.590	POST SEV7	.566
PRE SEV8	.504	POST SEV8	.578
PRE SEV9	.672	POST SEV9	.708
PRE SEV10	.519	POST SEV10	.564
PRE SEV11	.689	POST SEV11	.649

APPENDIX B

2000-2001 MVP EVALUATION
Results from the Qualitative (“pg.6”) Survey Data

Question 1: “Please write down one or two of your **favorite** things about the MVP program and training sessions.”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M) ⁴	PERCENTAGE ⁵
A) The Materials and Exercises • Videos (28) • Games/Exercises (27)	64 (36,28)	46.04
B) Class Discussion (learning from peers, sharing opinions and experiences)	42 (31,11)	30.22
C) The Atmosphere (how the MVP Program was presented and the people involved)	30 (17,13)	21.58
D) Personal Knowledge Gain (facts and statistics)	20 (8,12)	14.39
E) Confidence in Skills and Ability	10 (5,5)	7.19
F) The Trainers	9 (2,7)	6.47
G) Got out of Class	4 (1,3)	2.88

Quotes:

A) Videos put the topics we discuss in perspective so we can actually see that this actually happens every day in society... I enjoyed analyzing movies to find harassment prevention techniques... The role plays brought the situations to life and helped us brainstorm answers... My favorite thing was when we did the scenarios. It got us thinking about things that I have never thought of and prepared us for different options in case we were ever in the situation... I liked the Fishbowl activity because we got to see how the other gender felt about certain issues and it raised awareness.

⁴ Out of the 155 students who filled out post-test surveys, 139 filled out the pg. 6 questions. The numbers given are out of 139 total.

⁵ Percentages will not total 100, because students were allowed to respond with more than one answer.

- B)** I learned more in this Program, because I heard things from other students and their perspectives... I enjoyed being able to express feelings about these subjects – I like to know that my opinion and experiences count... The group discussions gave us a chance to learn from each other... I like to hear what my peers think... I liked the class discussions, because you really don't talk about stuff like that to your friends enough... I liked getting to voice my opinions.
- C)** I liked how they presented it – it was more interactive rather than them just blabbing away... I liked addressing such topics in a male/female environment; most other programs dealing with these issues do not mix gender. It helped gain perspective... I liked the fact that the Program doesn't eliminate guys... I liked that we had the confidentiality... I liked how kids from all different groups in school were part of the Program so that we could see everyone's opinion... I got to meet and connect with girls/guys who I normally would never talk to.
- D)** MVP challenged our thinking by giving us facts and statistics... Learning the statistics made things more real... I personally enjoyed the facts given, because it gave a realistic idea of the problem... In MVP, we looked in to things deeper than normal... I liked all the information I received on different types of violence towards women and ways to prevent it.
- E)** They taught me what to do in real life situations with girls and friends... I liked it when we talk about how to prevent violence and how I can contribute to violence prevention – it's important to me, because I can use it in the future... I can prevent anything from happening... My mother was just recently physically battered, and taking this class helped me to see the signs of abuse before anything else happens.
- F)** The trainers talked realistically... The leaders were young and “hip” and easy to open up to... The trainers were very good at relating to us, and therefor taught very well... The mentors treat you like you are a family against violence... My favorite thing was the two peer leaders – they were a bunch of fun and it made things easier to learn.
- G)** The best thing about MVP was it got me out of class... It got us out of theology class... I got out of school.

Question 2: “What did you like **least** about the MVP program and training sessions?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) Atmosphere/Presentation	41 (25,16)	29.5
B) No Complaints	34 (12,22)	24.46
C) Not Enough Time/Not Enough Training Sessions	18 (13,5)	12.95
D) Class Content, Topics, Materials	15 (7,8)	10.79
E) Trainers’ Approach and Attitudes	12 (10,2)	8.63
F) Male Bashing	12 (4,8)	8.63
H) Miscellaneous <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missed School • Already Knew Material • Filling Out Surveys 	7 (5,2)	5.04

Quotes:

- A) Some of the ways they presented the information was not all real to us... I think boys and girls should be kept together, because in life we are together, and that’s where these things happen... The program was very one-sided... I thought the unit on homosexuality was very poorly done. It was presented with the assumption that we were all straight and homophobic... I didn’t like that overanalyzing things and reading the Playbook – it became too repetitive... I think that a lot of the sessions were too spaced out and that caused a lot of people to forget what they learned in an earlier session... I think that the women leaders should be more involved in our sessions. We’re an all-male group, but I still feel the female perspective is important.
- B) Everything was awesome... I can’t find anything that was wrong with the Program... Nothing – I can’t imagine a better program... Actually, there was nothing wrong – everything was fun and educational... There wasn’t anything bad about the Program.
- C) There was never enough time to discuss everything – it affected my learning because things were rushed and people didn’t get to talk... It was too short – the time was too short and so were the weeks that we had MVP. There should have been more sessions... We didn’t have time to go deeply into a lot of things – maybe schedule more appointments... We did not have enough time to fully discuss or develop our ideas. It made us feel like we had no say in the class... I liked everything, but we could have had more meetings.
- D) I didn’t like the Playbook, because although it got you started, many situations were not too interesting... I did not like some of the movies, because they were very graphic and really “freaked”

me out... We should have had more movies... One thing I didn't like was that they only talk about abuse – there's other things than abuse... I didn't like the icebreakers – I wasn't sure why we needed to make the connection between mentors in training and friendships... Actual prevention wasn't the key issue – no prevention instruction was given... Sometimes when we read scenarios we focused too much on what we could do instead of learning how to act upon the right decision.

- E)** What I didn't really like was that the trainers weren't voicing their "opinions", they were saying "this is how it is and you have to follow it." I think it was bad, because it got a lot of people mad in my class... At times I felt almost bad about myself if I didn't feel the same way as MVP on certain subjects... There were times I felt like I was being told how to think and what to think about certain topics discussed. To fix this, maybe the MVP trainers shouldn't come off as strong... Sometimes when people spoke they got off the topic and the trainers wouldn't bring them back to the topic. I know it's rude to interrupt, but it was needed.
- F)** I didn't agree with all of the male-bashing done. I thought (at one point) that I need to be worried about my boyfriend maybe raping me... I thought it was way too hard on males, to the point I felt as if I was being sexually harassed as a male being in the room. It got better as the Program went along... I hated how they tried to brainwash us into believing that men are bad... I felt most of the time that I was being degraded as a man... They made it feel as if it was my fault, personally, that women are beaten.
- G)** Most of what they told me I already knew... Maybe have shorter sessions so we wouldn't miss so much school at one time... The worst part of the Program is filling out these surveys.

Question 3: “What was the most important thing or skill you learned in the MVP program?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) Skills (how to handle situations, how to treat women better, “the art of distraction”)	56 (26,30)	40.29
B) Confidence/Self Change	26 (20,6)	18.71
C) Fact and Information about Gender Violence	23 (10,13)	16.55
D) Awareness and Understanding	21 (16,5)	15.11
E) Didn't Learn Anything New or Had a Bad Experience	11 (5,6)	7.91
F) Responsibility/Duty To Intervene	10 (5,5)	7.19

Quotes:

- A) How to get involved even if it is someone I do not know... I learned how to stop a fight without really getting involved. It is important because I have been in a situation like that before, and I didn't know what to do, so I did nothing... We learned to be able to analyze potentially dangerous situations and how to diffuse situations in which we might be bystanders... I learned how to talk to people about violence... The most important thing I learned was the different ways to occupy someone to help another person get out of the violent or abusive situation... I learned not to be controlling... How to pass my knowledge on to others was the most important thing I learned... I learned to look around and notice things...
- B) The class reminded me to stand up for what I believe in... I learned to have confidence in myself that I can stop violence and how to take care of myself if I end up in a situation I don't think I have control over... I feel I could prevent violence... I feel empowered as a bystander. My responsibility as a member of society is much clearer – as are the skills required to attempt to intervene... I can help someone in need. I can support them and get them out of a bad situation.
- C) I learned exactly what harassment was and now I am able to realize when girls are being harassed... I am glad that I learned the definition of sexual assault. I may not agree 100%, but at least I know what the law says... The most important thing was learning the cycle of anger and violence in relationships, because it will help me see if it starts happening to me or one close to

me... What I learned best was definitions and different kinds of rape. It makes it so I know I can help a friend if she thinks she has been raped.

- D)** Men's violence against women is an every day, every minute struggle in one way or another. It helped me understand that statistics weren't just numbers on a paper – they are people – women like my friends, mother, grandmother, etc... The statistics about rape were important to me because they raised awareness about it to me for college next year... I learned that girls get hit a lot – I never knew they did... The most important thing was realizing the fears most women have and what they really think about the subject... I look at TV commercials and videos differently and notice how they portray women...
- E)** The only reason I can't think of something I have learned is because I had a fairly broad knowledge and understanding of gender violence before the Program... I pretty much knew everything besides some statistics... Nothing – to me it was common sense... I learned a lot but none of it seemed valuable at all to me. Now I am a lot more critical with my guy friends and their behavior. That just makes me not have a good time with them... I learned that "MVP" was a brainwashing service... You had to yell to be heard in MVP – I don't have the patience to sit in a class and not be heard.
- F)** The skill that I learned in the Program is to become a leader – to be the one to step into a situation when someone may be in trouble... If my friends are making dirty jokes about a girl, I must step in and ask them to stop... I learned not to be a bystander... It taught me to do something in these situations... We should have the courage to help other girls.

Question 4: “During any of your MVP sessions, did you ever feel uncomfortable or unsafe?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) No.	115 (63,52)	82.73
B) Yes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Materials (videos)• A greater sense of being “at risk” (for females)• Heterosexual bias in MVP’s presentation• When ‘male bashing’ occurred (for males)	21 (11,10)	15.11

Quotes:

A) I felt completely safe... I was extremely comfortable at all times... I trusted everyone there... It felt really confidential... I felt comfortable and safe at all times, because they were only informing us.

B) I felt uncomfortable for the people in the class that did go through the things we were talking about... When we talked about statistics and facts and about how many girls get raped at college I was scared, because that’ll be me next year... The rape scene made me uncomfortable, because that is not something you usually see in a school... When I saw how boys reacted to truths about violence and such, I saw I was in the minority and that made me uncomfortable... I felt uncomfortable when we had to imagine a woman really close to us getting hurt. It made me scared to even know it could happen... I felt we were looking down upon males and that females can do no wrong... The entire time I felt uncomfortable. I have strong beliefs and ideas, and I felt like MVP totally disagrees with some of my principles... I do think that there’s a heterosexual bias during the class on homophobia that should be made less obvious.

Question 5: “What did you like **most** about your MVP trainers?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) How they treated us/related to us	68 (31,37)	48.92
• Truthful, Honest, Sharing,	37 (17,20)	
Good listeners		
• Understanding and	18 (8,10)	
Respectful		
• Not Condescending nor	10 (4,6)	
Authoritative		
• Miscellaneous	3 (2,1)	
B) Their Personalities	60 (31,29)	43.17
C) Their Teaching Skills	14 (11,3)	10.07
D) Their Knowledge	10 (7,3)	7.19
E) Miscellaneous	9 (8,1)	6.47
F) Their Age	5 (3,2)	3.60
G) Ambivalent/Didn't Like Trainers	4 (3,1)	2.88

Quotes:

- A)** They told the truth, and it helped get their message across... They were open and shared stories with us... They listened to what we had to say... They kept it real... I liked that they were honest, frank, and actually listened to what we had to say... I liked the fact that they could relate to us and talk to us as peers rather than as students... I like how they didn't act superior... They were respectful of us and didn't judge us... They encouraged us... They showed respect to everyone in the group.
- B)** They were really nice and helpful... They were very personable... They were kind and communicative... They were very concerned... They were down-to-earth, cool people... They had personality and sense of humor while at the same time being serious about the topic... They were funny.
- C)** They were great teachers... They did not just tell us “rape is bad,” they gave us examples and reasons... They explained things and showed us exactly how and what things were like around us... They were interactive and got the class involved but didn't push the information or opinions... They were good at connecting with us but still able to control us and teach us.

- D) They had lots of information and stories to share with us that were very helpful... They always wanted to tell us more about a given subject... I liked that they knew what they were talking about... They were very informative people... They were all informed on the topic... They offered insight into things I had never thought of before.
- E) They were of different sexes and ethnicities... I think they care deeply for what they do, and their dedication and love for their work shows... They were committed.
- F) It was good that they weren't so-called teachers but were closer to our age so it made it easier to talk to them... They were young... They were close to our age, and I could talk to them... They were young and in style.
- G) I was indifferent about the trainers... I did not like them.

Question 6: “What did you like **least** about your MVP trainers?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) Nothing bad to say	77 (34,43)	55.40
B) How the trainers treated us/related to us	23 (16,7)	16.55
C) Administration Constraints	20 (14,6)	14.39
D) Teaching Skills	8 (5,3)	5.76

Quotes:

- A) I can't think of anything I didn't like... I thought they were great... Nothing really stands out to me – everything went pretty smoothly... Nothing – they spoiled us... I enjoyed being with them... They were pretty cool.
- B) They never let us fully explain our thoughts. They would always cut us off... Some of them had attitudes and would not let us finish explaining ourselves... Sometimes they came on too strong with their ideas... The leaders seemed very biased... They were overpowering and very demanding sometimes... They tried to force their opinion on you, like it was the only way... the female trainer always stood up for women and seems to hate men... They got aggravated with us too fast... They didn't open up to us as much... One of the trainers was rude.
- C) Sometimes they did not give everyone a chance to speak, although I realize there were time constraints... They always seemed in such a rush to move to the next topic, like they never had enough time... It relates to time constraints – we never got to talk in the large group... There could have been more MVP trainers... They weren't there enough and there weren't enough training sessions... The same trainers weren't always there.
- D) The trainers didn't complement each other or work well together... Sometimes class got a little carried away and they didn't control it... The trainers seemed unknowledgeable and unprepared... The trainers weren't all that exciting – too much repetition.

Question 7: “During MVP sessions, did you like it better when you were in a large group with both boys and girls, or did you prefer to be separated into groups with just boys or just girls?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) Mixed	53 (32,21)	38.13
B) Separate	34 (13,21)	24.46
C) Saw Value in Both	28 (25,3)	20.14
D) N/A (all-male group)	13 (0,13)	9.35
E) No Preference	6 (3,3)	4.32
F) Undecided	1 (0,1)	0.72

Quotes:

- A) I liked it when we were all together, because there was more input... When we were together it was more lively... I liked both boys and girls because that’s how it is in life, so that’s how it should be when learning about a topic such as this... I liked large group because it is important to hear what the opposite sex has to say... I liked large group because it made me understand the way the girls felt about issues... Big group because it’s more my comfort zone with my peers.

- B) I liked small groups because we were able to say what we thought without being criticized by the girls... We got more accomplished in the smaller groups and it was a more relaxed atmosphere... I liked it when we were separate, because I could talk freely without being nervous... I liked just girls because the boys were very defensive and argumentative.

- C) I liked both – it was more intimate when it was just girls but also interesting to interact with the boys... I liked that there was a mix of the two... Both were important for different reasons... Smaller groups were more effective; larger groups were more interesting... It was the combination of doing both that was good.

Question 8: “To whom have you spoken about the MVP program?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) Friends	91 (52,39)	65.47
B) Family	87 (50,37)	62.59
C) Teachers/Coaches	37 (22,15)	26.62
D) Boyfriend	12 (12,0)	8.63
E) No one	12 (3,9)	8.63
F) Girlfriend	8 (0,8)	5.76
G) Classmates/Peers	7 (4,3)	5.04
H) Everyone	6 (3,3)	4.32
I) Misc.	6 (5,1)	4.32

Question 9: “If one or more of your friends had the opportunity to be in the MVP program, would you tell them to join, or would you tell them that MVP was a waste of time?”

ANSWER	# OF STUDENTS (F, M)	PERCENTAGE
A) Yes (Join)	118 (63,55)	84.89
B) It Depends	9 (6,3)	6.47
C) No (A waste of time)	8 (4,4)	5.76

APPENDIX C

Appendix C contains copies of both the female and male versions of the MVP Survey, including “Page 6.”