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Learning Objectives

• Assess the value of bystander intervention programs
• Describe the outcomes of the Green Dot Across the Bluegrass Study
• Identify the implications from the study findings and how they can be applied to current bystander intervention and prevention work
RCT Testing Bystander Effectiveness to Reduce Violence

Audience Question

How many of you have looked at the article “RCT Testing Bystander Effectiveness to Reduce Violence”?

Answer on the left
### About the Guests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Coker, PhD</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Bush, PhD</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Recktenwald</td>
<td>Kentucky Association of Sexual Assault Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Parks</td>
<td>Green Dot etcetera, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo Lewis</td>
<td>National Sexual Violence Resource Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe how Bystander Intervention is helpful in sexual violence and domestic violence prevention efforts?
Bystander Role in Violence Prevention

- **Emerged in Mid 1990’s**

- **Premise:**
  - Addressing violence requires a shift in norms.
  - Need to involve both men and women to change the context or environment that may tacitly support violence.
  - Reframing violence as engaging men as well as women in prevention efforts shifts the blame and increases the number of students willing to be involved.
Why Green Dot in Kentucky?
Research Partners

- University of Kentucky
  - Ann L. Coker, PhD
  - Patricia G. Cook-Craig, PhD
  - Heather M. Bush, PhD
  - Emily Clear, MPH

- Kentucky Association of Sexual Assault Programs (KASAP)
  - Eileen Recktenwald, PhD (h.c.), MSW

- 13 Kentucky Rape Crisis Center Programs

- Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Families

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
  - Sarah DeGue
  - Alana Vivolo

(CDC U01CE001675)
What is a Green Dot?

A green dot is any behavior, choice, word, or attitude that promotes safety for everyone and communicates utter intolerance for rape, domestic violence, child abuse, and stalking. A green dot is intervening in a high risk situation – a green dot is sponsoring a fundraiser for prevention efforts – a green dot is responding to a victim blaming statement with words of support – a green dot is hanging a prevention poster in your office or business – a green dot is teaching your kids about respect – a green dot is putting a link on your website to your local prevention program - a green dot is providing safety information on the counter at your business. A green dot is simply your individual choice at any given moment to make our state safer.
Intervention Implementation

- Two phases
  - Green Dot persuasive speeches
    - Ideally given to the entire school population
    - Can be given in small and large groups
  - Peer/Popular Opinion Leader Bystander training
    - 5 hour bystander training
    - Focus on identified Peer Opinion Leaders (POL)
5-year cluster-randomized clinical trial
- 26 public high schools across Kentucky recruited by (Rape Crisis Center) Educators.
- Two school in each Kentucky Area Development District
- Half randomized to Intervention; half to delayed intervention (controls)
- Data collection Spring 2010 thru Spring 2014
- Focusing on analyses at school-level and as randomized.
- Primary question - Does this program work to prevent violence?

HOW: All students in schools were invited to complete an anonymous survey each Spring (n= 89,707; Response rate=83.9%) to assess the frequency and impact of violent victimization and perpetration behavior at baseline and over a four-year follow-up.
High School Selection

At least two schools per region; then randomized (UK) to intervention and delayed
Hypothesized Effect of Bystander Programs

Training / Modeling / Practice to safely and effectively engage peers in violence prevention strategies among students.

Training diffused through trainees’ peer networks to change norms supporting violence and its acceptance, identify risky situations, and increase bystander behaviors to interrupt or prevent violence.

Ultimate test of program is a reduction in the continuum of interpersonal violence at the community level.
Design / Implementation Issues

- Anonymous surveying (asking about illegal behaviors)
- Passive parental consent
  - Letters to all parents; >30,000 letters per year
  - Refusing parent called or emailed staff
- UK team surveyed every spring 2010-2014
- All student in school on survey date were eligible if able to consent.
- Survey administration in classrooms (all day) or during one period administered to all students
Figure 1. Consort Diagram

Sampling frame: public high schools in Kentucky in 2009: n=203
KASAP staff asked to recruit 2 comparable schools in each of 13 KASAP regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Allocation Baseline Spring 2010 Survey</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Allocated to Intervention | No. Schools = 13  
No. Students = 8,228 | Allocated to control | No. Schools = 13  
No. Students = 8,281 |
| Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13  
No. Students = 8540 | Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13**  
No. Students = 7317 |
| Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13  
No. Students = 8286 | ** imputed data from prior year |
| Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13  
No. Students = 7046 | Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13**  
No. Students = 6822* |
| Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13**  
No. Students = 6981 | Participation in data collection | No. Schools = 13**  
No. Students = 6,607 |

Year 1 Green Dot Intervention  
Spring 2011 Survey

Year 2 Green Dot Intervention  
Spring 2012 Survey

Year 3 Green Dot Intervention  
Spring 2013 Survey

Year 4 Green Dot Intervention  
Spring 2014 Survey
Findings: Big Picture Questions

1. Was Green Dot training implemented?
   – Measured student reports of bystander training received (2010-2014)
Intervention (Speech) Training

![Graph showing percent speech ever by study year for control and intervention groups.](image_url)
Intervention (POL) Training

![Study Year vs Percent Training Ever graph](image)

- **Percent Training Ever**
- **Study Year**

- **Control**
- **Intervention**
Findings: Big Picture Questions

• Was Green Dot training implemented? **YES**

  Both for Phase I (Speeches) and Phase II (Intensive Bystander POL Training)

Moving toward Prevention
Findings: Big Picture Questions

2. Did randomization work?
   Were demographic and violence proportions similar in Intervention and Control Schools at baseline?
Baseline School-Level Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Intervention (N = 13)</th>
<th>Control (N = 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: % Female</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade: % Freshman</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: % White</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Living in Poverty (Census 2010)</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Free or Reduced Meal</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exclusively Attracted to Opposite Sex</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Currently in a Romantic Relationship</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Witnessed Parental IPV (lifetime)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Binge Drinking in Past Month</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference in demographics, violence risk factors, OR violence frequency by condition at baseline. Randomization worked.
Measuring Outcomes: Think Continuum

- Bullying
- Sexual Harassment
- Intimate Partner / Dating Violence (psychological and physical)
- Stalking
- Sexual Violence (unwanted sex due to coercion, physical force, or intoxication)

Continuum of Interpersonal Violence Perpetration
Evaluating violence change over time

• Longitudinal analysis of school outcomes
  – School is the unit of analysis
  – As randomized to Intervention (n=13) and Control (n=13).

• Violence scores
  – Aggregate number of reported events (mean # events reported by students, average at school level)
  – Adjust for school size (attendance) and baseline number of violent events
  – Mischievous responders excluded.

• Means are compared for I vs. C over time
  – PROC GLIMMIX with an AR [1] R matrix and SE estimates
  – PROC GENMOD, link=log, dist=bin, using REPEATED with EXCH matrix. All analyses in SAS version 9.3 or 9.4
SEXUAL VIOLENCE (Unwanted Sex)
Sexual Violence (Unwanted Sex)

• **Victimization**
  Had sexual activities even though you didn't really want to because
  1. they threatened to end your friendship or romantic relationship if you didn’t or because you felt pressured by the other person's constant arguments or begging?
  2. because the other person threatened to use or used physical force (like twisting your arm, holding you down)?
  3. you were drunk or using drugs?

• **Perpetration**
  Had sexual activities with a high school student
  1. because you either threatened to end your friendship or romantic relationship if they didn’t or because you pressured the other person by arguing or begging?
  2. by threatening to use or used physical force (twisting their arm, holding them down)?
  3. because she/he was drunk or on drugs?

Response Options: # times in past 12 months: 0,1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10+
3. Does Green Dot training (as randomized at school level) reduce violence over time in Intervention high schools compare with Control schools?

Intent To Treat (ITT) analysis

Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01878097
Sexual Violence Perpetration (School-Level)

Condition x Time: F test for I-C = 7.18; p=.0003
Sexual Violence Perpetration (School-Level)

SVP – Item 3: Alcohol or drug facilitated sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>35 (-7, 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>11(-25, 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>-44 (-85, -3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>-43 (-76, -10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition x Time: F test for I-C = 8.53; p<.0001
Sexual Violence Victimization (School-Level)

Intervention x Time: F test = 7.12; p=0.0003
### Sexual Violence Perpetration (yes to ANY of 3 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>0.96 (0.85, 1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.12 (0.96, 1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>0.94 (0.81, 1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.83 (0.70, 0.99)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.79 (0.67, 0.94)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation: 17-21% reduction in SV perpetration among all students in Intervention years Y3 and Y4, respectively.
SEXUAL HARASSMENT
Sexual Harassment

Victimization

1. Tell you sexual stories or jokes that made you uncomfortable?
2. Make gestures, rude remarks or use sexual body language to embarrass or upset you?
3. Keep asking you out on a date or asking you to hookup even though you said No?

Perpetration

1. Tell sexual stories or jokes that made another high school student uncomfortable?
2. Make gestures, rude remarks, or use sexual body language to embarrass or upset another student?
3. Keep asking another high school student out on a date or ask to hookup even though they said No?

Response Options: # times in past 12 months: 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10+
Measures of SV/DV Impact (3 items)

In the past 12 month, because of unwanted sexual activity or because a current or previous boyfriend/girlfriend hurt you on purpose,

How frequently

1. Were you physically hurt?
2. Did you missed school?
3. Seek care from a doctor, school nurse, hospital, school counselor, social worker, therapist or other mental health expert?

Response Options: # times in past 12 months: 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10+
School-Level Reports of Missed School

Intervention x Time: F test = 9.54; p<.0001
Summary of Findings

- Does Green Dot training reduce violence over time in Intervention v Control high schools? **YES for....**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violence Form</th>
<th>Victimization</th>
<th>Perpetration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sex</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence</td>
<td>✓ Yes psychological</td>
<td>✓ Yes psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive coercion</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
<td>NOT measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined forms</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
<td>✓ yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of SV/DV</td>
<td>✓ Yes (physical hurt, missed school, sought help)</td>
<td>NOT measured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moving toward Prevention**
• Evidence that Green Dot works, as implemented by trained Rape Crisis Center Educators, to reduce interpersonal violence victimization and perpetration
  – Sexual violence
  – Sexual harassment
  – Reproductive coercion
  – Psychological dating violence
  – Stalking
Next steps

• Through trained Rape Crisis educators, KASAP will provide Green Dot to additional high schools across Kentucky.

• Evaluation efforts will continue in these high schools.

• Cost and Cost-Effectiveness Analyses

Moving toward Prevention
COST ANALYSIS OF GREEN DOT DURING THE 5-YEAR STUDY PERIOD
Cost Analysis

• Cost estimates were classified as start-up and ongoing implementation
  – Data for estimates obtained via interviews of key personnel, evaluation of budgets, and surveys collected from educators and directors
  – Cost associated with data collection for the purpose of evaluation are not included

• KY plan for implementation utilized existing resources in Rape Crisis Center educators

Cost Analysis for 5-year Period

• Approximate cost of implementing GD over a 5 year period: $1,613,000
  – Start-up costs: $62,000
  – Coaching for Educators: $165,000
  – Center Educators: $1,260,000*
  – Travel Re-imbursement and Supplies: $135,000

• Cost to add another school
  – $15,000 (educator*) + $2,100 (travel/supplies)

• Working on Cost analysis and Cost effectiveness papers

*Best estimate based on educators survey, ~ 20 hours/month spent on Green Dot training. Range of personnel costs: $420K - $1.26M
IMPLICATIONS FOR PREVENTION PRACTICE
Bystander Can Reduce Perpetration

Should bystander training be gender-neutral (same for males and females)? Advantages or disadvantages specific to gender and sexual orientation?
School/Community as Target of Change
School/Community as Target of Change
School/Community as Target of Change
MO LEWIS, NSVRC
Work with your local centers
Look for Leaders
Why is leadership within the community important to prevent efforts?
Train Well
Turnover and Training: The Cost of Sustaining Green Dot

- Ongoing training issue costs and scheduling challenges
- Monthly planning meetings are essential
  - Steering group (State Capacity Building Team)
  - Meeting of educators (Program Implementation Committee—PIC)
- (after RTC) Cost of coach for the educators proved cost prohibitive
Fidelity & Adaptability

ESSENTIAL PROGRAM ELEMENTS
Importance of Fidelity

- Green Dot Components

- Training 13-15% of the population

- Skill in Delivery

- POL Selection

- Adherence to Scientific Basis

- Delivery of All Program Components
Fidelity Assessment

• Fidelity to Curriculum
  – Audio recordings of EACH training or speech given in an intervention schools
  – Data collected as speeches are given
  – Periodic download of data to be analyzed by multiple reviewers

• Debriefing logs
  – data on details/problems/ successes in trainings
  – Logs completed 24-48 hours after each speech or training
Measure Impact
Evolution of the Curriculum

The shift from Green Dot 1.0 to Green Dot 2.0 created challenges for new and veteran prevention educators

- Which version to use
- Peer to peer practice and support
- Maintenance of a training protocol for post Green Dot Institute curriculum practice
Contact Information

Ann Coker, PhD, University of Kentucky
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Heather Bush, PhD, University of Kentucky
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ADDITIONAL VIOLENCE OUTCOMES
Green Dot Across the Bluegrass (ITT analyses)
Sexual Harassment Perpetration (School-Level)

Mean Events per Student, past 12 months

Intervention Schools

Control Schools

Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117 (-24, 258)</td>
<td>76 (-40, 192)</td>
<td>-178 (-324, -31)**</td>
<td>-113 (-226, 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 6.29; p = .0008
Sexual Harassment Victimization
(School-Level)

### Mean Events per Student, past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>212 (-127, 551)</td>
<td>136 (-172, 444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>212 (-127, 551)</td>
<td>136 (-172, 444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>-442 (-777, -106)**</td>
<td>-145 (-425, 135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>212 (-127, 551)</td>
<td>136 (-172, 444)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)**

Intervention x Time: F test = 7.43; p = .0002
STALKING
Stalking

• **Victimization**

1. You were followed, spied on or monitored using computer software, cameras, listening tools or global positioning system (GPS)?
2. Someone showed up at your home, school or work or waited for you when you did not want them to?
3. You received unwanted phone calls, gifts, emails, text messages, or notes/pictures posted on social networking sites for example, Facebook, MySpace or Twitter?

• **Perpetration**

1. Followed, spied on or observed someone using computer software, cameras, listening tools or global positioning system (GPS)?
2. Showed up at someone's home, school or work or waited for them when they asked you not to?
3. Sent unwanted gifts, emails, text messages, phone calls, notes or pictures posted on social networking sites for example, Facebook, MySpace or twitter?

Response Options: # times in past 12 months: 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10+
Stalking Perpetration
(School-Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
<th>Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>86 (-9, 181)</td>
<td>7 (-85, 99)</td>
<td>-131 (-220, -42)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-65 (-143, 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 4.48; p=.006
Stalking Victimization (School-Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
<th>Intervention–Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>162 (-32, 356)</td>
<td>76 (-95, 249)</td>
<td>162 (-32, 356)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>120 (-126, 266)</td>
<td>76 (-95, 249)</td>
<td>282 (-457, -108)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>90 (-155, 336)</td>
<td>76 (-95, 249)</td>
<td>134 (-283, 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>110 (-136, 356)</td>
<td>76 (-95, 249)</td>
<td>76 (-95, 249)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 7.98; p = .0001
PSYCHOLOGICAL + PHYSICAL DATING VIOLENCE
Psychological + Physical Dating Violence

• **Victimization**
  1. Tried to control you by always checking up on you, telling you who your friends could be, or telling you what you could do and when?
  2. Damaged something that was important to you on purpose?
  3. Shouted, yelled, insulted or swore at you?
  4. Threatened to hit, slap, or physically hurt you?
  5. Hit, slapped, or physically hurt you on purpose?

• **Perpetration**
  1. Try to control a current or previous girlfriend or boyfriend by always checking up on them, telling them who their friends could be, or telling them what they could do and when?
  2. Damage something on purpose that was important to a boyfriend or girlfriend?
  3. Shout, yell, insult or swear at a current or previous girlfriend or boyfriend?
  4. Threaten to hurt a current or previous boyfriend or girlfriend?
  5. Hit, slap, or physically hurt a current or previous boyfriend or girlfriend on purpose?

Response Options: # times in past 12 months: 0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10+
Psychological Dating Violence Perpetration (School-Level)

**Intervention - Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>203 (-11, 416)</td>
<td>82 (-63, 228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>-240 (-413, -66)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>-141 (-306, 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 6.06; p = .001
Physical Dating Violence Perpetration (School-Level)

Mean Events per Student, past 12 months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Year</th>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
<th>Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54 (22, 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (-6, 55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>-54 (-85, -22)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>-46 (-72, -19)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 11.19; p<.0001
Psychological Dating Violence Victimization (School-Level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Year</th>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>Control Schools</th>
<th>Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>323 (-45, 691)</td>
<td>131 (-180, 443)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>-366 (-718, -15)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>-163 (-489, 163)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 5.35; p=.002
Physical Dating Violence Victimization (School-Level)

![Graph showing mean events per student, past 12 months for intervention and control schools](graph)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention – Control Difference in Mean # Events (95% CI)</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 (-6, 92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (-35, 76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-64 (-110, -19)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-32 (-63, -1)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intervention x Time: F test = 6.20; p=.0008