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A. General Scientific and Technological Aims

Interventions for at-risk youth are making a paradigmatic shift nationwide that are redefining the response to antisocial and even criminal behavior. The approach seeks to make those at risk, and offenders, directly accountable to the community and to themselves for their actions. A core principle in the approach is to actively involve youth with their community, and in particular, insure they have the life skills competencies they will need to be independent and productive citizens in society.

Interventionists need materials that focus on teaching an array of social skills. Key among these are skills relating to anger management, social decision making (or self-efficacy), and empathy. The purpose of this project is to develop and evaluate innovative programs in these areas that are specifically designed for use by youth in independent living programs, the Job Corps, alternative schools, and the juvenile justice system.

The proposed programs will offer an attractive interactive multimedia (IMM) approach to learning that gives young people guided support, simplifies language and concepts, and uses animated “virtual” teens to model social skills. The instructional models for the proposed programs are based on existing curriculums developed within Lane County, Oregon, which has been an innovator in developing youth interventions. The multimedia programs, which can be delivered on DVD and the Web, are designed to complement classroom instruction by giving teens a dynamic visual format to see, as well as to independently review and practice essential social learning concepts and skills.

In Phase I, we developed, produced, and evaluated Options to Anger, an interactive multimedia (IMM) intervention on anger management. The program was designed to help teens and young adults understand their patterns of anger and to acquire the necessary social skills to transform a destructive cycle of personal conflict into an adaptive one of resolution.

In Phase II, the goal of the project was to develop an IMM intervention on self-efficacy and empathy. The program extended and applied the intervention model developed in Phase I to this broader set of social skills. The technological aim of the current project was to develop training programs for at-risk youth that fully exploited the educational capacities of popular visual media (DVD and the Web) to teach them social skills essential for successful independent living. The materials were specifically adapted to meet the social and family contexts, circumstances, needs, and issues of at-risk youth. The proposed program entailed group and individualized training.

B. Phase II Research Activities

Instructional Content

In Phase II we generalized the instructional model of the program developed in Phase I (Options to Anger) to social problem solving, or self-efficacy. The program delivery blended group instruction and individualized online activities. The group activity was designed for delivery to small groups of youth, led by a facilitator. Instruction included 11 classes. Each class began with the group viewing the DVD, which follows a group of virtual youth going through the same training program. Each class involves interactive discussions, role-plays, and other activities. After each class, students login to individual accounts on Vstreet to complete interactive exercises and journaling that correspond to the content of the previous class. Students can also preview the story segment with the virtual teens for the next class.

Below is a brief description of the course content that describes the topics, interactive exercises, and printable handouts covered in each class (The Training Manual and DVD are available upon request).

Class 1: The Anger Cycle Revisited and the Big Picture

- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers meet the virtual class on Vstreet; set ground rules and expectations, and review concepts originally presented in Options to Anger, a previous curriculum on anger management.
- **Class Activities**: Sets ground rules and expectations, reviews the Anger Cycle from Options, students tell of their previous success stories, taps into individuals’ Big Picture (life goals), and students affirm respect for each other.
- **Journal**: Review questions and prompts.

Class 2: The Problem Cycle

- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers learn what efficacy means, the structure of the problem-solving cycle, and how efficacy can be used to create positive outcomes in the cycle.
- **Class Activities**: Presents and applies the Problem Cycle – a more generalized model on problem solving adapted from *Options*.
- **Journal**: Review questions and prompts.

**Class 3: Owning Up To Your Choice**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers see a story in which the teen characters tell about a problem, how it fits in with the problem cycle and whether or not they seem to be taking responsibility for their choices.
- **Class Activities**: Covers the elements of taking self-responsibility in problems, practices applying taking responsibility, and gives students the opportunity to acknowledge the courage it takes.
- **Interactive Exercise**: Students review a conflict situation with one of the virtual teens and practice using “I” statements as a means of taking responsibility.

**Class 4: Risky vs. Clear Thinking**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers see a story that demonstrates different types of risky thinking that can lead to poor choices.
- **Class Activities**: Identifies four different forms of risky thinking and distinguishes them from clear thinking and gives students opportunities to identify thinking patterns in story scenarios.
- **Journal**: Review questions and prompts.

**Class 5: Costs and Benefits**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers review risky thinking and then learn to weigh the costs and benefits of making choices based on clear or risky thinking.
- **Class Activities**: Explores the costs and benefits of clear thinking and risky thinking for the short- and long-term.
- **Interactive Exercise**: Students view a story scenario with the virtual teens and identify costs and benefits to pro-social and problem behaviors.

**Class 6: Values**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers see how clear thinking incorporates personal values, and how these are different from attitudes.
- **Class Activities**: Builds a list of different values, students identify their values, and evaluate whether or how their actions have been consistent with their most important values.
- **Journal**: Review questions and prompts.

**Class 7: Review of the Big Picture**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers get an overview of all the main concepts presented thus far in the context of a story.
- **Class Activities**: Reviews the central concepts presented in the training thus far: the Problem Cycle, taking self-responsibility, risky thinking, costs and benefits of behaviors, values, and how they all relate to students’ “big picture.”
- **Interactive Exercise**: Students learn about the five stages of change and how to formulate an action plan.

**Class 8: Empathy**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers learn how to distinguish between sympathy and empathy, and to see how empathy fits into the problem cycle.
- **Class Activities**: Covers the basic elements of empathy, recognizing others’ feelings, validating others’ point of view, providing others support.
- **Interactive Exercise**: Students practice formulating an empathy response for a problem situation of one of the virtual teens.

**Class 9: Active Listening**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers see active listening being modeled in a story scenario and learn about its different features.
- **Class Activities**: Covers active listening skills including: restating, summarizing and asking questions; body language and eye contact; and showing support and giving feedback.
- **Interactive Exercise**: Students practice paraphrasing in response to story scenarios.

**Class 10: Refusal Skills**
- **DVD**: In the opening DVD, viewers learn to recognize different strategies for refusing and how story characters connect refusals to clear thinking and their big picture.
- **Class Activities**: Examines making effective refusals in response to low, moderate, and high social pressure.
- **Journal**: Review questions and prompts.
Class 11: Negotiation

- **DVD:** In the opening DVD, viewers see story characters bridge negotiation skills with many of the previously learned skills to create an outcome consistent with their values and big picture.
- **Class Activities:** Covers the basic principles of effective negotiations, and how to follow through in moderately difficult and then tough negotiations.
- **Journal:** Review questions and prompts.

Class 12 and 13: Practice Role-Plays (Optional)

- **Class Activities:** Presents a variety of structured role plays with increasingly realistic and demanding elements for students to practice the basic skills they learned throughout the training.

Process for Developing the Media Materials

The Team

To begin the process, the content development team – Dr. Caesar Pacifici (Principal Investigator, co-writer), Lee White (Producer, co-writer) and Dr. John Crumbley (consultant) – outlined the specific points to be presented and identified exemplifying points of the Self-Efficacy curriculum. A script was developed in draft form that included interactive exercises and supplemental material. The script was reviewed by outside experts John Aarons and Dr. Brad Klontz. The revised script underwent a series of revisions to prepare it for the production process.

The raw media materials were gathered and developed by the media team, which included: Lee White, producer and co-writer; Keith Qiao Jin, programmer; William Haldane, director and editor; Erik de Buhr, animator; Kris Hansen, graphic designer; and Damian McDonald, videographer.

Talent was hired for both images and voices. Permission to use copyright protected images was obtained. All new images and video recordings were made and assembled. Flash technology was used to construct interactive exercises and audio and visual elements. Handouts were written and finalized.

The Process

The media elements for the course were integrated within an audio-visual 'skin,' which included the following elements:

- A viewing frame for presenting the visual components of the instructional content – photographs and bulleted text overlays from the sound track.
- A viewing frame that displayed a narrator (John Aarons) in real-time audio and video.
- Animated and assembled scenes.
- Interactive and programmed activities.
- A navigational ‘remote control’ panel that identified the course chapters and topics, and that highlighted the current place in the course. Users could also select different topics or move back to different chapters.

Preliminary Assessments

Early Audio Presentation of Materials

A focus group meeting with two youth was held at Northwest Media on June 29, 2006, to obtain feedback on the audio track of *The Big Picture*. Both participants identified themselves as Hispanic; neither answered the racial background question. One was an 18-year-old female, and the other was a 19-year-old male. Both are currently attending a 2-year college. They were recruited through the Centro Latino Americano in Eugene.

The facilitator introduced the concept of the “anger cycle” from *Options to Anger* and then explained how the problem-solving program, which was in the early stages of development, expanded on it.

The youth heard an early version of the problem-solving program, in several segments, in which just two people read all of the lines. The youth were asked to comment on the clarity of the content. For the first segment on the “Big Picture” one said the point was that it’s important to emphasize the positive things in life, instead of focusing on anger. For the next segment, “The Problem Cycle,” the youth identified the main points and felt that the language used was clear. Both youth knew that choices have consequences. One participant said that, in the program, the focus was more on the moment, and suggested that it might be a good idea to refer back to some choice a character made a year ago – and what the character would do differently now as a consequence. This would be a way for the program to expand the focus beyond the moment. For the segments on “Owning Up” and “Risky Thinking” they agreed again that the content was clear and helpful.
There was more discussion on the “Costs and Benefits” segment. Both teens said the segment made sense, but parts were a little confusing.

At this point, one of the participants mentioned that sometimes choices depend on your attitude at the time. For example, if you’re in a bad mood, it can affect the choices you make that day; i.e., attitude influences choices. The next segment on “Values” made sense to the participants.

The facilitator asked if the gang girl’s lines were ok. One said they were “too much.” Both thought she didn’t swear enough – the other characters swore more than she did. They liked her “outcast” role.

The focus group session lasted 2 hours, and group members received $25 for their participation.

Focus Group on Questionnaires and Video Content
Ten youth participants, 16-23 years of age from the Angell Job Corps Center in Yachats, Oregon, participated in a focus group in June 2007 to evaluate the questionnaires for the evaluation study and the content of the Self-Efficacy program. This was a very diverse group of men and women who were in the forestry, building, and masonry programs. Many of the group members talked of their inner-city street experiences. They seemed friendly and interested in learning. They were not disruptive and most spoke freely. Two of the youths had previously been through Northwest Media’s Options to Anger training given at the Center. Lee White, a research associate on the project, facilitated the focus group.

In the first part of the session, participants completed a 50-item version of the knowledge questionnaire being developed at the time for the evaluation study. We used the data to determine whether items were at an acceptable level of difficulty. Participants also completed the 7-item Self-Efficacy Scale (Pearlin et al., 1981) and a 14-item scale composed of the Perspective Taking and Empathic Concern subscales of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, 1983).

Next, participants viewed sequences of the video for the DVD program. After each segment there was a brief discussion for feedback and comments. Youth were able to articulate an understanding of the concepts in the segments. As the segments progressed, participation in the discussions grew. The youth talked as if the characters in the script were real. When discussing the band scene in which a guy hits a girl, the group felt this was very realistic and that it should be left in. They identified with it. By the time the group was watching the later segments, they were totally into the characters and the story. Discussions between segments increased over time. The youth had some difficulty getting an understanding of empathy. Most of them said they really enjoyed the group session, and they were all excited to receive $40 for participating.

The meeting affirmed the quality of our product. There were some scenes that were modified or dropped based on confusion or disapproval expressed by focus group participants. In an effort to increase understanding, we added some discussions during the instructional activities. We also created some additional interactive exercises to reinforce teaching points.

Pilot Study of Knowledge Measure
For the next stage in the development of the self-efficacy knowledge questionnaire, we conducted a pilot study. The original version of the questionnaire contained a pool of 54 items. Twelve youth were recruited from a community program for at-risk youth in Bloomington, Indiana and were administered the questionnaire. The youth were between the ages of 14-17 years; 10 were female and 2 were male; all were White. Items in which at least eight of the respondents responded correctly were considered too easy and were dropped. In all, 15 items were dropped, leaving 39 items in the final questionnaire.

Technical Development
All audio was recorded in-house, in studio sessions according to previously approved scripts. The sound engineer cleaned, sweetened, filtered, and edited audio tracks on Cool Edit Pro 1.2a. Sound foley was added to the soundtrack.

The Flash animator used final audio files and graphic elements to create a first rough-cut according to the script, using Macromedia Flash MX software. The entire team then reviewed this version and made appropriate revisions until reaching final approval.

The bulk of the production process was conducted using the Flash environment for quick turnaround for Web and DVD production and revision. Once approved, all image files were compressed for bandwidth economy and authored for Web. The graphical elements – navigator, buttons, etc. – were developed and finalized for Web usage.
Project Evaluation

The purpose of the study in Phase II was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Self-Efficacy training program with a sample of at-risk youth. We wanted to assess whether the online training was effective in increasing teens' knowledge of social problem-solving skills, their sense of perceived competence in solving social problems, their capacity to understand and empathize with others in the context of solving social problems, and their satisfaction with the training program.

Participants

Students were recruited from the Network Charter School, an alternative high school in Eugene, Oregon. The school has an enrollment of about 120 students, all of whom are characterized by the school's director as at risk because of poverty, learning disability, or idiosyncrasies that make attending a regular public school an uncomfortable option; one-quarter of the student population have individualized educational programs (IEP). A total of 70 students were recruited for the study. Our final sample included 61 participants, 29 in the treatment group and 32 in the comparison group. Of the 61 participants, almost 64% were male. Ethnically, 8.3% identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino; racially, about 64% identified themselves as white, about 2% as black, 25% as more than one race, and the rest as other or unknown. The mean age was 15.8. (See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2, for complete details on the sample demographics.)

Procedure

Students were recruited at the school by Northwest Media staff in conjunction with school administrators and teachers. Students who initially expressed interest in the study gave their assent by signing a consent form. Parents or guardians of those students under the age 18 years were asked for their consent and returned signed permission slips. Before administering the pretest, the reason for the study and the procedures for testing and maintaining confidentiality were explained to the students who then had the opportunity to ask questions about the study activities. Test administrators and the treatment group instructors monitored students as they completed the pretest questionnaires, which included: Background Information, Empathy Scale, Self-Efficacy Scale, and Knowledge – Efficacy Training (see below for descriptions). A few students required assistance reading some items. After completing the pretest, participants signed a receipt for payment ($10 Unique Eugene coupons, which are valid at several local businesses near the school).

Testing was conducted in two groups: the first group, with 35 students, was assigned to the treatment condition. These students belonged to three classes and received the media-based intervention titled Efficacy: Your Secret Power for Decision Making. The second group, with 32 students, was assigned to the control condition. These students belonged to seven different classes and received their normal class instruction and did not receive any treatment during the intervention period.

Two instructors volunteered to teach the curriculum during regularly scheduled classes and two staff volunteered their classes as control groups. Students were assigned to either the treatment or control group based on pre-existing class. While this means that randomization in the sample was based on pre-existing school class rather than on individual assignment, the Network Charter School randomly assigns students to all their classes.

Two teachers participated in the treatment group; one taught the curriculum to 26 students and the other to 9 students. In addition to the 13 standard classes in the curriculum, teachers added an extra review class at the end of the intervention. Classes met three times a week, for a total of 5 weeks.

At the end of the intervention period, all subjects were administered the posttest battery which included the same questionnaires as the pretest, except Background Information was dropped and User Satisfaction – Efficacy Training was added. Those who completed both pre-and posttesting received a total of $20 "Unique Eugene" coupons.

Measures (see Appendix A for copies of measures)

1) Knowledge – Efficacy Training (K-ET):
A 39-item knowledge scale, developed in-house, that used true-false and multiple-choice questions to assess students’ knowledge of the content of the Efficacy training. The outcome score represented the percent of correct answers.

2) Self-Efficacy Scale:
A 7-item (4-point) scale that measures attitudes and self-perceptions about problem-solving competence (Pearlin, et al., 1981).

3) Empathy Scale:
A 14-item (5-point) scale based on the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, 1983) that measures
attitudes and self-perceptions about empathy.

4) Background Information:
   A 6-item demographics questionnaire used to assess students’ age, gender, ethnic and racial background, grade level, and at-risk status.

5) User Satisfaction – Efficacy Training (US-ET):
   A 7-item scale that measures students’ satisfaction with the training materials and approach.

Hypotheses
The following hypotheses were tested:
1. We anticipate a main effect of group; that is, the treatment group will outperform the comparison group on the Knowledge-Efficacy Training, Self-Efficacy, and Empathy measures.
2. We expect strong satisfaction ratings for the Efficacy training; specifically, mean ratings of 2.5 and above on items of the US-ET.

Results
A .05 alpha level was used to determine significance in all statistical tests.

Preliminary Analyses
Means and standard deviations for all measures can be found in Appendix B, Table 3; Appendix B, Table 4 contains correlations between measures.

Assumptions of Independent t-test
Three separate independent t-tests were run. Group served as the independent variable with two levels: treatment and control. Posttest scores on Knowledge-Efficacy Training, Self-Efficacy, and Empathy measures were used as the dependent variables.

Before proceeding with analysis, we needed to evaluate statistical assumptions of this procedure: (a) data are from normally distributed populations; (b) data are measured at the interval level; (c) homogeneity of variance; and (d) scores are independent.

Visual analysis of histograms and interpretation of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test were used to test the assumption of normality. Scores were significantly non-normal for the Self-Efficacy measure, control group [pretest, \( D(31) = .175, p < .05 \); posttest, \( D(31) = .225, p < .05 \)]. As t-tests are robust to violations of normality, the analysis was run.

Data measured are at the interval level.

Results of Levene’s tests were not significant, indicating the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met.

Scores are independent as they are from different people.

Outcome Analysis: Independent t-test
On average, participants in the treatment group scored significantly higher on the Knowledge-Efficacy Training measure (\( M = .58, SE = .13 \)) compared to participants in the comparison group (\( M = .48, SE = .11 \), \( t(59) = 3.18, p = .002 \)). Results were not significant for the Self-Efficacy (\( p = .727 \)) or Empathy measures (\( p = .720 \)).

Additional Analysis: Dependent t-test
Three dependent t-tests were run. Results of the dependent t-test for the Knowledge-Efficacy Training measure indicate that participants in the treatment group, on average, reported significantly higher scores at posttest (\( M = .58, SE = .13 \)) than at pretest (\( M = .52, SE = .11, t(28) = -2.19, p = .037 \)). Results were not significant for the Self-Efficacy (\( p = 0.415 \)) or Empathy measures (\( p = .507 \)).

Analysis of Satisfaction Data
As can be seen in Appendix B, Table 5, mean scores for satisfaction items were above the criterion set of 2.5.

Discussion
The development effort in Phase II produced an attractive and comprehensive multimedia training curriculum for at-risk teens and young adults on developing self-efficacy. All milestones were successfully achieved. The curriculum was fully programmed, performance-tested, and launched on our Vstreet.com site. The content and look of the course were fully consistent with the high quality standard of other programs.
already available on Vstreet.com, and this program similarly included an array of video and visual montage, interactive exercises, and printable handouts to deliver state-of-the-art information to youth on independent living skills.

The intervention model developed in Phase II incorporated the core elements of the model used in Phase I, which dealt with anger management, and applied them more generally to social problem solving. The model lays out a universal pattern, or cycle, in which problem behaviors typically occur. Youth have to understand the elements in the cycle, recognize how these elements exist in themselves, and apply a set of social-communication skills to help them solve their problem situations. These skills include understanding your own responsibility in making behavior choices, tuning in to your thinking process, learning to evaluate the pros and cons of potential choices for behavior, reconsidering choices based on a discovery and application of your own life values, empathizing with others involved in problem situations, knowing how to listen more actively when communicating with those involved, knowing how to make effective refusals that can avoid problem situations, and finally, knowing how to work out negotiated outcomes.

The first necessary step in developing these skills is to acquire a working knowledge of them. To that end, our findings showed that youth who participated in the training did indeed improve their knowledge of concepts and skills related to self-efficacy when compared to those in the control group. The finding is especially encouraging given the small size of our sample. The study site was an alternative school where managing youth’s behavior was particularly difficult. This also attested to the strength of the findings since the fidelity of the intervention may have been somewhat compromised in this kind of environment, and participants’ behavior problems were probably fairly entrenched. Still, this can only be considered a preliminary finding.

The more difficult test of the training was to see whether youth’s empathy and efficacy improved. Here, the results did not provide any supporting evidence. However, once again, the lack of findings may be attributed, at least in part, to the small sample size but also to the fairly brief nature of the intervention. In reality, this type of training will likely need to be given with more intensive time for practice and with more extensive review.

Participating youth were very satisfied with the training, a testament to the high quality of scripting and animation that was used to appeal to youth. In our experience, at-risk youth unabashedly pan material that seems unappealing. The criterion for even passing levels of satisfaction is severe in this population, thus we were very pleased.

Marketing Status

The final product is being offered in two forms, as Web-based training on our Web site for youth at risk, www.vstreet.com, and as a CD. The CD is distributed by SocialLearning.com and other retail outlets.
Appendix A – Phase II Measures
KNOWLEDGE

Read each question and circle the one answer you think is correct.

1. Your friends say they’re going to go out later that night and get high. You decide not to go. One possible cost for making that choice is that you’ll miss out on having fun with your friends.
   - True.
   - False.

2. If a person talks too fast or goes on and on, the best strategy is to:
   a) Stop the person as soon as possible and tell them directly that they are talking too fast.
   b) Always let the person finish what they are saying.
   c) Interrupt and say something like, “I think I lost you there…”
   d) Tell them how you feel about what they are doing.

3. You go with a friend to a music store and your friend says he wants to steal some CDs. When you tell him you don’t think it’s a good idea he calls you a wimp. Putting you down like that is an example of:
   a) The Anger Cycle.
   b) The Problem Cycle.
   c) An invitation.
   d) A choice.

4. The best policy for dealing with making a mistake that upset someone is to:
   a) Admit it when you’re ready to face it.
   b) Admit it and deal with it early on.
   c) Carefully weigh whether it’s worth admitting.
   d) Deal with the consequences first, then see if it’s important to admit it later.

5. The golden rule for negotiating is to never give up and stop until you get what you want.
   - True.
   - False.

6. Saying the words “I’m sorry” is essential to expressing empathy.
   - True.
   - False.
7. You’re walking down the hall at school, daydreaming, and you bump into someone by accident. The person, who’s with a group of friends, says, “Hey dude, you awake yet?” and moves on. You start to think he and the group of friends he’s with are going to think you’re a jerk and can be stepped on. This is an example of:
   a) Clear thinking.
   b) Realistic thinking.
   c) Defensive thinking.
   d) Risky thinking.

8. Which is NOT an obstacle to sticking with your values:
   a) Low confidence.
   b) Making choices.
   c) Fear.
   d) Peer pressure.

9. Trying to put what someone else said in your own words is generally considered risky and not productive.
   True.
   False.

10. When a choice you need to make puts two of your values in conflict, for example, respecting someone’s privacy and being honest, it’s best to:
    a) Get input from someone you trust.
    b) Stay neutral to avoid making a bad choice.
    c) Change one or the other value.
    d) Act quickly before the issue becomes a mind game.

11. If a negotiation ends by “agreeing to disagree,” you should consider it a failed negotiation.
    True.
    False.

12. Personal problems are very different from each other and don’t happen in any type of pattern.
    True.
    False.
13. Sonny smoked a joint in the school bathroom. A monitor detected the smell a couple of hours later and reported it. Later in the classroom, the teacher asked whoever smoked the joint to come up to her after class. Sonny didn’t, but after school he told a friend he was the one. This is a good example of:
   a) Owning up.
   b) A short-term outcome.
   c) Avoiding conflict.
   d) None of the above.

14. “Remorse” means:
   a) Being punished for a harm you did to someone.
   b) Letting the victim know that you feel bad about what you did.
   c) Having the victim respect your situation.
   d) All of the above.

15. An effective refusal does NOT include which of the following?
   a) Making eye contact.
   b) Saying “no.”
   c) Saying why you are refusing.
   d) Asking the other person to explain their behavior.

16. Personal problems go through which sequence?
   a) You’re cruising along, someone makes a problem for you, you suffer the consequences.
   b) You’re cruising along, you encounter a problem, you make a choice, you get a certain outcome.
   c) You give someone a choice, it creates a problem for them, things get back to normal.
   d) Someone hassles you, you make a choice, you cruise along until things get back to normal.

17. “Empathy” means having someone see what it’s like to be in your shoes.
   True.
   False.

18. Personal problems start when certain people around you make bad choices for you.
   True.
   False.
19. You’re taking a test and a classmate tells you to pass her paper to someone else. The teacher sees you and takes your test paper away. It makes you mad because you studied for the test and you weren’t the one who was cheating. In this case, it’s best to:
   a) Understand the world is sometimes an unfair place.
   b) Accept that you helped someone cheat, but negotiate the outcome with the teacher.
   c) Accept that you helped someone cheat and accept the consequences.
   d) Explain that you weren’t cheating and assert your right to finish your test.

20. “Efficacy” means:
   a) Taking big risks.
   b) Dreaming about what you want in life.
   c) Having the power to reach your life goals.
   d) Making wise financial investments.

21. A friend dares you to tag the school building. The friend is someone you respect, so you think you should do it if you want to keep his respect. This is a good example of:
   a) Clear thinking.
   b) No thinking.
   c) Risky thinking.
   d) Humility.

22. Staying calm generally works against making an effective refusal.
   True.
   False.

23. You’re in a department store and you notice that the salesclerk is looking at you closely and following you around. You go over to her and ask her if there’s a problem. You notice that your heart starts racing. She tells you, “I don’t have a problem as long as you don’t make one.” In this example, an early warning sign of a problem was:
   a) Walking into the department store.
   b) Noticing the salesclerk look at you.
   c) Noticing the salesclerk follow you.
   d) Noticing your heart racing.
24. If a person is shy or finds it difficult to tell you something, it’s better to back off than to say to the person things like, “Tell me more,” or “Then what happened?”
   True.
   False.

25. You and some friends that you don’t know that well decide to sneak into a backyard with a swimming pool. You see some guys jump in the pool. Another guy sprays graffiti in the yard. Someone else accidentally breaks some flower pots. A neighbor reports some mischief, but when the police get there, everyone splits before getting caught. The likely upshot of this event for you is:
   a) Nothing, because you didn’t get caught.
   b) Nothing, because you didn’t mean to do any harm.
   c) You gain respect from your friends, but may get more involved doing similar things with them.
   d) You gain respect from your friends, and for yourself for not trashing the yard.

26. When talking to someone you victimized it’s best to assume:
   a) You are innocent until proven guilty.
   b) You are guilty.
   c) The victim is right.
   d) The victim and you are in the right.

27. Wanting to buy a muscle car is an example of a personal value.
   True.
   False.

28. Which is NOT an effective way to deal with pressure when saying “no” doesn’t work?
   a) Use “I” statements.
   b) Change the topic.
   c) Walk away.
   d) Alternate between giving in and saying no.

29. A personal value is:
   a) A positive or negative thought about living life.
   b) Both a principle about life and a monetary amount.
   c) A positive goal or principle about living life.
   d) Not something that can usually be expressed in words.
30. Dusty has always worked hard to buy his toys – a dirt bike, a snowboard, a guitar. One time, he was out with his friends and one of them spotted a beat-up guitar on someone’s front porch. The friend all of a sudden went over, took it, kept walking and started playing it. Everyone in the group cracked up. For Dusty, this is a good example of a conflict between:
   a) Friendship and music.
   b) Peer pressure and pleasure.
   c) Risky thinking and values.
   d) Costs and benefits.

31. It’s more important to use the right words than to use the right body language when you want to let someone know that you’re listening.
   True.
   False.

32. Thinking you can blame someone for a poor choice you made is an example of:
   a) Bad luck.
   b) The ends justify the means.
   c) Risky thinking.
   d) Low-risk thinking.

33. Which of the following is a type of risky thinking?
   a) Making things seem less important than they really are.
   b) Making things seem more important than they really are.
   c) Blaming someone else.
   d) All of the above.

34. Which is NOT a part of showing empathy?
   a) Recognizing the other person’s feelings.
   b) Making sure the person you hurt accepts your apology.
   c) Reassuring the person you hurt.
   d) Acknowledging the problems you caused.
KNOWLEDGE

Read each question and circle the one answer you think is correct.

35. You and your friend want to go out. She wants to take her mother’s car, even though her mom grounded her and said she couldn’t. Your friend thought that it would be okay for just this one time because she would drive carefully and get back home early. You tell your friend that you’re not sure you should do it but you go along because you know that your friend is close with her mom and probably knows best. Which is true?
   a) You and your friend used clear thinking.
   b) You used clear thinking, but your friend used risky thinking.
   c) Your friend used clear thinking, but you used risky thinking.
   d) You and your friend used risky thinking.

36. “Paraphrasing” means:
   a) Putting what the other person said in your own words.
   b) Summarizing what you said to the other person.
   c) Getting advice on what the other person said.
   d) Echoing back the same words that the other person said.

37. A girl friend who you thought was cool gives you attitude because you hang with some people she doesn’t like. You begin to think that anyone who would do that is a total jerk. Seeing things in “black and white” like this can actually help clarify your feelings.
   True.
   False.

38. In clear thinking about a situation which is usually true?
   a) There are more benefits than costs.
   b) There are more costs than benefits.
   c) There are equal amounts of costs and benefits.
   d) You can never tell whether there will be more costs or benefits.

39. If a person is having difficulty telling you something, it’s better to not say anything directly about their difficulty.
   True.
   False.
**PART OF MY WORLD**

*Read each statement and circle the number you think describes you the best.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is really no way I can solve some of the problems I have.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sometimes I feel that I'm being pushed around in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I have little control over the things that happen to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>There is little I can do to change many of the important things in my life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Me and Other People**

Based on scales from the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980, 1983)

*Read each statement and circle the number you think describes you the best.*

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I often have concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the other guy's point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sometimes I don't feel very sorry for other people when they are having problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Other people's bad luck doesn't usually disturb me a lot.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If I'm sure I'm right about something I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very sorry for them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – Tables
### Table 1

**Sample Demographics - Part 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comparison Group $(n = 32)$</th>
<th>Treatment Group $(n = 29)$</th>
<th>Total Sample $(N = 61)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or not reported</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one race</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown or not reported</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of school completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th grade</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th grade</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking GED</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever participated in an IEP or special education class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever suspended from school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever appeared before a judge for a behavior problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Sample Demographics - Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comparison Group (n = 32)</th>
<th>Treatment Group (n = 29)</th>
<th>Total Sample (N = 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Mean Performance on Measures, by Group and Pre/Post Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Efficacy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment-Pre</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment-Post</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison-Pre</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison-Post</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Unless otherwise noted, unadjusted means are reported throughout the table.
### Table 4

*Correlations Between All Measures, at Pre- and Posttest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge2</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy1</th>
<th>Self-Efficacy2</th>
<th>Empathy1</th>
<th>Empathy2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge1</td>
<td>.563** (61)</td>
<td>.249 (61)</td>
<td>.175 (60)</td>
<td>-.346** (59)</td>
<td>-.240 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.185 (61)</td>
<td>.153 (60)</td>
<td>-.298 (59)</td>
<td>.332 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.637** (60)</td>
<td>.199 (59)</td>
<td>-.101 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.359** (58)</td>
<td>-.308* (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.817** (57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample sizes are reported in parentheses.

* *p < .05
** *p < .01
Table 5

*Means and Standard Deviations for Course Satisfaction Items – Treatment Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How much did you like the material on the DVD?</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How cool was it?</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.147</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How easy was it to understand?</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>2.963</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How useful was it for you?</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How useful would it be to others?</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much did you like the story characters?</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.320</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall, how would you rate the program?</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>