

As Table 1 reports, participating trainers spanned the age range, with just over one-fourth of the participants (27.8%) ages 20-29 years old and approximately one-third of the trainers (32.6%) ages 30-39 years old. Few trainers were under 20 or over 60 years old. The mean age across all trainers and sites was 36.2 years (SD=11.01). Southwest Oklahoma State University had a notable age distribution of its trainers, as over one-half of the participants (53.9%) were ages 20-29, and almost one-quarter (23.1%) were ages 50-59.

More females (61.7%) than males (38.3%) were trained as CLI trainers, and in none of the seven sites did the number of male participants exceed the number of female participants. On average 62% of the participants were female (SD=0.49) at each site, with Southwest Oklahoma State University providing the widest range, with 71.4% female and 28.6% male participants.

Over one-half of the trainers (58.4%) served in staff roles for their respective institutions across the seven sites, with the roles of student (18.8%) and faculty (15.4%) more evenly split, and 7.4% of the participants indicating that they held a role other than these three. Notably, most schools had no faculty participants; however, 66.7% of the Virginia Tech participants and 18.5% of the University of Iowa participants were faculty. Student participation also varied with 78.6% of the trainers at St. Cloud State University representing students, and no students participating from the University of Iowa.

The years of experience that trainers reported serving in their respective roles varied widely. Over one-half of the participants (56%) across the seven sites had five or fewer years of experience in their current role. Almost 20 percent (18.7%) had between six and 10 years of experience, and over one-quarter (25.8%) reported having more than 10 years of experience. The composition of experience varied within sites as well. Southwest Oklahoma State's training was delivered to participants, 84.7% of whom had five or fewer years of experience and 7.7% of whom had more than 10 years of experience. With a very different composition, the University of Iowa's training had 42.2% of its participants with five or fewer years of experience and 45.9% of the trainers with more than 10 years of experience. On average, participants across the seven sites had 7.73 years of experience in their role (SD=7.84).

The CLI training was delivered to very highly educated participants. Almost two-thirds (63%) of the trainers had completed six to 10 years of education beyond high school, and almost one-third (31.6%) had completed up to five years of post-secondary education. On average, trainers had completed 6.3 years of education beyond high school. Similarly, over one-half (53%) of the trainers across the seven sites indicated that the highest degree they had completed was a master's degree, and an additional 13.4% had completed a PhD, JD or MD. Very few participants (2%) had completed an associate's degree, 21.5% had completed a bachelor's degree, and 9.4% had received a high school diploma or equivalent.

The racial and ethnic distribution of the participants indicated that over two-thirds (68.2%) of the trainers identified as White. Other racial and ethnic groups were less represented, with 11.5% African American, 10.8% Hispanic, 5.4% Asian, 1.4% Native American, 2.0% identifying with multiple races or ethnicities, 0.7% identified as Other, and no one identifying as Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Three sites were particularly high in the representation of Whites

within the participants, including Virginia Tech (77.8%), the University of Iowa (84.6%), and Southwest Oklahoma State (85.7%).

Participants also represented 25 different institutions, including the site location, with over one-quarter (25.5%) of the trainers coming from institutions other than the site at which the training was delivered.

RESULTS: TRAIN-THE-TRAINER EFFECTIVENESS

The Instrument

In order to determine the effectiveness of CLI across the seven sites at which it was delivered, several analytic procedures were undertaken. First, the evaluators tested to see if the survey instrument itself was reliable. This was done by using Cronbach’s Alpha to first test the items that comprised each of the four scales on the survey instrument to determine the internal consistency of each scale. Next, Cronbach’s Alpha was applied across all four mean scale scores to determine the internal consistency of the entire survey instrument. Table 2 identifies the items that comprised each scale and reports the reliability results for each scale for the pre-tests across all seven sites, as well as for the total survey score.

Table 2: Scale Reliability for Pre-Test Individual Survey Instrument Items (n=149)

Scale	Instrument Item	Alpha (α)
Scale 1 (9 items): Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is okay for a man to hit a woman if she hits him first.* 2. A woman who stays in an abusive relationship is partially responsible for her abuse.* 3. A woman who wears revealing clothing is asking to be harassed.* 4. Calling someone a “bitch” is no big deal.* 5. It is okay to refer to someone a “faggot” or “dyke,” as long as your comments are made in private.* 6. It is okay for a man to have sex with a heavily intoxicated woman, as long as she doesn’t say no.* 7. If a couple has been dating for a while, it is okay for one partner to hit or slap the other.* 8. When a woman resists sex, she often really wants it.* 9. When a man forces a woman to have sex, she often ends up liking it.* 	0.77

Scale 2 (4 items): Bystander Efficacy Beliefs	10. If I see a man and woman physically fighting, it is none of my business.* 11. Bystanders can prevent or stop men behaving abusively toward women. 12. There are several effective ways for a bystander to prevent or stop a man from behaving abusively toward a woman. 13. If I see a man behaving abusively toward a woman, I can prevent it from escalating or stop it.	0.67
Scale 3 (5 items): Bystander Behavior Intent	14. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man raising his voice to a woman. 15. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man calling a woman a derogatory name. 16. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man threatening to harm a woman. 17. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man hitting a woman. 18. If I saw a person being abusive toward another, I would be equally likely to speak up or take other action regardless of their gender or sexual orientation.	0.86
Scale 4 (3 items): Personal Teaching Efficacy for Sexual Abuse Prevention	19. I have the skills to teach others how to stop men's abuse against women. 20. I feel confident that I can teach others how to stop men's abuse against women. 21. I have access to the resources I need to teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	0.84
Total Cross-Scale Score (4 Mean Scale Scores)		0.64

* These item scores were reversed so that a high score indicates a desirable response (i.e., a response supporting sexual abuse prevention).

As Table 2 reports, Cronbach Alpha Coefficients were substantially high for each of the four scales. All individual scale results showed an α greater than 0.60. In addition, the α across all four scales was 0.64, indicating strong reliability of the instrument. These results suggest that all components of the instrument were internally consistent and tested the four separate topics, or constructs, of interest for CLI, as well as for the Cross-Scale Score: 1) Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse; 2) Bystander Efficacy Beliefs; 3) Bystander Behavior Intent; and 4) Personal Teaching Efficacy for Sexual Abuse Prevention; and 5) Cross-Scale Score.

Program Effects

Once the reliability of the survey instrument had been established, evaluators tested each item in the survey to determine the extent and direction of the change in participants' responses from pre-test to post-test. Paired dependent t-tests were conducted on the pre-test-to-post-test changes for each item. Table 3 presents the findings for each site and across all sites.

Table 3: Paired Item T-Tests, Pre- Post- for Each Site and Across All Sites

	Site 1 <i>n</i> =28 <i>df</i> =27	Site 2 <i>n</i> =14 <i>df</i> =13	Site 3 <i>n</i> =18 <i>df</i> =17	Site 4 <i>N</i> =14 <i>df</i> =13	Site 5 <i>n</i> =27 <i>df</i> =26	Site 6 <i>n</i> =21 <i>df</i> =20	Site 7 <i>n</i> =27 <i>df</i> =26	All Sites <i>n</i> =149 <i>df</i> =148
Item 1								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	0.18 (0.86)	1.47 (0.17)	2.56 (0.02)*	1.00 (0.34)	1.00 (0.33)	1.45 (0.16)	2.43 (0.02)*	2.34 (0.02)*
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.46 (0.79)	4.71 (0.61)	4.61 (0.50)	4.71 (0.47)	4.78 (0.58)	4.81 (0.40)	4.59 (0.64)	4.66 (0.60)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.50 (1.04)	4.86 (0.36)	4.89 (0.32)	4.64 (0.50)	4.85 (0.36)	4.90 (0.30)	4.78 (0.51)	4.77 (0.59)
Item 2								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	3.29 (0.00)*	1.75 (0.10)	0.77 (0.45)	0.62 (0.55)	3.12 (0.00)*	1.71 (0.10)	2.60 (0.02)*	5.20 (0.00)*
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.32 (0.95)	4.64 (0.84)	4.44 (0.78)	4.36 (0.93)	4.33 (0.92)	4.71 (0.56)	4.37 (0.79)	4.44 (0.83)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.75 (0.70)	4.93 (0.27)	4.61 (0.61)	4.50 (0.94)	4.67 (0.68)	4.90 (0.30)	4.74 (0.53)	4.73 (0.61)
Item 3								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	1.66 (0.11)	1.47 (0.17)	0.70 (0.50)	0.43 (0.67)	0.63 (0.54)	0.57 (0.58)	1.69 (0.10)	1.55 (0.12)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.43 (0.88)	4.71 (0.47)	4.78 (0.43)	4.64 (0.63)	4.70 (0.67)	4.90 (0.30)	4.44 (1.01)	4.64 (0.72)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.68 (0.48)	4.86 (0.36)	4.67 (0.59)	4.57 (0.76)	4.63 (0.79)	4.95 (0.22)	4.74 (0.53)	4.72 (0.57)
Item 4								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	1.00 (0.33)	0.56 (0.58)	0.00 (1.00)	1.39 (0.19)	1.15 (0.26)	1.55 (0.14)	1.00 (0.33)	0.71 (0.48)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.43 (0.79)	4.79 (0.43)	4.50 (0.62)	4.64 (0.63)	4.78 (0.51)	4.57 (0.75)	4.56 (0.58)	4.60 (0.64)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.57 (0.63)	4.86 (0.36)	4.50 (0.62)	4.86 (0.36)	4.59 (0.89)	4.86 (0.36)	4.44 (0.64)	4.64 (0.63)
Item 5								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	1.89 (0.07)	1.00 (0.34)	1.14 (0.27)	0.56 (0.58)	0.47 (0.65)	--	1.44 (0.16)	1.18 (0.24)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.89 (0.32)	4.79 (0.43)	4.89 (0.32)	4.79 (0.43)	4.78 (0.51)	5.00 (0.00)	4.81 (0.40)	4.85 (0.37)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.64 (0.87)	4.86 (0.36)	4.72 (0.58)	4.86 (0.36)	4.70 (0.87)	5.00 (0.00)	4.89 (0.32)	4.80 (0.60)
Item 6								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	1.00 (0.33)	0.00 (1.00)	0.00 (1.00)	1.47 (0.17)	0.68 (0.50)	2.34 (0.03)*	0.44 (0.66)	1.91 (0.06)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.89 (0.32)	4.93 (0.27)	4.89 (0.32)	4.93 (0.27)	4.89 (0.32)	4.95 (0.22)	4.78 (0.42)	4.89 (0.32)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.79 (0.79)	4.93 (0.27)	4.89 (0.32)	4.79 (0.43)	4.78 (0.80)	4.67 (0.67)	4.81 (0.40)	4.80 (0.59)
Item 7								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	0.72 (0.48)	1.00 (0.34)	1.0 (0.33)	1.47 (0.17)	0.94 (0.36)	--	0.47 (0.65)	0.52 (0.61)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.89 (0.32)	4.79 (0.58)	4.78 (0.55)	4.71 (0.47)	4.96 (0.19)	5.00 (0.00)	4.89 (0.32)	4.88 (0.37)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.79 (0.79)	4.93 (0.28)	4.83 (0.51)	4.86 (0.36)	4.81 (0.79)	5.00 (0.00)	4.81 (0.79)	4.85 (0.62)
Item 8								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	0.00 (1.00)	1.00 (0.34)	1.0 (0.33)	0.00 (1.00)	0.21 (0.83)	--	1.44 (0.16)	0.14 (0.89)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.79 (0.50)	4.86 (0.54)	4.94 (0.24)	4.71 (0.61)	4.81 (0.48)	5.00 (0.00)	4.85 (0.36)	4.85 (0.43)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.79 (0.79)	4.93 (0.27)	4.89 (0.32)	4.71 (0.47)	4.78 (0.80)	5.00 (0.00)	4.93 (0.27)	4.86 (0.53)
Item 9								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	0.23 (0.82)	--	--	--	0.72 (0.48)	--	0.00 (1.00)	0.65 (0.52)
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.86 (0.36)	4.93 (0.27)	4.94 (0.24)	4.86 (0.36)	4.93 (0.27)	5.00 (0.00)	4.89 (0.32)	4.91 (0.28)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.82 (0.77)	4.93 (0.27)	4.94 (0.24)	4.86 (0.36)	4.81 (0.79)	5.00 (0.00)	4.89 (0.32)	4.89 (0.51)
Item 10								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	1.51 (0.14)	2.46 (0.03)*	1.37 (0.19)	0.00 (1.00)	1.07 (0.29)	2.65 (0.02)*	1.24 (0.23)	3.71 (0.00)*
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.39 (0.74)	4.43 (0.76)	4.61 (0.50)	4.64 (0.50)	4.56 (0.58)	4.43 (0.81)	4.37 (0.57)	4.48 (0.64)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.71 (0.81)	4.93 (0.27)	4.78 (0.43)	4.64 (0.50)	4.70 (0.47)	4.76 (0.54)	4.59 (0.84)	4.72 (0.62)
Item 11								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	2.54 (0.02)*	2.22 (0.05)*	1.37 (0.19)	0.00 (1.00)	0.43 (0.67)	2.27 (0.03)*	3.86 (0.00)*	4.37 (0.00)*
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.29 (0.71)	4.07 (1.14)	3.72 (0.90)	4.36 (0.84)	4.30 (0.82)	3.76 (1.41)	3.93 (0.73)	4.07 (0.95)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.61 (0.50)	4.79 (0.80)	4.17 (0.99)	4.36 (0.84)	4.41 (1.01)	4.57 (0.98)	4.52 (0.51)	4.49 (0.81)
Item 12								
<i>t</i> (<i>p</i> -value)	3.31 (0.00)*	3.68 (0.00)*	4.58 (0.00)*	2.46 (0.03)*	1.76 (0.09)	3.99 (0.00)*	2.85 (0.01)*	7.99 (0.00)*
<i>M</i> ₁ (SD ₁)	4.39 (0.50)	4.21 (0.70)	3.89 (0.68)	4.29 (0.91)	4.37 (0.69)	4.33 (0.80)	3.89 (0.75)	4.20 (0.73)
<i>M</i> ₂ (SD ₂)	4.79 (0.42)	4.93 (0.28)	4.61 (0.50)	4.79 (0.43)	4.63 (0.49)	4.86 (0.48)	4.44 (0.85)	4.70 (0.55)

Item 13									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	5.11 (0.00)*	2.83 (0.01)*	4.51 (0.00)*	1.75 (0.10)	3.02 (0.01)*	2.77 (0.01)*	2.75 (0.01)*	8.29 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.04 (0.64)	4.21 (0.20)	3.50 (0.79)	4.29 (0.73)	3.89 (0.75)	3.86 (1.01)	3.74 (0.76)	3.91 (0.80)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.64 (0.49)	4.79 (0.43)	4.28 (0.58)	4.57 (0.51)	4.41 (0.75)	4.48 (0.60)	4.30 (0.95)	4.48 (0.67)	
Item 14									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	4.09 (0.00)*	3.61 (0.00)*	2.76 (0.01)*	4.19 (0.00)*	3.53 (0.00)*	1.69 (0.11)	2.38 (0.03)*	7.98 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	3.75 (0.75)	3.57 (1.02)	3.56 (0.86)	3.50 (1.02)	3.59 (0.97)	3.62 (1.02)	3.41 (0.75)	3.58 (0.89)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.36 (0.73)	4.57 (0.51)	4.11 (0.76)	4.43 (0.51)	4.22 (0.80)	4.05 (0.81)	3.89 (0.85)	4.20 (0.76)	
Item 15									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	3.55 (0.00)*	4.27 (0.00)*	3.37 (0.00)*	2.59 (0.02)*	2.47 (0.02)*	2.44 (0.02)*	1.67 (0.11)	7.22 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	3.71 (0.81)	3.71 (0.99)	3.50 (0.86)	3.71 (0.91)	3.81 (0.83)	3.57 (1.08)	3.70 (0.61)	3.68 (0.85)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.21 (0.79)	4.71 (0.47)	4.17 (0.71)	4.36 (0.63)	4.30 (0.72)	4.19 (0.60)	4.04 (0.85)	4.25 (0.73)	
Item 16									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	1.89 (0.07)	3.31 (0.01)*	3.01 (0.01)*	2.46 (0.03)*	1.54 (0.14)	2.68 (0.01)*	2.08 (0.05)*	6.16 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.36 (0.62)	4.21 (0.70)	4.11 (0.68)	4.21 (0.80)	4.41 (0.64)	4.19 (0.87)	4.19 (0.56)	4.26 (0.68)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.61 (0.57)	4.79 (0.43)	4.67 (0.49)	4.71 (0.47)	4.63 (0.57)	4.67 (0.58)	4.52 (0.85)	4.64 (0.60)	
Item 17									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	3.31 (0.00)*	1.47 (0.17)*	1.37 (0.19)	1.88 (0.08)	1.00 (0.33)*	1.83 (0.08)	0.72 (0.48)	4.31 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.46 (0.69)	4.57 (0.76)	4.50 (0.62)	4.43 (0.85)	4.67 (0.48)	4.52 (0.75)	4.41 (0.57)	4.51 (0.65)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.86 (0.36)	4.86 (0.36)	4.67 (0.49)	4.86 (0.36)	4.78 (0.42)	4.81 (0.51)	4.52 (0.89)	4.75 (0.54)	
Item 18									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	2.27 (0.03)	2.86 (0.01)*	4.58 (0.00)*	1.71 (0.11)	3.31 (0.00)*	2.63 (0.02)*	1.56 (0.13)	6.59 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.36 (0.73)	4.21 (0.89)	3.89 (0.58)	4.00 (0.78)	4.19 (0.68)	4.24 (0.77)	4.04 (0.65)	4.15 (0.72)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.75 (0.52)	4.86 (0.36)	4.61 (0.50)	4.43 (0.76)	4.63 (0.49)	4.67 (0.48)	4.37 (0.88)	4.61 (0.61)	
Item 19									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	6.02 (0.00)	4.50 (0.00)*	4.81 (0.00)*	3.16 (0.01)*	5.79 (0.00)*	6.25 (0.00)*	4.63 (0.00)*	13.28 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	3.25 (1.11)	3.50 (1.09)	3.11 (1.08)	3.57 (1.09)	3.30 (1.10)	3.48 (0.98)	3.15 (0.99)	3.31 (1.05)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.75 (0.44)	4.79 (0.43)	4.39 (0.50)	4.64 (0.50)	4.56 (0.58)	4.67 (0.48)	4.33 (0.83)	4.58 (0.58)	
Item 20									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	5.96 (0.00)	4.02 (0.00)*	3.92 (0.00)*	3.79 (0.00)*	5.39 (0.00)*	4.39 (0.00)*	4.31 (0.00)*	12.09 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	3.36 (1.16)	3.79 (1.12)	3.50 (0.99)	3.79 (0.89)	3.48 (1.02)	3.62 (0.92)	3.19 (0.96)	3.48 (1.02)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.61 (0.50)	4.86 (0.36)	4.39 (0.61)	4.71 (0.47)	4.56 (0.64)	4.52 (0.60)	4.30 (0.87)	4.54 (0.63)	
Item 21									
t (<i>p</i> -value)	3.80 (0.00)	4.02 (0.00)*	4.12 (0.00)*	3.79 (0.00)*	4.65 (0.00)*	5.44 (0.00)*	3.61 (0.00)*	10.83 (0.00)*	
M ₁ (SD ₁)	3.75 (1.08)	3.71 (1.27)	3.56 (0.92)	3.79 (0.89)	3.56 (1.19)	3.71 (0.90)	3.59 (0.93)	3.66 (1.02)	
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.57 (0.57)	4.79 (0.43)	4.39 (0.50)	4.71 (0.47)	4.59 (0.75)	4.86 (0.36)	4.48 (0.85)	4.61 (0.62)	

*significant at $p < 0.05$

M₁ = pre-test mean , M₂ = post-test mean

SD₁ = pre-test standard deviation , SD₂ = post-test standard deviation

-- The standard error of the mean difference is 0; as such, t and p values cannot be computed.

As Table 3 reveals, t-values were significant ($p < 0.05$) for Items 1, 2, and 10-21.

These results indicate that there were significant changes in participants' scores for over one-half of the items in the survey instrument between the pre-test and post-test, and the changes went all in the desired direction. These findings provide a first indication that CLI was effective in increasing participants' responses that support sexual abuse prevention.

One item that did not show a significant change is of particular interest because across four sites, there was no difference in the standard error of the mean difference. In addition, the means for this item (9) were all 4.86 or higher on a 5-point scale, and

in the case of Site 6, the means were 5.0. The interpretation of these results is that the scores of the participants started out so high for this item that they did not, or could not, increase significantly between the pre- and post- tests. This “ceiling effect” phenomenon also occurred for three additional items in Site 6.

It is also important to note that no corrections were done to control for the sheer number of t-tests performed, so care must be taken with the interpretation of the results. We have conducted 21 t-tests across all sites for this analysis, and we would expect that by chance alone, 5% of these tests (i.e., 1.05 cases) would show significant change at the $p < 0.05$ level in either the desirable or undesirable direction. Our results indicated significant changes in 14 items for which 12 items achieved the high significance level of ($p < .0001$) and none were in the other undesirable direction.

Once the extent and direction of change for each survey item between the pre-test and the post-test had been determined, the evaluators tested to determine the extent and direction of change for each of the four scales that the 21 survey items comprised. Matched dependent t-tests were conducted on the pre-test-to-post-test differences in the means for each scale. In addition, t-tests were conducted on the total scale scores for each site and across all sites. Table 4 presents the results for each site and across all sites.

Table 4: Scale T-Tests for Each Site and All Sites

Scale (Items)	Site 1 n=28 df=27	Site 2 n=14 df=13	Site 3 n=18 df=17	Site 4 n=14 df=13	Site 5 n=27 df=26	Site 6 n=21 df=20	Site 7 n=27 df=26	All Sites n=149 df=148
Scale 1 (1-9)								
t (<i>p-value</i>)	0.46 (0.65)	2.25 (0.04)*	0.27 (0.79)	0.55 (0.59)	0.35 (0.73)	1.05 (0.31)	1.73 (0.10)	1.30 (0.20)
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.66 (0.35)	4.79 (0.36)	4.75 (0.30)	4.71 (0.38)	4.77 (0.29)	4.88 (0.18)	4.69 (0.35)	4.75 (0.32)
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.70 (0.57)	4.90 (0.27)	4.77 (0.34)	4.74 (0.42)	4.74 (0.64)	4.92 (0.11)	4.78 (0.35)	4.78 (0.44)
Scale 2 (10-13)								
t (<i>p-value</i>)	4.34 (0.00)*	3.57 (0.00)*	3.43 (0.00)*	1.71 (0.11)	2.04 (0.05)	4.73 (0.00)*	3.78 (0.00)*	8.78 (0.00)*
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.28 (0.41)	4.23 (0.68)	3.93 (0.59)	4.39 (0.60)	4.28 (0.49)	4.10 (0.67)	3.98 (0.50)	4.16 (0.56)
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.69 (0.43)	4.86 (0.40)	4.46 (0.43)	4.59 (0.43)	4.54 (0.50)	4.67 (0.41)	4.46 (0.52)	4.60 (0.46)
Scale 3 (14-18)								
t (<i>p-value</i>)	4.15 (0.00)*	3.65 (0.00)*	4.57 (0.00)*	3.22 (0.01)*	3.09 (0.01)*	2.77 (0.01)*	1.97 (0.06)	8.27 (0.00)*
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.13 (0.53)	4.06 (0.77)	3.91 (0.50)	3.97 (0.77)	4.13 (0.58)	4.03 (0.79)	3.95 (0.45)	4.03 (0.61)
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.56 (0.46)	4.76 (0.35)	4.44 (0.52)	4.56 (0.43)	4.51 (0.52)	4.48 (0.43)	4.27 (0.79)	4.49 (0.54)
Scale 4 (19-21)								
t (<i>p-value</i>)	5.68 (0.00)*	5.72 (0.00)*	5.00 (0.00)*	3.79 (0.00)*	6.07 (0.00)*	7.16 (0.00)*	4.60 (0.00)*	13.88 (0.00)*
M ₁ (SD ₁)	3.45 (1.04)	3.67 (0.92)	3.39 (0.84)	3.71 (0.89)	3.44 (0.96)	3.61 (0.76)	3.31 (0.84)	3.48 (0.90)
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.64 (0.46)	4.81 (0.36)	4.39 (0.49)	4.69 (0.40)	4.57 (0.59)	4.68 (0.41)	4.37 (0.80)	4.57 (0.56)
Total Scale (4 Scale Means Combined)								
t (<i>p-value</i>)	6.16 (0.00)*	5.69 (0.00)*	5.32 (0.00)*	4.13 (0.00)*	4.26 (0.00)*	5.99 (0.00)*	4.24 (0.00)*	13.03 (0.00)*
M ₁ (SD ₁)	4.13 (0.40)	4.19 (0.54)	4.00 (0.42)	4.20 (0.51)	4.16 (0.45)	4.15 (0.48)	3.98 (0.34)	4.11 (0.44)
M ₂ (SD ₂)	4.65 (0.36)	4.83 (0.32)	4.52 (0.35)	4.64 (0.38)	4.59 (0.41)	4.69 (0.26)	4.47 (0.50)	4.61 (0.39)

*significant at $p < 0.05$

M₁ = pre-test mean , M₂ = post-test mean

SD₁ = pre-test standard deviation, SD₂ = post-test standard deviation

As Table 4 indicates, for three of the four scales (Scales 2, 3, and 4), as well as for the Total Scale, significant changes ($p < 0.05$) in the desirable direction occurred at each site (except Site 4, Scale 2, and Site 7 Scale 3) and highly significant changes ($p < 0.001$) occurred across all sites. This means that across all sites participants showed significant pre-test-to-post-test changes in the desired direction for Bystander Efficacy Beliefs (Scale 2), Bystander Behavior Intent (Scale 3), Personal Teaching Efficacy (Scale 4), and the Total Scale. Only the Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse (Scale 1) scores did not change enough in the desirable direction to reach significance across all sites. Only one site (Site 2– St. Cloud State University, MN) showed significant change ($p < 0.04$) in the desired direction from pre-test to post-test. It appears that for Scale 1, pre-test scores were usually so high (across all sites, Mean = 4.75 on a 5.00 scale) for these highly educated participants (66% held Masters or Doctoral level degrees) that increases may have been difficult to achieve (i.e., a “ceiling effect”).

RESULTS: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SATISFACTION AND UTILITY

In addition to training trainers to deliver the program, CLI delivered additional technical assistance (TA) to the eight participating sites throughout the 12 months while the program was being delivered and for 12 months later. The TA consisted of regular group email communication, a website that provided resources for the program providers and regular conference calls between the MVP director and key contacts from each site. At the end of the program delivery, on-line surveys were distributed to key contacts in order to assess their ratings of satisfaction and utility for the technical assistance that was provided by CLI (see Appendix C). Of the eight participating sites, contacts from seven sites responded to the survey. In addition, contacts from five additional institutions provided responses. In total, 18 individuals from 12 different institutions provided feedback on the CLI TA. Table 5 provides demographic data on the survey respondents.

Table 5: Technical Assistance Survey Respondent Data

	Percent (n=18)
Age (n=17)	
Under 20 years	0.0
20-29	12.0
30-39	35.0
40-49	29.0
50-59	24.0
60 years and over	0.0
Gender	
Female	72.0
Male	28.0

Role on Campus	
Student	0.0
Faculty	28.0
Staff	72.0
Other	0.0
Years of Experience in Role	
0-5	50.0
6-10	17.0
More than 10	33.0
Years of Education Beyond High School	
0-5	17.0
6-10	72.0
More than 10	11.0
Highest Degree Completed	
High School/GED	0.0
Associates	0.0
Bachelors	17.0
Masters	67.0
PhD/JD/MD	17.0
Certification	0.0
Race/Ethnicity	
African American	6.0
Asian	6.0
White	78.0
Hispanic	0.0
Native American	6.0
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	6.0
Other	0.0
More than one race/ethnicity	0.0
Institutions Represented	
Training site	61.0
Other	39.0

As Table 5 indicates, the ages of survey participants were diverse across cohorts; however, most respondents (88%) were over 30 years old. Additionally, respondents were heavily female (72%) and the site contacts either served in staff (72%) or faculty (28%) capacities at their respective institutions. The experience of the site contacts was bifurcated; most respondents had either been in their position less than five years (50%) or were very experienced and had been in their role over 10 years (33%). Survey participants were also very well educated, with 72% of the respondents having completed 6-10 years of school beyond high school, and 67% having

earned a master’s degree. Finally, the racial/ethnic backgrounds of the respondents were primarily White (78%), and over two-thirds (39%) represented institutions other than the training site.

Satisfaction

Most respondents were satisfied overall with the CLI TA. As Table 7 reports, 89% of the site contacts reported being either “somewhat” (50%) or “very” (39%) satisfied overall with the TA. Of the four areas of TA, the train-the-trainer sessions received the most positive feedback, with 78% of the respondents reporting that they were “very satisfied.” The TA that received the least positive feedback was the conference calls and group e-mail, with 22% of the respondents reporting being “neutral” and 11% reporting being “somewhat dissatisfied” with the conference calls, and 33% reporting being “neutral” to the group e-mail.

Table 6: Technical Assistance Satisfaction (n=18)

	Very Dissatisfied %	Somewhat Dissatisfied %	Neutral %	Somewhat Satisfied %	Very Satisfied %
Overall	0.0	0.0	11.0	50.0	39.0
Train-the-Trainer	0.0	11.0	0.0	11.0	78.0
Group E-mail	0.0	0.0	33.0	50.0	17.0
Website	0.0	6.0	22.0	44.0	28.0
Conference Calls	0.0	11.0	22.0	56.0	11.0

The sentiments reflected in Table 6 were also expressed in the open-ended questions. When asked what parts of the TA was most valuable, 72% of the respondents identified the train-the-trainer TA. One site contact remarked that *“[l]earning the MVP Program and how to deliver it was so helpful to me and what I do. Getting a chance (the pressure) to practice it live was really helpful and now I feel competent in delivering this program.”*

Accordingly, when asked what parts of the TA were least valuable, 44% of the respondents identified the conference calls. One respondent elaborated, *“[n]ot much really happened on email and what I did get by email I found difficult to prioritize what with everything else going on. The conference calls were okay, but not super valuable because often we didn’t really get the answers we wanted or there was really nothing to discuss.”* Another site contact agreed, and suggested that *“much of the information could have been shared over email or a Google Group/message board/etc.”*

Utility

Similar to the results of the satisfaction measure, site contacts also indicated that they found the TA useful overall. As Table 7 reports, 95% of the respondents indicated that the TA was either “very useful” (56%) or “somewhat useful (39%). No one found the TA to be not useful. The

train-the-trainer sessions had the highest utility response, with 83% of the site contacts indicating that this form of TA was “very useful.” The conference calls and the website showed the lowest utility responses, with 33% of the respondents reporting that the conference calls were either “neutral” (22%) or “not very useful” (11%), and 28% of the site contacts indicating that the website was either “neutral” (22%) or “not very useful” (6%).

Table 7: Technical Assistance Utility (n=18)

	Not At All Useful %	Not Very Useful %	Neutral %	Somewhat Useful %	Very Useful %
Overall	0.0	0.0	6.0	39.0	56.0
Train-the-Trainer	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	83.0
Group E-mail	0.0	0.0	11.0	67.0	22.0
Website	0.0	6.0	22.0	39.0	33.0
Conference Calls	0.0	11.0	22.0	56.0	11.0

The open-ended questions also reflected the sentiment about the TA utility expressed in Table 7. Reflecting on the information about bystanders in the TA that was most useful and identifying the train-the-trainers sessions, one respondent expressed that “*[t]he concept of bystander intervention is newer to me, and I have often struggled in articulating how and why bystander intervention is important and some of the details of bystander prevention theory. The Train-the-Trainer really helped me understand bystanders better and be better able to articulate how they are important in preventing violence and what types of things often hold bystanders back from intervening.*”

Conversely, when asked about recommended changes to the program, one site contact commented “*[e]liminate the conference calls and move toward an online meeting system or message board. Also, the website had the potential to be quite useful, but often had technological glitches and issues. A more robust website would have been tremendously helpful as well.*”

Technical Assistance Reach and Learning

The survey respondents reported delivering CLI to 25 different institutions. All were schools, including universities, colleges and in one case a high school. In addition to reporting on their satisfaction and utility of CLI, survey respondents reported on several key learning points, including how much new information they received, how often they visited the CLI website, how often the TA helped them connect with and learn from others who were conducting the program and whether they would recommend the TA to others.

All contacts reported receiving some amount new information from the TA. The level of new information they reported receiving varied, with 33% reporting receiving “a lot,” 39% receiving

“some” and 28% receiving “a little.” The TA website provided one source of new information. Most respondents reported using the website infrequently, however, with 78% citing monthly usage. Weekly and no website usage were cited by 11% of the respondents and no one reported using the site daily. Learning from others in the program provided another potential source of new information. Most respondents (72%) reported connecting and learning from others only “sometimes.” Few contacts reported connecting and learning “rarely” (17%) or “often” (11%) and no one reported “never” connecting or learning from others.

Despite the moderate levels of website use and connecting and learning from others, most of the survey respondents (83%) said they would either recommend (50%) or strongly recommend (33%) the technical assistance to others who are conducting the program. None of the respondents reported that they would not recommend the TA, and 17% were neutral.

DISCUSSION

Train-the-trainers

The results from the train-the-trainer evaluation are highly encouraging. The findings suggest that CLI was reliably effective in three of the four areas in which it focuses, as well as across all four areas. Participants’ responses changed following the CLI in the desirable direction for Bystander Efficacy Beliefs, Bystander Behavior Intent, and Personal Teaching Efficacy, as well as for the Total Scale Score. In addition, the data suggest that the Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse did not show evidence of change, perhaps because the participants entered the training with their beliefs at such high levels that it was difficult, but not impossible, for participants to significantly increase in their scores. One site (St. Cloud State University) was able to show significant improvement in their Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse scores despite high pre-test scores (4.75 on a 5.0 scale).

Further exploring the results for Scale 1 (Items 1-9) and returning to the curious results from the item t-tests, we see that in four sites, Item 9 showed no significant change from pre-test to post-test. If we consider Item 9, we see that it is a very strong statement that, arguably, most professionals would disagree with before taking any type of anti-violence training: “When a man forces a woman to have sex, she often ends up liking it.” It is not surprising that there was no significant change in this item. Many respondents already strongly disagreed with the statement before the training and there was little room to disagree with it even more strongly on the post-test. In short, people’s responses to this topic had almost nowhere to go because their pre-test beliefs were already near the high end of scale.

Except for the lack of significant findings for Scale 1, the overall findings of this study suggest that MVP has a highly reliable evaluation instrument that can be used to assess future programs. The alpha coefficients for the four scales and for the Total Scale Scores were strong, indicating strong reliability of the instrument, and the findings were remarkably consistent across each of the sites. These results suggest that all scales were internally consistent and, except for Scale 1, each other scale provided a sensitive and reliable assessment of the effectiveness of the CLI in achieving the goals of the MVP Program.

Technical assistance

Although the site contact participants were limited to a small number of respondents and skewed toward highly educated White females, their responses to the TA were encouraging. Site participants were quite satisfied with the TA and found it to be useful overall. In the areas in which they were less satisfied and identified lower utility for portions of the TA, respondents provided constructive feedback for alternatives. And finally, despite reporting relatively low levels of gaining new information from the website or other program participants, the site contacts nevertheless found the TA valuable enough that most of them would recommend the materials to other people in the program.

Given the site participants' low level of engagement with the website and other program participants, as well as their distinctive dislike for the conference calls, MVP may want to consider changing the TA formats to be more dynamic and interactive. Given the positive feedback to the train-the-trainer sessions, MVP may want to invest in changing the website to be more interactive. Possibilities include creating and uploading short training tip video clips from the MVP staff weekly, followed by a required interactive exercise. An open feedback mechanism can also be developed on the website which would eliminate the need for conference calls.

CONCLUSIONS

The clear and strong results from the train-the-trainer evaluation and the positive responses from the TA contacts are very encouraging for the future of MVP and CLI. The findings of this evaluation indicate that MVP has a train-the-trainer program that is highly effective in changing trainers' bystander efficacy beliefs, bystander behavior intent, and personal teaching efficacy to train and support others in sexual assault prevention. In addition, trainers who utilize the technical assistance provided for CLI are generally satisfied with it and find it to be useful.

This said, there are several points that MVP should consider as it continues to build its program. First, given the lack of significant change across sites in the Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse (Scale 1), this measure may need to be modified for use with participants who are as highly educated and experienced in sexual assault prevention as those in this sample. Although it is possible that this Scale may be useful for a more general population of students who would presumably have lower baseline response levels of beliefs supporting sexual abuse prevention, the baseline levels for these participants appeared to be so high that increases were difficult to demonstrate. Perhaps scale items measuring more subtle or broadly held beliefs that support sexual assault could be developed for use with participants such as those in this sample. In addition, program trainers may want to consider ways to address more subtle and deeper levels of participants' beliefs that support sexual assault than those reflected in this scale.

In terms of program participation, given the heavy concentration of females represented as trainers and contacts for the technical assistance, MVP may want to consider working with the

site coordinators to recruit more male trainers in order to prepare a more gender-balanced cohort of MVP trainers. Similarly, a large majority of trainers and TA contacts were White. In order to prepare future cohorts of trainers that are more racially and ethnically diverse, more active outreach and recruitment of minority participants may be needed.

Possible changes to the technical assistance have also been discussed, including developing the website to be more interactive and eliminating traditional communication, such as conference calls. Perhaps the key question for this component of the program is to further specify and prioritize what goals the program has for those who utilize the TA. If the primary goals are to encourage engagement with other program members, for example, then specific effort can be directed toward developing this goal and testing it in a way that goes beyond overall satisfaction and utility measures.

Finally, this evaluation has laid the groundwork for the next stage of assessment of CLI. While we know that the training changed the beliefs of highly educated trainers in the short run, we do not know the extent to which those changes held over time. Additionally, we do not know how effective the trainers were at changing the same beliefs of those who they trained. The question of changing Beliefs Supporting Sexual Abuse for participants with less education is particularly relevant here. It is entirely possible that while the trainers have already solidified their beliefs on this topic, less educated participants, such as those who they will be training, very well may not have, and there may be room for change. Future assessments that examine these questions are essential to continue to build CLI and MVP as a world-class, evidence-based anti-violence program.

APPENDIX A

PRE

University ID# _____

Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) Program Evaluation 2009-2010

Please answer ALL of the questions to the best of your ability.

1. What is the name of your college or university? _____
2. What is your age? _____
3. What is your gender? Male Female Other
4. What is your role on campus?
 Student Faculty Staff (Specify) _____ Other (Specify) _____
5. How many years of experience do you have in this role? (If student, what year are you in?) _____
6. How many years of education beyond high school have you completed? _____
7. What is the highest degree you have completed?
 High School/GED Associates Bachelors Masters PhD/JD/MD Certification
8. How do you prefer to classify your ethnic/racial background? Please circle all that apply.

<input type="radio"/> African American	<input type="radio"/> Hispanic American or Latino/Latina
<input type="radio"/> Asian American	<input type="radio"/> Native American/American Indian
<input type="radio"/> European American (White)	<input type="radio"/> Other (Specify) _____

Please circle one response for each of the following statements:

1. It is okay for a man to hit a woman if she hits him first.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. A woman who stays in an abusive relationship is partially responsible for her abuse.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. A woman who wears revealing clothing is asking to be harassed.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. Calling someone a "bitch" is no big deal.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
5. It is okay to refer to someone a "faggot" or "dyke," as long as your comments are made in private.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
6. It is okay for a man to have sex with a heavily intoxicated woman, as long as she doesn't say no.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. If a couple has been dating for a while, it is okay for one partner to hit or slap the other.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
8. When a woman resists sex, she often really wants it.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. When a man forces a woman to have sex, she often ends up liking it.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
10. If I see a man and woman physically fighting, it is none of my business.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
11. Bystanders can prevent or stop men behaving abusively toward women.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
12. There are several effective ways for a bystander to prevent or stop a man from behaving abusively toward a woman.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
13. If I see a man behaving abusively toward a woman, I can prevent it from escalating or stop it.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
14. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man raising his voice to a woman.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
15. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man calling a woman a derogatory name.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
16. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man threatening to harm a woman.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
17. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man hitting a woman.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
18. If I saw a person being abusive toward another, I would be equally likely to speak up or take other action regardless of their gender or sexual orientation.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. I have the skills to teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
20. I feel confident that I can teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
21. I have access to the resources I need to teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

APPENDIX B

POST

University ID# _____

Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) Program Evaluation 2009-2010

Please answer ALL of the questions to the best of your ability.

1. What is the name of your college or university? _____

Please circle one response for each of the following statements:

1. It is okay for a man to hit a woman if she hits him first.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
2. A woman who stays in an abusive relationship is partially responsible for her abuse.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
3. A woman who wears revealing clothing is asking to be harassed.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
4. Calling someone a "bitch" is no big deal.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
5. It is okay to refer to someone a "faggot" or "dyke," as long as your comments are made in private.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
6. It is okay for a man to have sex with a heavily intoxicated woman, as long as she doesn't say no.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
7. If a couple has been dating for a while, it is okay for one partner to hit or slap the other.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
8. When a woman resists sex, she often really wants it.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
9. When a man forces a woman to have sex, she often ends up liking it.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
10. If I see a man and woman physically fighting, it is none of my business.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
11. Bystanders can prevent or stop men behaving abusively toward women.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

12. There are several effective ways for a bystander to prevent or stop a man from behaving abusively toward a woman.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
13. If I see a man behaving abusively toward a woman, I can prevent it from escalating or stop it.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
14. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man raising his voice to a woman.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
15. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man calling a woman a derogatory name.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
16. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man threatening to harm a woman.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
17. I would likely speak up or take other action if I saw a man hitting a woman.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
18. If I saw a person being abusive toward another, I would be equally likely to speak up or take other action regardless of their gender or sexual orientation.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
19. I have the skills to teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
20. I feel confident that I can teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
21. I have access to the resources I need to teach others how to stop men's abuse against women.	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Unsure</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>

Please tell us your thoughts to help us improve the MVP program.

1. Overall, what parts of this training did you find **MOST** valuable?
2. Overall, what parts of this training did you find **LEAST** valuable?
3. In the training, what information or lesson about gender violence was most surprising to you?
4. In the training, what information or lesson about bystanders was most surprising to you?
5. What parts of this training best **AND** least prepared you to intervene in potentially abusive and violent situations?
6. What parts of this training best **AND** least prepared you to teach others about gender violence and abuse?
7. What changes would you recommend we make to this training?

APPENDIX C

ID# _____

Date _____

Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) Evaluation of Technical Assistance 2010-2011

We would like your feedback on the Technical Assistance (TA) you received in support of the MVP Campus Leadership Initiative. The TA for the initiative includes: (a) train-the-trainer trainings; (b) group e-mail communication; (c) the website; and (d) conference calls.

Please answer ALL of the questions to the best of your ability.

1. What is the name of your college or university? _____
2. Which campus do you attend or work at? _____
3. What is your age? _____
4. What is your gender? Male Female Other
5. What is your role on campus?
 Student Faculty Staff (Specify) _____ Other (Specify) _____
6. How many years of experience do you have in this role? (If student, what year are you in?) _____
7. How many years of education beyond high school have you completed? _____
8. What is the highest degree you have completed?
 High School/GED Associates Bachelors Masters PhD/JD/MD Certification
9. How do you prefer to classify your ethnic/racial background? Please circle all that apply.
 African American
 European American (White)
 Hispanic American or Latino/Latina
 Native American/American Indian
 Other (Specify) _____
10. Please list all of the campuses and other organizations that you have delivered MVP to:

11. Overall, how satisfied were you with the Technical Assistance? (Circle one)
Very Dissatisfied *Somewhat Dissatisfied* *Neutral* *Somewhat Satisfied* *Very Satisfied*

12. How satisfied were you with each of the following components of the Technical Assistance?
(Circle one)

a. Train-the-Trainers Trainings:

Very Dissatisfied *Somewhat Dissatisfied* *Neutral* *Somewhat Satisfied* *Very Satisfied*

b. Group E-mail Communication:

Very Dissatisfied *Somewhat Dissatisfied* *Neutral* *Somewhat Satisfied* *Very Satisfied*

c. Website:

Very Dissatisfied *Somewhat Dissatisfied* *Neutral* *Somewhat Satisfied* *Very Satisfied*

d. Conference Calls:

Very Dissatisfied *Somewhat Dissatisfied* *Neutral* *Somewhat Satisfied* *Very Satisfied*

13. Overall, how useful did you find the information or ideas provided by the Technical Assistance?
(Circle one)

Not At All Useful *Not Very Useful* *Neutral* *Somewhat Useful* *Very Useful*

14. How useful did you find the information or ideas provided in each component of the Technical Assistance? (Circle one)

a. Train-the-Trainers Trainings:

Not at All Useful *Not Very Useful* *Neutral* *Somewhat Useful* *Very Useful*

b. Group E-mail Communication:

Not at All Useful *Not Very Useful* *Neutral* *Somewhat Useful* *Very Useful*

c. Website:

Not at All Useful *Not Very Useful* *Neutral* *Somewhat Useful* *Very Useful*

d. Conference Calls:

Not at All Useful *Not Very Useful* *Neutral* *Somewhat Useful* *Very Useful*

15. How much new information or ideas did you receive from the Technical Assistance? (Circle one)

No New Information/Ideas *A Little New Information/Ideas* *Some New Information/Ideas* *A Lot of New Information/Ideas*

16. How often did you go to the website? (Circle one)

Never *Monthly* *Weekly* *Daily*

17. How often did the Technical Assistance help you to connect with and learn from others who are conducting this program? (Circle one)

Never *Rarely* *Sometimes* *Often*

18. Would you recommend this opportunity to receive Technical Assistance to others who are conducting this program? (Circle one)

Strongly Not Recommend *Not Recommend* *Neutral* *Recommend* *Strongly Recommend*

Finally, please tell us your thoughts about the Technical Assistance provided for the MVP program (including the train-the-trainer trainings, email communication, the website, and conference calls).

19. Overall, what parts of the Technical Assistance did you find **MOST** valuable?

20. Overall, what parts of the Technical Assistance did you find **LEAST** valuable?

21. In the Technical Assistance, what information or ideas about gender violence was most useful to you?

22. In the Technical Assistance, what information or ideas about bystanders was most useful to you?

23. What parts of this Technical Assistance best **AND** least prepared you to teach others about gender violence and abuse?

24. What parts of this Technical Assistance best **AND** least prepared you to teach respond effectively in potentially abusive or violent situations?

25. What changes would you recommend we make in the Technical Assistance we provide?

Thank you for your feedback!