Evaluation Research
on the Effects of "A Good Boy" and "Daughter" Videos

SUMMARY

"A Good Boy" is a story of pedophilia. "Daughter" is about a 12-year-old girl, who becomes a victim of sexual abuse by her own father. These two animations were produced by Stairway Foundation, Inc. in an effort to educate the public about the largely hidden problem of child sexual abuse. They assist the public in addressing subjects that are very hard to talk openly about, but which must be talked about as a matter of urgency and if we are going to prevent further damage to vulnerable individuals and to society.

Are the animations achieving their purpose?

This is an evaluation research that made use of a survey questionnaire to determine the effects of showing the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, without processing.

Effects are gauged in terms of the learning that takes place among the audience after watching the two videos.

Learning refers to predetermined learning points in the areas of (1) disclosure, (2) knowledge about the dynamics of sexual abuse, and (3) preempting abuse, factors that are deemed necessary for people in society to have, in order to combat child sexual abuse. These predetermined learning points formed the basis of the constructed questionnaire.

The variables included in the study are gender, grade level (Grades 5-6, Year 1-2, Year 3-4), type of school (private, public), and type of community (urban, rural).

This study sought to find out the effects of showing the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, without processing, on the level of the subjects' learning on sexual abuse.

It sought answers to the following questions:

1. **Is there a significant increase in the subjects' learning about sexual abuse as a result of watching the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, in general?**
2. **In which area (disclosure, knowledge about the dynamics of sexual abuse, or prevention) was the learning highest/lowest?**
3. **In which groups (males, females, private schools, public schools, rural, urban, different grade levels) were there significant increases in learning?**
4. **Is there a significant difference in the learning of:**
    - **Males vs. Females**

- **Rural vs. Urban**
- **Private vs. Public**
- **Different grade levels**

The sample was composed of male and female students in Grades 5 and 6, 1st to 4th year high school, from both private and public schools in Manila, Pasay, and Oriental Mindoro. Grades 5 and 6 were treated as one grade level, 1st and 2nd year high school as another grade level, and 3rd and 4th year high school as another. There were one private high school, one public high school, and one public elementary school in Manila; one public elementary, one public high school and one private high school in Pasay. There were also one private high school and one public elementary school in Mindoro. Thus, the total number of participating schools is eight. The sections and the students were sampled randomly, although the participant schools were chosen on the basis of their willingness to participate in the study. There were 935 students in the intervention sample.

Another group of 44 students with the following distribution served as the control group, who were also given the pre- and posttest, but were shown the videos only after the posttest.

A questionnaire was constructed, based on the intended learning in the areas of disclosure, knowledge about the dynamics of child sexual abuse, and preempting abuse, three elements that are necessary to combat child sexual abuse in society.

Disclosure **is defined by the tendency to agree with items in the questionnaire about expressing/sharing/revealing past or present experience of sexual abuse as well as seeking help, and by the tendency to reject items about concealing the experience and the identity of the perpetrator. The opposite of disclosure is concealment, not speaking up, or not knowing what to do.**

Knowledge about the dynamics of child sexual abuse **is defined by correct answers to items on the dynamics, forms, and facts of child sexual abuse, as well as proper behavior toward children. The opposite of knowledge is wrong answer or answer that says he/she does not know.**

Preempting abuse **is defined by the tendency to agree with items about acting in a self-protective manner and protecting others within one's sphere of influence from sexual abuse, and by the tendency to reject items about not being able or willing to protect self and others from sexual abuse, or not knowing what to do.**

The questionnaire was constructed by a group that is experienced in the area of advocacy against sexual abuse. Their expertise ascertained the content validity of the questionnaire.

The permission of the chosen schools was sought. Sections were randomly chosen from each of the three grade levels. In classes where there were over 90 students, half were randomly selected by the class teacher to participate in the study. These students were given the pre-test.

Afterwards, two students were randomly chosen to be part of the control group. They were taken out of the room, and administered the posttest, after which they watched the "A Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos.

The intervention students remaining in the room were shown the videos immediately after the pretest. After the videos, they had a 30-minute snack break. Finally, the post-test (which uses the same questionnaire as the pre-test), was administered.

The questionnaires were scored. All of the data from each questionnaire were encoded for each subject, including the demographic variables, his/her score for each item pre- and posttest, and his/her overall score, pre- and posttest. Means were computed for the test scores.

Frequencies of right and wrong scores on each item were obtained for the Control and Intervention groups. Percentages were computed.

The t-test for dependent and independent samples was computed to determine if there are significant differences in the means of the different groupings from pretest to posttest.

Increase in the Subjects' Learning About Sexual Abuse as a Result of Watching the Videos

The t-test reveals that the pretest means of the two groups are not significantly different. This means that there was good randomization of the subjects at the beginning of the study.

On the other hand, the posttest mean of the Intervention group is significantly higher than that of the Control group. This means that the videos, which were shown to the Intervention group right after the pretest and immediately before the posttest, proved to be the factor that increased the Intervention subjects' learning about sexual abuse.

Area Where Learning was Highest/Lowest

The increase in percentage of students answering the items correctly is generally higher for the Intervention group than for the Control group. This is a validation of both the videos and the questionnaire, generally.

For all items except Item 28, the Intervention group shows an increase in percentage of those answering correctly. The pretest means of both the Control and Intervention groups on Item 28 are already high, to begin with. Any increase is expected to be small. Still, it is worth looking at why the 10% of the Intervention group did not learn from the video that: just because one has accepted gifts from another person does not mean that one should do everything that that person wishes (Item 28). Perhaps the "*utang na loob*" (debt of gratitude) element of the culture was at work in the minds of the 10%.

Disclosure and Knowledge appears to have the higher average increase than Preempting Abuse in percentage of those answering correctly, but this could be a function of number of items. There are fewer questionnaire items for Preempting Abuse, which means that the Preempting Abuse aspect of the videos was not as fully dealt with or brought out in the questionnaire as Disclosure and Knowledge were.

Area of Greatest Learning

It should be noted that for both the Control and Intervention groups, the percentages of students answering the items correctly were already high for many items at pretest, to begin with. This could mean that the subjects as a whole have had exposure to educational materials on sexual abuse, which is no surprise, since the subjects are students in schools, where this topic is taken up. However, the significant increase at posttest of the Intervention group points to additional unique learning areas that the videos have to offer.

Most of the items that reflect the relatively higher increase of at least 5% of the Intervention group over the Control group or on which at least 90% of the Intervention group scored correctly at posttest are about action tendencies or what the subjects would tend to do given a situation of abuse or potential abuse. This means that the videos have increased the tendency or resolve of the subjects to do something about the situation. Taking action is apparently where the greatest learning has occurred.

Increase in Learning by Group

All groupings, regardless of gender, grade level, type of school, or type of community registered a significant increase at posttest over the pretest.

This means that the variables did not make a difference in the subjects' learning significantly more about sexual abuse as a result of the videos. Both males and females, rural and urban, private and public, and all the grade levels have learned significantly more, as a result of the videos, even without processing.

Significant Differences in Increase in Learning by Variable

If we examine the categories within each variable, we find that although both males and females registered significant increases at posttest over pretest, the females have significantly higher scores than males at pretest and at posttest, although the difference is small. The difference could be because the public talks more about abuse of women than of men and the women are cautioned more than men are.

Public and private schools did not differ significantly at pretest, but at posttest, the private schools scored significantly higher than the public schools, although the difference is small; it will be recalled that both public and private schools gained significantly higher posttest than pretest scores.

The rural schools scored significantly higher than the urban schools at both pretest and posttest, although the difference is again small.

If we recall the area where greatest level of learning occurred, which is action, it can be surmised that the private schools and the rural areas were a little more emboldened to take action than their counterparts.

It is therefore concluded that generally, the Intervention subjects learned more than the Control subjects about the dynamics of sexual abuse after watching the videos, across gender, grade level, type of school, and type of community, even without processing. They also learned to disclose more. They also learned to prevent potential abuse more.

Overall, taking action is where the greatest learning occurred.

Since such learning is crucial to preventing and combating child sexual abuse within a society, then the videos could play a significant role in protecting children in areas where they are shown.

It is hereby recommended that the videos be shown to other types of audiences, locally and abroad.

Further research could be conducted to determine differences in effects of the videos on different ethnic or regional groups, and on different nationalities, as well as on different sectors within a society.

Different forms of processing, such as one-on-one, focus group, or classroom type, could be implemented in order to find out the effects of the videos that are not covered in the present questionnaire.

Evaluation Research on the Effects of "A Good Boy" and "Daughter" Videos

"A Good Boy" is a story of pedophilia. "Daughter" is about a 12-year-old girl, who becomes a victim of sexual abuse by her own father. These two animations were produced by Stairway Foundation, Inc. in an effort to educate the public about the largely hidden problem of child sexual abuse. They assist the public in addressing subjects that are very hard to talk openly about, but which must be talked about as a matter of urgency and if we are going to prevent further damage to vulnerable individuals and to society.

Are the animations achieving their purpose?

INTRODUCTION

This is an evaluation research that made use of a survey questionnaire to determine the effects of showing the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, without processing.

Effects are gauged in terms of the learning that takes place among the audience after watching the two videos.

Learning refers to predetermined learning points in the areas of (1) disclosure, (2) knowledge about the dynamics of sexual abuse, and (3) preempting abuse, factors that are deemed necessary for people in society to have, in order to combat child sexual abuse. These predetermined learning points formed the basis of the constructed questionnaire.

The variables included in the study are gender, grade level (Grades 5-6, Year 1-2, Year 3-4), type of school (private, public), and type of community (urban, rural).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study sought to find out the effects of showing the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, without processing, on the level of the subjects' learning on sexual abuse.

It sought answers to the following questions:

1. **Is there a significant increase in the subjects' learning about sexual abuse as a result of watching the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, in general?**
2. **In which area (disclosure, knowledge about the dynamics of sexual abuse, or prevention) was the learning highest/lowest?**
3. **In which groups (males, females, private schools, public schools, rural, urban, different grade levels) were there significant increases in learning?**
4. **Is there a significant difference in the learning of:**
    a. **Males vs. Females**
    b. **Rural vs. Urban**
    c. **Private vs. Public**
    d. **Different grade levels**

METHOD

The following constitutes the blueprint for the research:

Design

This is an evaluation research that made use of a constructed survey questionnaire administered pre- and post-intervention to determine the learning that takes place among the audience after watching the "Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos, without processing. Based on the results of the questionnaire, a judgment is made as to whether the two videos can stand alone without processing, or whether certain processes and/or pointers need to be added in conjunction with the videos, in order to achieve the desired learning level among the audience.

Setting of the Study

The research was conducted in both urban and rural areas. Manila and Pasay were the urban settings, while Mindoro was the rural setting.

Sample

The sample was composed of male and female students in Grades 5 and 6, 1st to 4th year high school, from both private and public schools in Manila, Pasay, and Oriental Mindoro. Grades 5 and 6 were treated as one grade level, 1st and 2nd year high school as another grade level, and 3rd and 4th year high school as another. There were one private high school, one public high school, and one public elementary school in Manila; one public elementary, one public high school and one private high school in Pasay. There were also one private high school and one public elementary school in Mindoro. Thus, the total number of

participating schools is eight. The sections and the students were sampled randomly, although the participant schools were chosen on the basis of their willingness to participate in the study. There were 935 students in the intervention sample, distributed as follows:

Urban (Manila)												Rural (Mindoro)											
Private						Public						Private						Public					
5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0	0	35	47	40	40	43	48	39	56	33	53	0	0	28	64	29	43	34	24	0	0	0	0

Urban (Pasay)											
Private						Public					
5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0	0	16	18	9	8	47	26	45	36	37	36

Another group of 44 students with the following distribution served as the control group, who were also given the pre- and posttest, but were shown the videos only after the posttest:

Urban (Manila)												Rural (Mindoro)											
Private						Public						Private						Public					
5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0	0	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0

Urban (Pasay)											
Private						Public					
5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th		5/6		1st/2nd		3rd/4th	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	2	2

<u>Instrument</u>

A questionnaire was constructed, based on the intended learning in the areas of disclosure, knowledge about the dynamics of child sexual abuse, and preempting abuse, three elements that are necessary to combat child sexual abuse in society.

Disclosure **is defined by the tendency to agree with items in the questionnaire about expressing/sharing/revealing past or present experience of sexual abuse as well as seeking help, and by the tendency to reject items about concealing the experience and the identity of the perpetrator. The opposite of disclosure is concealment, not speaking up, or not knowing what to do.**

Knowledge about the dynamics of child sexual abuse **is defined by correct answers to items on the dynamics, forms, and facts of child sexual abuse, as well as proper behavior toward children. The opposite of knowledge is wrong answer or answer that says he/she does not know.**

Preempting abuse **is defined by the tendency to agree with items about acting in a self-protective manner and protecting others within one's sphere of influence from sexual abuse, and by the tendency to reject items about not being able or willing to protect self and others from sexual abuse, or not knowing what to do.**

Based on the above definitions, the questionnaire items were constructed. (Please see attached questionnaire). The 29 items are distributed according to the following table of specification:

	Disclosure	**Knowledge about CSA**	**Prevention**
Knowledge		2, 24, 25, 26	
Attitudes			
Thinking/Belief	7, 23	4, 8, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27	28, 29
Feeling	11		22
Action	1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19	14	9, 15, 17

The questionnaire was constructed by a group that is experienced in the area of advocacy against sexual abuse. Their expertise ascertained the content validity of the questionnaire.

Data Gathering Procedure

The permission of the chosen schools was sought. Sections were randomly chosen from each of the three grade levels. In classes where there were over 90 students, half were randomly selected by the class teacher to participate in the study. These students were given the pre-test.

Afterwards, two students were randomly chosen to be part of the control group. They were taken out of the room, and administered the posttest, after which they watched the "A Good Boy" and "Daughter" videos.

The intervention students remaining in the room were shown the videos immediately after the pretest. After the videos, they had a 30-minute snack break. Finally, the post-test (which uses the same questionnaire as the pre-test), was administered.

Data Analysis

The questionnaires were scored. All of the data from each questionnaire were encoded for each subject, including the demographic variables, his/her score for each item pre- and posttest, and his/her overall score, pre- and posttest. Means were computed for the test scores.

Frequencies of right and wrong scores on each item were obtained for the Control and Intervention groups. Percentages were computed.

The t-test for dependent and independent samples was computed to determine if there are significant differences in the means of the different groupings from pretest to posttest.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results are presented in the order of the questions in the Statement of the Problem.

Increase in the Subjects' Learning About Sexual Abuse as a Result of Watching the Videos

Table 1 shows the pretest and posttest means and standard deviations of the Control and Intervention groups.

The t-test reveals that the pretest means of the two groups are not significantly different: $t(977) = .236$ at $\alpha > .813$. This means that there was good randomization of the subjects at the beginning of the study.

On the other hand, the posttest mean of the Intervention group is significantly higher than that of the Control: $t(977) = 3.195$ at $\alpha < .001$. This means that the videos, which were shown to the Intervention group right after the pretest and immediately before the posttest, proved to be the factor that increased the Intervention subjects' learning about sexual abuse.

Table 1. Pretest and posttest means, standard deviations and t-tests for Control and Intervention groups

Group	Pretest Mean	t-test #	df * (N-2)	A	Posttest Mean	t-test #	df * (N-2)	α	N (no. of subjects pre and post)	Standard Deviation** Pretest	Standard Deviation** Posttest
Control	23.89	.236	977	.813	24.11	3.195	977	.001	44	4.545	6.180
Intervention	24.04				25.99				935	4.315	3.652

The **t-test** assesses whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other.

***** For a set of data points in a given situation (e.g. with mean or other parameter specified, or not), **degrees of freedom** is the minimal number of values which should be specified to determine all the data points.

****** The **standard deviation** is a statistic that tells how tightly all the various scores are clustered around the mean. When the scores are pretty tightly bunched together, the standard deviation is small. When the scores are spread apart, the standard deviation is relatively large. In the table above, it is shown that the standard deviation of the Intervention group became smaller, that is, the scores became more tightly bunched together around the higher mean of the Intervention group at posttest, proving further that there was a greater convergence of the scores of the Intervention group towards a higher mean.

Area Where Learning was Highest/Lowest

Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the percentage of students answering Disclosure, Knowledge, and Preempting Abuse items correctly, at pretest and at posttest, for the Control and Intervention groups.

It is evident that the increase in percentage of students answering the items correctly is generally higher for the Intervention group than for the Control group. This is a validation of both the videos and the questionnaire, generally.

For all items except Item 28, the Intervention group shows an increase in percentage of those answering correctly. The pretest means of both the Control and Intervention groups on Item 28 are already high, to begin with. Any increase is expected to be small. Still, it is worth looking at why the 10% of the Intervention group did not learn from the video that: just because one has accepted gifts from another person does not mean that one should do everything that that person wishes (Item 28). Perhaps the "*utang na loob*" (debt of gratitude) element of the culture was at work in the minds of the 10%.

Disclosure and Knowledge appears to have the higher average increase than Preempting Abuse in percentage of those answering correctly, but this could be a function of number of items. There are fewer questionnaire items for Preempting Abuse, which means that the Preempting Abuse aspect of the videos

was not as fully dealt with or brought out in the questionnaire as Disclosure and Knowledge were.

Table 2

Percentage of students answering Disclosure Items correctly (Items 1, 3, 5, 6, 7,10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 23)

	CONTROL			INTERVENTION		
Item No.	Pretest	Posttest	Difference	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
1	81.4	90.9	9.5	86.6	94.7	8.1
3	35.7	53.5	17.8	40.9	52.4	11.5
5	90.9	93.2	2.3	89.5	95.8	6.3
6	88.6	88.6	0	86.3	93.7	7.4
7	88.6	81.8	-6.8	84.5	93.7	9.2
10	84.1	81.8	-2.3	82.4	93.5	11.1
11	88.6	90.9	2.3	90.9	96.3	5.4
12	79.5	81.8	2.3	82.9	91.6	8.7
13	81.8	86	4.2	87	95	8
16	90.9	88.6	-2.3	84.6	94	9.4
18	70.5	77.3	6.8	81.9	86.8	4.9
19	88.6	88.6	0	90.3	91.2	0.9
23	83.7	95.5	11.8	91	95.2	4.2
		Average increase	**3.507692308**			**7.315385**

Table 3

Percentage of students answering Knowledge Items correctly (Items 2, 4, 8, 14, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27)

	CONTROL			INTERVENTION		
Item No.	Pretest	Posttest	Difference	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
2	55.8	69.7	13.9	59.3	69.9	10.6
4	55.8	61.4	5.6	66.6	79.6	13
8	90.9	84.1	-6.8	87.5	91.8	4.3
14	97.7	86.4	-11.3	88.6	89.9	1.3
20	79.5	84.1	4.6	80.7	86.3	5.6
21	88.6	81.8	-6.8	86.1	92.6	6.5
22	74.4	75	0.6	75.6	87.2	11.6
24	75	65.9	-9.1	73.4	85.9	12.5
25	95.5	90.9	-4.6	92.7	96.1	3.4
26	86.4	90.9	4.5	90.4	93.9	3.5
27	86	81.8	-4.2	80	87	7
		Average increase	**-1.236363**			**7.209090**

Table 4

Percentage of students answering Preempting Abuse Items correctly (Items 9, 15, 17, 28, 29)

	CONTROL			INTERVENTION		
	Pretest	Posttest	Difference	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Item No.						
9	88.6	83.7	-4.9	92.1	94.1	2
15	84.1	88.6	4.5	80.6	92.5	11.9
17	88.6	88.6	0	89.8	95.2	5.4
28	97.7	93.2	-4.5	90.7	89.5	-1.2
29	100	93.2	-6.8	91.4	93.2	1.8
		Average increase	**-2.34**			**3.98**

Area of Greatest Learning

It should be noted that for both the Control and Intervention groups, the percentages of students answering the items correctly were already high for many items at pretest, to begin with. This could mean that the subjects as a whole have had exposure to educational materials on sexual abuse, which is no surprise, since the subjects are students in schools, where this topic is usually taken up. However, the significant increase at posttest of the Intervention group over the Control group points to additional unique learning areas that the videos have to offer.

Following are the items that reflect the relatively higher increase of at least 5% of the Intervention group over the Control group or on which at least 90% of the Intervention group scored correctly at posttest:

Disclosure

Disclosure Items that reflect the relatively higher increase of at least 5% of the Intervention group over the Control group or on which at least 90% of the Intervention group scored correctly at posttest

	CONTROL			INTERVENTION		
	Pretest	Posttest	Difference	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Item No.						
6	88.6	88.6	0	86.3	93.7	7.4
7	88.6	81.8	-6.8	84.5	93.7	9.2
10	84.1	81.8	-2.3	82.4	93.5	11.1
12	79.5	81.8	2.3	82.9	91.6	8.7
13	81.8	86	4.2	87	95	8
16	90.9	88.6	-2.3	84.6	94	9.4

Knowledge

Knowledge Items that reflect the relatively higher increase of at least 5% of the Intervention group over the Control group or on which at least 90% of the Intervention group scored correctly at posttest

	CONTROL			INTERVENTION		
	Pretest	Posttest	Difference	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Item No.						
21	88.6	81.8	-6.8	86.1	92.6	6.5
22	74.4	75	0.6	75.6	87.2	11.6
24	75	65.9	-9.1	73.4	85.9	12.5

Preempting Abuse

Preempting Abuse Items that reflect the relatively higher increase of at least 5% of the Intervention group over the Control group or on which at least 90% of the Intervention group scored correctly at posttest

	CONTROL			INTERVENTION		
	Pretest	Posttest	Difference	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Item No.						
15	84.1	88.6	4.5	80.6	92.5	11.9
17	88.6	88.6	0	89.8	95.2	5.4

It would be noted that most of the items above are action tendencies or what the subjects would tend to do given a situation of abuse or potential abuse. This means that the videos have increased the tendency or resolve of the subjects to do something about the situation. Taking action is apparently where the greatest learning has occurred.

Increase in Learning by Group

Table 5 presents the means at pretest and posttest of the different groups (males, females, private, public, rural, urban, grade levels) and the t-tests showing significant and non-significant differences.

It will be seen that all groupings, regardless of gender, grade level, type of school, or type of community registered a significant increase at posttest over the pretest.

This means that the variables did not make a difference in the subjects' learning significantly more about sexual abuse as a result of the videos. Both males and females, rural and urban, private and public, and all the grade levels

have learned significantly more, as a result of the videos, even without processing.

Table 5. Pretest and posttest means, standard deviations (SD), and t-tests for the different groupings

Group	Pretest Mean & SD	Post Test Mean & SD	t-test	N	df (N-1)	α	Significant/ Not Significant
Males	23.13 SD=4.815	25.11 SD=4.363	10.935	434	433	.000	Significant
Females	24.84 SD=3.655	26.75 2.679	14.215	501	500	.000	Significant
Private	24.00 SD=4.588	26.83 3.013	14.402	377	376	.000	Significant
Public	24.07 SD=4.124	25.42 SD=3.928	10.893	558	557	.000	Significant
Rural	25.18 SD=3.474	26.85 SD=2.656	9.684	222	221	.000	Significant
Urban	23.69 SD=4.489	25.72 SD=3.873	15.052	713	712	.000	Significant
Gr 5 & 6	23.72 SD=4.284	24.89 SD=4.226	6.672	223	222	.000	Significant
HS 1 & 2	24.21 SD=4.293	26.28 SD=3.289	12.632	384	383	.000	Significant
HS 3 & 4	24.06 SD=4.362	26.39 SD=3.496	10.710	328	327	.000	Significant

Significant Differences in Increase in Learning by Variable

Table 6 shows comparisons within the variables.

If we examine the categories within each variable, we find that although both males and females registered significant increases at posttest over pretest, as shown in Table 5 above, the females have significantly higher scores than

males at pretest and at posttest, as shown in Table 6 below, although the difference is small. The difference could be because the public talks more about abuse of women than of men and the women are cautioned more than men are.

Table 6 also shows that public and private schools did not differ significantly at pretest, but at posttest, the private schools scored significantly higher than the public schools, although the difference is small; it will be recalled that both gained significantly higher posttest than pretest scores (Table 5).

The rural schools scored significantly higher than the urban schools at both pretest and posttest, although the difference is again small.

If we recall the area where greatest level of learning occurred, which is action, it can be surmised that the private schools and the rural areas were a little more emboldened to take action than their counterparts.

Table 6. Comparisons within the variables

Variable		Pretest Mean & SD	t-test	α	Significance	Posttest Mean & SD	t-test	α	Significance
GENDER	Male	23.13 SD=4.815	6.155	.000	√	25.11 SD=4.363	6.999	.000	√
	Female	24.84 SD=3.655				26.75 SD=2.679			
SCHOOL TYPE	Public	24.07 SD=4.124	.240	.810	x	25.42 SD=3.928	5.914	.000	√
	Private	24.00 SD=4.588				26.83 SD=3.013			
COMMUNITY	Rural	25.18 SD=3.474	4.540	.000	√	26.85 SD=2.656	4.055	.000	√
	Urban	23.69 SD=4.489				25.72			

CONCLUSION

Generally, the Intervention subjects learned more than the Control subjects about the dynamics of sexual abuse after watching the videos, across gender, grade level, type of school, and type of community, even without processing. They also learned to disclose more. They also learned to prevent potential abuse more.

Overall, taking action is where the greatest learning occurred.

Since such learning is crucial to preventing and combating child sexual abuse within a society, then the videos could play a significant role in protecting children in areas where they are shown.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is hereby recommended that the videos be shown to other types of audiences, locally and abroad.

Further research could be conducted to determine differences in effects of the videos on different ethnic or regional groups, and on different nationalities, as well as on different sectors within a society.

Different forms of processing, such as one-on-one, focus group, or classroom type, could be implemented in order to find out the effects of the videos that are not covered in the present questionnaire.