Using Social Self-Identification in Social Marketing Materials Aimed at Reducing Violence Against Women on Campus
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Abstract
Bystander-focused in person sexual violence prevention programs provide an opportunity for skill development among bystanders and for widening the safety net for survivors. A social marketing campaign was designed modeling prosocial bystander behavior and using content familiar to target audience members by staging and casting scenes to look similar to the people and situations that the target audience regularly encounters. We refer to this sense of familiarity as social self-identification. In this exploratory study, we attempt to understand how seeing oneself and one’s peer group (e.g., social self-identification) in poster images affects target audience members’ (e.g., college students) willingness to intervene as a prosocial bystander. The posters in the social marketing campaign were displayed throughout a midsize northeastern public university campus and neighboring local businesses frequented by students. During the last week of the 4-week poster display, the university’s homepage portal featured an advertisement displaying a current model of an iPod offering undergraduate students an opportunity to win the device if they completed a community survey.
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We found that among students who had seen the posters, those who indicated that the scenes portrayed in the posters looked like situations that were familiar to them were significantly more likely to contemplate taking action in preventing a situation where sexual violence had the potential to occur. Furthermore, students who indicated familiarity with the poster content were more likely to indicate that they had acted in a manner similar to those portrayed in the poster. Future directions based on findings from this exploratory study are discussed.
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Sexual assault of women is the most common violent crime committed on college campuses today (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Koss, Gidcyz, & Wisniewski, 1987). The majority of attempted and completed sexual assaults on college campus are perpetrated by acquaintances (e.g., classmates, residence hall neighbors, dates) or intimate partners of the victim rather than a stranger (Fisher et al., 2000; Koss & Harvey, 1991; Sampson, 2002). Despite the fact that college campus communities are at-risk environments for sexual and relationship violence, there is great variability nationally in the extent to which campuses are working to prevent this problem (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005). Prevention on college campuses has usually meant the presentation of educational programming, but studies of these programs demonstrate mixed results regarding effectiveness especially over time (e.g., Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Historically, the focus of many programs was on men as potential perpetrators and women as potential victims leading to defensiveness on the part of men and women and decrease the effectiveness of the primary messages in the program (see Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004 for a detailed discussion and review of the research focusing on the mixed results and program limitations). In addition, recently more programs and evaluations of them are being conducted using a bystander-oriented framework with more positive results with participants (e.g., Banyard, 2008; Banyard, Eckstein, & Moynihan, 2010; Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009; Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Berkowitz, 2002; Foubert & Newberry, 2006; Katz, 1995; Moynihan & Banyard, 2008; O’Brien, 2001).

Theoretical perspectives suggest that sexual and relationship violence will be eliminated only when broader social norms are addressed and a broader range of audiences are reached (e.g., Banyard et al., 2004; Berkowitz, 2002; Swartz & DeKeseredy, 2000). In recognition of this, the American College Health Association (ACHA, 2007) and the Centers for Disease
Control and Prevention (CDC, 2004) have both called for the implementation of bystander-focused prevention efforts. The bystander approach is an innovation aimed at addressing the limitations of traditional programs noted above to reduce the widespread problem of sexual and relationship violence on campuses (see Banyard et al., 2007) that teaches community members how to safely intervene in situations that involve sexual and relationship violence. Bystander-focused in person prevention programs provide an opportunity for skill development among bystanders thereby widening the safety net for survivors (Banyard et al., 2004, 2007). For example, Banyard and her colleagues (2007) found that compared to a control group, participants in a bystander-focused prevention program showed decreased rape myth acceptance, increased confidence in helping, increased willingness to help, and an increase in actual helpful bystander behaviors.

Recently, Potter and her colleagues (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, & Banyard, 2009; Potter, Stapleton, & Moynihan, 2008) designed and tested a poster campaign using tenets of the bystander approach in an effort to develop a passive educational tool for the prevention of sexual violence on campus. In addition to modeling prosocial bystander behaviors, the campaign uses content familiar to target audience members. Scenes were staged and cast to look similar to the people and situations that members of the target audience regularly encounter. We refer to this sense of familiarity recognized by members of the target audience as social self-identification. In this article, we attempt to understand how identifying oneself and one’s peer group (e.g., social self-identification) in the poster images affects target audience members’ (e.g., college students) willingness to intervene as a prosocial bystander. We wanted to learn if the use of poster images portraying familiar scenarios and using actors resembling target audience members make the targeted prevention behavior an acceptable choice, in this case intervening if sexual violence is occurring, is about to occur or has occurred.

**Background**

As college students pull away from their family identities and establish their individual identities, the opinions and actions of their peer group members increases in importance. College students strive to act in manners that are socially acceptable to their peers (Brown & Messman-Moore, 2009; Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003; Korcuska & Thombs, 2003; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Stein, 2007). For instance, research illustrates that male college students base their decision to intervene in situations where
there is the potential for sexual violence based on their perceptions of their male peer’s willingness to intervene in similar situations (Fabiano et al., 2003). A study of men’s willingness to intervene to prevent sexual assault indicates that although men want to intervene, they perceive that their peers are significantly less willing to intervene than is the case and are very conscious of their peers’ attitudes toward intervening (Stein, 2007). Finally, Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, and Alvi (2001) found that campus communities have higher rates of sexual violence to the extent that community and peer norms support individual coercive behavior in relationships, provide excuses for those who use coercion, and lack community members who use informal social control to inhibit perpetrators and protect potential victims. Recognizing the high value that college students place on the opinions and actions of their peers, social norms marketing has been used as a tool to change students’ perceptions regarding the behaviors of their peers (Fabiano, 2003; Glider, Midyett, Mills-Novoa, Johannessen, & Collins, 2001; Haines, 1996).

**Social Norms Marketing**

In recent years, health educators on college campuses have begun to adapt social marketing approaches that use perceptions of peer norms to influence behavior change (Berkowitz, 1997, 2002; Fabiano et al., 2003; Perkins, 2003; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986). Social psychological research indicating that people make decisions regarding their own behavior in relation to how they perceive their peers’ behavior served as the theoretical underpinning for the development of social norms marketing. Social norms marketing engage public audiences by asking them to think about their behaviors relative to their peers’ behaviors (Berkowitz, 1997; Fabiano, 2003; Thombs, Dotterer, Olds, Sharp, & Giovannone, 2004). Ironically, social norms researchers find that most people overestimate their peers’ engagement in unhealthy behaviors including drinking activities (Berkowitz, 1997; Martens et al., 2006; Perkins, Meilman, Leichliter, Cashin, & Presley, 1999) and sexual and drug-related activities (Martens et al., 2006). Yet students’ misperceptions of their peers’ behavior are influential predictors of their own individual behavior (Berkowitz, 1997, 2005; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986). By contextualizing the targeted behavior, the social marketing campaign highlights the actual drinking behaviors of the majority of students at the institution and “promotes accurate, healthy norms for drinking and non-use” (Berkowitz, 2005, p. 205). Although some research on the effectiveness of social norms marketing and alcohol consumption indicate mixed findings (Wechsler et al., 2006), other research indicate that when target audience members see their behavior in the context of their peers’ behavior, they gain insight into their own behaviors, which can
result in decreased alcohol consumption (Fabiano, 2003; Glider et al., 2001; Haines, 1996). What we term social self-identification builds on social norms tenets and incorporates a more in-depth context in an attempt to mirror the social experiences of the target audience members. Even though we are unable to provide normative feedback, one of the goals of our social marketing campaign is to reinforce positive norms.

**Social Self-Identification**

**Defining Social Self-Identification**

The term social self-identification refers to an individual’s ability to see himself or herself and a familiar context in the social marketer’s message. That is, if the models/actors and settings portrayed in the social marketing campaign look like the target audience or members of the target audiences’ peer group, then target audience members are more likely to absorb the campaign message than if the actors and social scene do not look familiar to members of the target audience. When we see ourselves in an advertising image and like the reflection of our social self and surroundings in the portrayed context, we are likely to pay greater attention to the advertised image. In addition to building on social norms marketing concepts, social self-identification also encompasses findings from corporate advertisers who have found success enticing the public to purchase products and services by highlighting how their products would enhance the consumers’ lifestyle (Sinclair, 2006; Wilson, 2006; Wissinger, 2009).

*Previous research.* Likewise, social science researchers find that the strength of identification with one’s reference group has been shown to be important in a range of groups as diverse as organization leaders (Kanter, 1977; Moore, 1962) to homeless people (Christian & Abrams, 2003). When people recognize themselves in others, there is an inherent sense of trust along with a feeling; there is less that is unknown and therefore overall impression of less uncertainty in the situation (Kanter, 1977). Furthermore, identification with one’s reference group influences an individual’s actions. The concept of social self-identification incorporates how one’s reference group can serve as both a protective and motivating factor.

Research on the effectiveness of social marketing campaigns highlight the need for the portrayal of characters, places, and events that are similar to the experiences of target audience members (Agha, 2003; Gilbert, 2005; Pechmann & Reibling, 2006). Two recent studies on adolescent tobacco use indicate to varying degrees the importance of utilizing context that is recognizable by the target audience (Gilbert, 2005; Pechmann & Reibling, 2006). First, Pechmann and Reibling (2006) found that advertisements that resonated most with the
adolescents showed people that looked like members of the target audience or people that the target audience members imagined that they would look like when they are older. In contrast, Gilbert (2005) found that antismoking campaign advertisers failed to attract the attention of late adolescent girls with their campaign by not understanding why the young women choose to smoke or the context in which they make their decisions to smoke. Gilbert (2005) concludes that successful antismoking campaigns must address the meanings that young women place on smoking, how smoking helps them construct their identity, and where smoking occurs.

Using Social Self-Identification as a Sexual Violence Prevention Tool

The Know Your Power sexual violence prevention poster campaign was developed using the concept of social self-identification as a guiding concept. The scenarios portrayed in the poster images were adapted from the experiences of target audience members gathered through focus groups and survey instruments. As the scenarios were being developed, additional data were collected to modify the scenes in an effort to portray scenarios that members of the target audience would identify and recognize. Great care was taken to make sure that the actors’ clothing, manners, and positions were an accurate portrayal. The Know Your Power posters attempt to reduce the degree of uncertainty by having people who look like the target audience model behaviors that may reduce the incidence of sexual violence in the depicted scene. Using “typical” students can send the message to the target audience that the behavior modeled in the posters “are something you can do, because, people just like you are engaging in proactive bystander behaviors.” Likewise, using scenarios that are familiar to target audience members or situations that reproduce the context and people they see may convince target audience members to take on bystander roles.

The Know Your Power social marketing campaign brings the main theories of the Bringing in the Bystander in-person program to the large student community in a less expensive proposition than the in-person program yet still giving community members an opportunity to engage in discussions regarding responsibilities in the prevention of sexual violence. Following the Bringing in the Bystander in-person program, the Know Your Power campaign asks men and women in the college community to intervene safely and in prosocial ways in situations where they suspect sexual violence is occurring or has the potential to occur. Unlike the in-person prevention programs where a peer educator can modulate their message depending on the audience reaction, social marketing campaigns by their nature generally do not have this type of
flexibility (for details of the poster development, see Potter et al., 2008; Potter et al., 2009).

**Poster descriptions.** The actors in the campaign images model the appropriate community-oriented behaviors that participants also learn in the bystander education program. This emphasis on the community’s role is fundamental to engaging both men and women in this effort. The four posters examined in this study portray typical college scenarios that explicitly model safe and appropriate bystander behaviors that address incidents occurring along the continuum of sexual violence. The first poster shows two women strategizing to stop a young man leading an incapacitated young woman upstairs at a house party; another poster shows a young man forcing his partner up against the desk in her residence hall room while she protests that he is hurting her while two bystanders discussing how they will intervene in the situation; a third poster features three different scenes modeling friends listening and caring for friends who have experienced sexual violence. Finally, the fourth poster takes place in the college town where young men in a car are shown yelling sexist remarks to an attractive young woman walking down the street. The bystander in this situation coolly admonishes the young men for their behavior (Potter et al., 2008).

All four posters feature the campaign tagline “Know your power. Step in, Speak up. You can make a difference,” and each provides specific advice about what to do in a situation similar to the one depicted. For example, the tagline in the poster that shows friends listening to friends reads, “Support a friend. Your support encourages victims of violence to seek help.” The campaign slogan informs bystanders that everyone in the community has a role to play in preventing sexual violence. The focus of community responsibility draws from criminological theory and previous research findings that community norms and attitudes are important explanatory factors for the prevalence of sexual and relationship violence on college campuses and thus a key target for prevention efforts (Schwartz et al., 2001). The campaign does not target perpetrators as research by forensic psychologists finds that predators use community contexts to facilitate their crimes and assert that perpetrators will not be reached through prevention education but rather through improved criminal justice responses (Lisak & Miller, 2002).

Finally it is important to note that even though today’s college students are immersed in media through the Internet, posters continue to represent an important form of contact by university personnel for disseminating academic and health and well-being information (Konradi & DeBruin, 2003; Mattern & Neighbors, 2004; Shive & Neyman Morris, 2006; White, Kolble, Carlson, & Lipson, 2005) and by corporate representatives seeking to build product loyalty (Schweitzer, 2005).
Method

Procedure

The four posters in the social marketing campaign were displayed throughout a midsize northeastern public university campus (e.g., residence halls, fraternities, sororities, campus recreation facilities, student center, and dining halls) as well as neighboring local businesses frequented by students. Research team members checked all posting locations every other day and rehung posters if necessary. During the last week of the 4-week poster display, the university’s homepage portal featured an advertisement showing a current model of an iPod offering undergraduate students an opportunity to win the device if they completed a community survey. Students who clicked on the link were directed to an institutional review board–approved online survey that took approximately 5 min to complete. The first set of survey questions focused on the participants’ willingness to engage in bystander prevention if they saw sexual violence occurring, about to occur, or following its occurrence. Participants were then shown photos of the four posters and asked whether they had seen them. Participants who answered “no” were advanced to demographic questions; those who answered “yes” were sent to a series of questions about their familiarity with the poster content and were then asked the demographic questions. Following the completion of the survey, all participants were directed to a separate Web page to be entered into the prize drawing.

Participants

Three hundred and seventy-two students completed the online survey. Sixty-two percent (231) were female, 27% (100) were 1st-year students, 87% were White, and 28% lived off-campus. Forty-six percent of the participants lived in university residence halls, 12% lived in university apartments, and 42% lived off-campus. Twenty-eight percent of students reported participating in a program focused on the prevention of violence against women.

Our sample is representative of the larger university population with the exception of the students living off campus. During the same semester, 57% of the undergraduate students enrolled at the university were female, 24% were 1st-year students, 93% were White, and 42% lived off campus.

Measures

Outcome variables. Three “stage of change” variables were developed to measure participants’ willingness to engage in bystander behaviors in relationship to preventing sexual assault (Grimley, Prochaska, Velicer, Blais, &
Participants respond on a 5-point scale from *not at all true* to *very much true* indicating how much each of the statements was true of them. Following the work of Grimley et al. (1994), the scale was then divided into three subscales that assess the magnitude of change that participants express willingness to make: precontemplation, contemplation, and action. The precontemplation subscale assessed participants’ awareness of the problem of sexual violence on campus and was coded so that higher score indicates the participant’s greater knowledge about sexual violence on the campus. The contemplation subscale assesses willingness to get involved in reducing violence against women. The contemplation stage subscale was coded so that higher scores indicate greater willingness to take action. The action subscale assessed whether participants have taken action accordingly. Thereby, the higher the action subscale score, the more likely the participant has been involved in actual activities aimed at reducing violence against women (for a detailed description of the Stages of Change Model and Scales, see Banyard, Eckstein, & Moynihan, 2010).

**Predictor variables.** We operationalized social self-identification by asking Likert-type scale questions, measured on a 5-point scale, examining whether participants have witnessed similar situations, been involved in similar situations, and if the actors featured in the posters look like people with whom participants are likely to spend their time. In the analysis, we also control for covariates found in prior research to affect college students’ attitudes toward sexual violence: gender, year in college, race, residence, and previous participation in a program aimed at reducing violence against women on campus (Berkowitz, 2002).

**Results**

**Descriptive Analyses**

Seventy-eight percent (291) of the participants reported seeing the posters, and 22% (81) of the participants reported that they had not seen the posters (see Table 1). The difference between those who did and did not see the posters varied significantly by class standing, $\chi^2(3, N = 372) = 16.48, p < .001$. First-year students were more likely to report seeing the posters than not seeing the posters (30% vs. 15%). Alternately, seniors were more likely to report not seeing the posters than seeing the posters (42% vs. 28%). The differences in the gender and race/ethnicity of participants who reported seeing and not seeing the posters was not significant. Students who lived in a residence hall were significantly more likely to report seeing the posters compared to students who lived off campus (56% vs. 30%), $\chi^2(2, N = 369) = 88.64, p < .0001$. We
conducted a $t$ test to determine if there was a difference in the stage of change scales based on whether participants reported seeing posters. There was a significant effect for the contemplation and action stage scales $t(370) = -3.64, p < .0001$ and $t(370) = -2.57, p < .01$, respectively, with participants who reported seeing the posters showing higher contemplation scores (6.57 vs. 5.47) and higher action scores (5.99 vs. 4.83; see Table 1). Finally, of the 291 students who reported seeing the posters, 220 (76%) reported seeing the posters once a day or more and 71 (24%) saw the posters less than once a day.

**Statistical Analyses**

**Social self-identification.** Examining participants’ familiarity with the social marketing campaign images, we find that of the 291 participants who saw the posters, 39% agreed with the statement “I have witnessed similar situations.” The 113 participants that agreed with this statement had an average precontemplation score of 11.2 ($SD = 2.6$), and the 178 participants who disagreed or were undecided had an average precontemplation score of 10.4 ($SD = 2.4$). The effect of participants witnessing situations similar to those depicted in the posters, therefore, was highly significant, $F(1, 289) = 7.5, p < .007$. Furthermore, compared to the participants who did not agree or were undecided about the statement, the 113 participants who agreed with this statement had a significantly higher contemplation score ($M = 7.3, SD = 2.3$ vs. $M = 6.1, SD = 2.3$), $F(1, 289) = 19.1, p < .0001$, and a significantly higher action score ($M = 7.3, SD = 4.2$ vs. $M = 5.1, SD = 3.1$), $F(1, 289) = 25.7, p < .0001$.

Twenty-four percent (71) of the students agreed with the statement “I have been involved in similar situations.” The 71 participants who agreed with this statement had an average precontemplation score of 11.5 ($SD = 2.6$) and the 220 participants who disagreed or were undecided had an average precontemplation score of 10.5 ($SD = 2.4$), the effect of participants reporting being involved in similar situations was highly significant, $F(1, 289) = 8.23, p < .004$. Furthermore, compared to the participants who did not agree or were undecided about the statement, the 71 participants who agreed with this statement had a significantly higher contemplation score ($M = 7.4, SD = 2.2$ vs. $M = 6.3, SD = 2.3$), $F(1, 289) = 11.77, p < .001$, and a significantly higher action score ($M = 8, SD = 4.4$ vs. $M = 5.3, SD = 3.3$), $F(1, 289) = 29.88, p < .0001$.

Finally, 60% (176) of the participants agreed with the statement “these people look like people that I am likely to see.” The 176 participants who agreed with this statement had an average precontemplation score of 11.3 ($SD = 2.5$), and the 115 participants who disagreed or were undecided had an
Table 1. Participant Characteristics and Poster Viewing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participant Did Not See Posters (N = 81)</th>
<th>Participant Saw Posters (N = 291)</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>15 (12)</td>
<td>30 (88)</td>
<td>$\chi^2(3, n = 372) = 16.48^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>12 (10)</td>
<td>22 (65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>31 (25)</td>
<td>20 (58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>42 (34)</td>
<td>27 (80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39 (31)</td>
<td>37 (109)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61 (49)</td>
<td>63 (182)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>88 (71)</td>
<td>87 (254)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>12 (10)</td>
<td>13 (37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>56 (163)</td>
<td>$\chi^2(2, n = 369) = 88.64^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>14 (41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apartment</td>
<td>89 (70)</td>
<td>30 (86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in VAW program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 (15)</td>
<td>30 (88)</td>
<td>$\chi^2(1, n = 372) = 4.35^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81 (66)</td>
<td>70 (203)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of change scale scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precontemplation Scale</td>
<td>10.4 (2.4)</td>
<td>10.73 (2.52)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemplation Scale</td>
<td>5.47 (2.62)</td>
<td>6.57 (2.36)</td>
<td>$t(370) = -3.64, .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Scale</td>
<td>4.83 (2.94)</td>
<td>5.99 (3.74)</td>
<td>$t(370) = -2.57, .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: VAW = violence against women.

*p < .1. ***p < .01.

average precontemplation score of 9.9 (SD = 2.3), the effect of the people (in the posters) looking like people that I am likely to see, therefore, was highly significant, $F(1, 289) = 20.37, p < .0001$. Furthermore, compared to the participants that did not agree or were undecided about the statement, the 176
participants who agreed with this statement had a significantly higher contemplation score ($M = 6.9, SD = 2.4$ vs. $M = 6.1, SD = 2.2$), $F(1, 289) = 8.3, p < .004$, and a significantly higher action score ($M = 6.6, SD = 4$ vs. $M = 5, SD = 3.2$), $F(1, 289) = 14.3, p < .0001$.

**Regression analyses.** We completed our statistical analysis using ordinary least squares regression (OLS) with SPSS 16, by examining the impact of the social-self identification variables on the three stage of scale scores—precontemplation, contemplation, and action controlling for participant demographic characteristics, poster viewing frequency, and previous experience participating in a sexual violence prevention program (see Table 2). Agreeing with the statement “these people look like people that I am likely to see” ($\beta = .79, p < .01$) demonstrated significant effects on the precontemplation stage scale scores. Examining the contemplation scale, we find that women were significantly ($\beta = .54, p < .05$) more willing than men to become involved. Participants agreeing with the statement “I have witnessed similar situations” had higher contemplation scale scores than participants who disagreed or were undecided about this statement ($\beta = .82, p < .05$). Finally, students who had previously taken part in a program aimed to reduce violence against women had significantly higher action scale scores than those who had not ($\beta = 3.7, p < .001$). Participants who agreed with the statement “I have witnessed similar situations” had higher action stage scale scores than students who indicated that they disagreed or were undecided about this statement ($\beta = .77, p < .10$). Furthermore, participants who agreed with the statement “I have been involved in similar situations” had higher action stage scale scores than students who disagreed or were undecided about this statement ($\beta = 1.0, p < .05$).

**Discussion**

Colleges have begun to develop policies and practices to reduce sexual violence on campus, in conjunction with victim assistance and procedures for informing the community about sexual violence incidents. Yet as Karjane (2005) and her colleagues indicate, administrative action represents only one component of the multifaceted approaches needed to reduce sexual violence on campus. As recommended by the ACHA and the CDC, prevention that provides community members with a role to play in ending sexual violence needs to be incorporated into campus education endeavors. Based on the findings from the current exploratory study, these endeavors may be more effective if they incorporate actors, scenarios, and context that are familiar and resonate with target audience members.
Table 2. OLS Regression Results Assessing Social Self-Identification and Stage-of-Change Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Precontemplation</th>
<th>Contemplation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class standing (Senior is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>-0.43 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.72 (0.45)*</td>
<td>0.05 (0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>0.37 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.45)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>0.45 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.20 (0.29)******</td>
<td>0.54 (0.28)**</td>
<td>-0.48 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity (White is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.42)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.84 (0.57)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (Off-campus residency is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>-0.10 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.4)</td>
<td>-0.18 (0.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>-0.58 (0.46)</td>
<td>-0.71 (0.45)*</td>
<td>-0.46 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in VAW program (No previous participation is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.10 (0.32)*****</td>
<td>0.47 (0.31)*</td>
<td>3.70 (0.43)****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant saw the social marketing campaign (Seeing the campaign less than once a day is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a day or more</td>
<td>0.16 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.41 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have witnessed similar situations (Disagreeing with statement or undecided is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant agreed</td>
<td>0.12 (0.36)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.35)***</td>
<td>0.77 (0.49)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been involved in similar situations (Disagreeing with statement or undecided is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant agreed</td>
<td>0.08 (0.4)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.39)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.54)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These people look like people that I am likely to see (Disagreeing with statement or undecided is the reference category)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant agreed</td>
<td>0.79 (0.3)*****</td>
<td>0.33 (0.3)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.08 (0.43)*****</td>
<td>5.15 (0.42)****</td>
<td>3.89 (0.58)****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: VAW = violence against women. Standard errors are in parenthesis. Since the hypotheses was one directional stating that people who reported viewing the campaign would have a higher Precontemplation Scale score, Contemplation Scale score and Action Scale score than those who did not report viewing the social marketing campaign, we used a 1-tailed test. *p < .1. **p < .05. ***p < .01. ****p < .001.

Our findings on the utility of social self-identification enable us to build on the work of social norms researchers. In most social norms marketing campaigns, the campaign materials feature descriptions of normative student
behavior rather than perceived student behavior (Glider et al., 2001; Thombs et al., 2004). The Know Your Power social marketing campaign builds on the use of reporting normative behaviors as the “actors” in the poster resemble the peer group of target audience members and model prescribed prosocial bystander behaviors in familiar settings. Thus, the posters add information about the target audience’s peer group behaviors. Research participants indicate that the familiarity of the poster context makes them contemplate the prescribed behavior or act in the manner highlighted in the poster. The importance of seeing oneself as a motivator for behavior change is substantiated in the work of Stein (2007) and Fabiano et al. (2003) who find that individuals make decisions regarding their own behavior based on the perception of their peer’s behaviors.

The results of the current study indicate the importance of presenting a familiar context when engaging target audience members in social marketing campaigns. The research participants were significantly more likely to contemplate taking action in preventing a situation where sexual violence had the potential to occur when they indicated that the scenes portrayed in the posters looked like situations that were familiar to them. Furthermore, those participants who indicated familiarity with the poster content were more likely to indicate that they had acted in a manner similar to those portrayed in the poster. Seeing a poster with actors who look like friends in an environment that is familiar can make the target audience members feel more comfortable in taking on a prosocial bystander role in a situation where sexual violence is occurring or has the potential to occur. The results of the analyses indicate that the effectiveness of social marketing campaigns will be raised if campaign designers work to ensure that the target audience can recognize themselves or people like them or their friends in the campaigns. Furthermore, the target audience needs to see situations that they frequently encounter portrayed in social marketing campaigns.

Previous research indicates that in-person education programs tend to be more effective than passive intervention methods. Yet our findings show that the Know Your Power social marketing campaign raises awareness about the incidence of sexual violence on campus and the importance of taking action to reduce sexual violence on campus even when controlling for previous participation in a prevention program. Unlike an in-person bystander program, a bystander social marketing campaign requires minimal funds and administrative time and therefore can serve as one method or a first step in a multimethod program. Moreover, although the results of the study are robust, perhaps a longer campaign would have produced even stronger results.
The present exploratory study has a number of limitations including the lack of diversity in the sample age and ethnicity. We have recently developed two posters that address sexual violence in the gay, bisexual, lesbian, and transgender community that are currently being evaluated. In addition, we recently received funding that will enable us to develop a poster addressing sexual violence of disabled individuals. We also acknowledge the limitations of the small sample size. Perhaps the sample size could have been larger if the advertisement for the survey could have remained for a larger period time on the university porthole. However, that was not a possibility. As the cost and cooperation to conduct a random sample of classes across the university was prohibitive, we used a realistic and cost-effective survey technique available to us. Clearly, further research conducted with a larger sample is in order, but the findings from this exploratory study are promising regarding the utility of social self-identification in social marketing campaigns modeling prosocial bystander behavior for intervening in situations where sexual violence is occurring or has the potential to occur. Finally, it is important to note that although posters can produce attitude changes as we demonstrated, these changes are not the same as the development of actual intervention skills that are taught in the in-person prevention program. In addition, it would be interesting to examine the effectiveness of incorporating explicit feedback (e.g., social norms marketing) into a poster campaign that addresses bystander behavior.

Further research needs to examine the effectiveness of a sexual violence bystander prevention campuswide social marketing campaign that uses the images modeling prosocial bystander behaviors in other venues including product distribution (e.g., bookmarks), university computer splash pages, and large images like bus wraps. In addition, researchers need to examine whether passive prevention initiatives (e.g., social marketing campaigns) in conjunction with active prevention efforts (e.g., in-person prevention programs) can be used in an effective way both educationally and economically. For instance, is there an interaction effect between the uses of an in-person program with a social marketing campaign? Will the messages from an in-person program resonate more effectively if participants are exposed to a related social marketing program along with or after their in-person training? How do attitudes or behaviors of people exposed to the social marketing campaign differ from people who are not exposed to the posters but participate in the in-person prevention program? In conclusion, the promising findings from this exploratory study give some optimism to believe that these and similar prevention efforts will help create safer campuses where members of the campus community recognize and take on the role of prosocial bystanders who send out the message that sexual violence is not tolerated in their community.
Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared that they had no conflicts of interest with respect to their authorship or the publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) declared that they received no financial support for their research and/or authorship of this article.

References


**Bios**

**Sharyn J. Potter**, PhD, MPH, is an associate professor in the department of sociology, and she is codirector of Prevention Innovations at the University of New Hampshire, Durham. She received her PhD in medical sociology and an MPH in health policy and management from Emory University, Druid Hills, Georgia. She has studied how policy change impacts organizations, providers, and clients. For the past 6 years, she has helped lead the development and evaluation efforts of the Know Your Power Bringing in the Bystander Social Marketing Campaign. She is part of a research team that has received funding from the NIJ, DOJ, and CDC.

**Mary M. Moynihan**, PhD, is a research associate professor of women’s studies, an affiliate of the Justice Studies Program and co-coordinator of Prevention Innovations at the University of New Hampshire, Durham. She received her PhD from the University of Akron-Kent State University Joint PhD program in sociology, held a postdoctoral fellowship at the Mary Ingraham Bunting Institute (now Radcliffe Institute of Harvard University), Cambridge, Massachusetts, and was a research associate at the Family Research Laboratory. She is a cocreator and evaluator of the Bringing in the Bystander in-person program and social marketing campaign. She is part of a research team that has received funding from the NIJ, DOJ, and CDC.

**Jane G. Stapleton**, MA, is a research instructor of women’s studies and family studies, an affiliate of the Justice Studies Program and co-coordinator of Prevention Innovations at the University of New Hampshire, Durham. As an activist, administrator, policy maker, service provider, and researcher, she has worked in the field of ending violence against women on university campuses for 20 years. She is part of a research team that has received funding from the DOJ and CDC.