Supplemental Materials: Survey Measures

All attitude measures used a similar response scale and are described in more detail in the Supplemental Appendix. Participants responded to each item on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 4 (*Strongly Agree*).

Collective Efficacy. Our measure of collective efficacy included five items from a larger, widely-used collective efficacy scale created and validated by Sampson et al. (1997). For example, "People in [Community] can be trusted." We averaged the items as an indicator of perceptions of community cohesion. Scores ranged from 1 to 4, M=2.81, SD=0.46 (Cronbach's α=.82).

Injunctive Norms. All injunctive norms questions began with the prompt "The next set of questions will ask you what people in [Town] think other people in [Town] should do. In other words, how do people in [Town] expect other people in [Town] to act?" (Carlson & Worden, 2005; McDonnell et al., 2011). One set of items measured personal injunctive norms or beliefs that people in the community should talk to others about the unacceptability of violence. We averaged items to create a single indicator of community personal injunctive norms for each participant. Scores ranged from 1 to 4, M=3.37, SD=0.49 (Cronbach's α=.82). Another set of items measured public injunctive norms or beliefs that people in their community should support local organizations, events, or engage in activities designed to prevent violence. We averaged items to create a composite. Scores ranged from 1 to 4, M=3.32, SD=0.57 (Cronbach's α = .82).

Descriptive Norms. All descriptive norms questions began with the prompt "The next set of questions will ask you about what people in [Town] ACTUALLY THINK or DO. Make your best guess if you are not sure" (Carlson & Worden, 2005; McDonnell et al., 2011). One set of items measured individual descriptive norms (that people in their community demonstrate

disapproval of sexual and intimate partner violence). We averaged items to create a single indicator of direct individualized action descriptive norms for each participant, M=2.75, SD=0.47 (Cronbach's α=.83). Two additional items measured perceptions that people in their community support local organizations, events, or engage in activities designed to prevent interpersonal violence. We averaged items to create single indicators of indirect public action descriptive norms for each participant, M=2.82, SD=0.55 (Cronbach's α=.74).

Prevention Actions (Reactive). We used five items in our measure of actionist response and prevention opportunity (Coker et al., 2011). Participants who indicated witnessing a particular opportunity to intervene were then asked how many times, if any, they had intervened, such as "How many times during the past year did you tell someone to stop talking down to, harassing, or messing (not in a playful way) with someone else?" Participants responded to each item on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 (*0 times*) to 4 (*10 or more times*). Participants could also indicate that they had never heard or seen this particular opportunity. These responses were combined with responses about opportunity to create three categories of prevention action (none, some, frequent) (current authors, masked for review).

Proactive Prevention Frequencies. Proactive helping behaviors were measured with five items (Coker et al., 2011). An example item was: "Use social media or texting to show that domestic violence and sexual assault are not okay." Participants responded to each item on a 5-point scale, ranging from 0 (*0 times*) to 4 (*10 or more times*) and were dichotomized into those who did any action or none.

Supplemental Empirical Limitations

A few study limitations should be noted. First, the sample lacked racial diversity, and future research would benefit from examining the extent to which GDC may or may not work in

more diverse communities, especially in light of research suggesting that culturally-grounded prevention is more effective than programming not culturally grounded (Okamoto et al., 2014). Second, older female adults were over-represented in the study survey and data was not linked across time at the participant level. Third, with regard to analyses within GDC towns, it is unclear whether GDC exposure necessarily led to changes in collective efficacy or social norms. It could be that those with higher collective efficacy and certain social norms were more likely to engage in GDC activities. Fourth, regarding the key informant interviews, researchers did not interview the same individuals prior to and after GDC implementation, which is not as strong of a design as interviewing the same individuals to assess change over time.