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Summary

This paper describes a fast-track process of collaboratively developing a program theory-based assessment instrument during the fourth year of a five year local implementation of a CSAP violence prevention demonstration program. The program consists of several interrelated components delivered in grades four through eight across three school districts: (1) a classroom curriculum, (2) paraprofessional-delivered individual counseling, (3) peer conflict-mediation training, and (4) community mobilization. The assessment instrument employed during the first three years of the program consisted of individual items matched to individual elements of the classroom curriculum scope and sequence, without the benefit of a theoretical framework. The data collected with this instrument had yielded counter-intuitive findings that program staff believed did not adequately represent the intended effects of the program. WestEd was selected at the beginning of the fourth year of the program to redesign the evaluation, including development of a new primary assessment instrument.

Because of time pressures to begin data collection for fourth year pre-tests, the instrument development timeline had to be condensed from the six to nine months typically required for this type of collaborative theory-based process to approximately three months. In addition, the three-hour driving time between the evaluation office and the program site limited the evaluation team to monthly on-site visits. To maintain the collaborative process under these limitations, at several stages we obtained written input in place of a more typical facilitated discussion and consensus building process, then organized this material within an evolving theoretical framework and presented it back to the group for feedback and revision. This allowed us to tap the collective local group wisdom and reinforce local ownership of the evaluation at every stage of the process within the constraints of the time and travel resources available.

Our process involved the following ten primary steps:

1. Assembly and orientation of an expanded local evaluation work group;
2. Elicitation of logic model elements (problems, goals, etc.) from each group member;
3. Development of a combined work-group visual logic model;
4. Development of a generic behavioral-change theoretical framework;
5. Preliminary organization of logic model elements into the theoretical framework;
6. Priority ratings of theoretically organized model elements by the evaluation work group;
7. Completion of program-specific theoretical framework;
8. Development of item pool by an item-writing panel of local staff and outside experts;
9. Piloting items with student focus groups; and
10. Reliability analyses of items and scales.
Logic Models and Theoretical Frameworks

Logic models are commonly used in evaluation research to visually depict a program’s structure, organization, assumptions, and/or intended outcomes. Logic models range from the fully descriptive and atheoretical, or at least weakly theoretical, sometimes referred to as a “program model,” to a true theoretical framework based on a prior body of evidence around a specific behavioral change or other theory. The later is relatively rare in evaluation and much more common in investigator-designed research studies. Among the reasons for this are (1) that evaluators often don’t hear as strong a message about the importance of theory in their training as, say, a research psychologist or sociologist does, and (2) that it can be an exceedingly challenging task to discover after the fact the implicit theory that a particular program is based upon.

An example of a relatively atheoretical logic model would be the program models/maps used to succinctly describe a complex community initiative, sometimes referred to as a "theory of change" framework. These have been used to good benefit in consolidating stakeholders’ inconsistent perceptions of their program and in translating a pile of overwhelming program proposals into much more manageable one pager visual depictions of the key components, so there is certainly value in this type of model. But the "theory" here usually consists of some set of generic components such as problems/causes/interventions/milestones/etc. An example of a middle ground approach (semi-theoretical?) might be one linking risk and protective factors, interventions, outcomes, and measures.

A true theoretical framework, on the other hand, typically is based on a specific existing theory of social behavior (or of whatever), or an eclectic amalgamation of two or more existing theories. A visual depiction of the framework is used to organize the program assumptions, strategies, and intended outcomes, and the theorized relationships among them. Fishbein’s Theory of Reasoned Action (beliefs, attitudes, perceived social norms, behavioral intentions, etc.) is an example of the first; and Fisher’s Information/Motivation/Behavioral Skills Theory is an example of the second. A modified combination of these two theories was adapted as the theoretical framework for this evaluation.

Local Evaluation Work Group

At the time we began work on the evaluation at the beginning of year four, the existing evaluation committee consisted of several program administration staff from the two primary collaborating agencies. We worked with the committee to carefully specify additional key stakeholders in the evaluation who might be able to make a commitment to attend monthly half-day meetings. We ended up forming an evaluation workgroup consisting of four administrative staff, two of the program paraprofessional counselors, four teachers representing the three participating districts and two school types.
(elementary and middle school), and the two evaluators. The existing evaluation
commitee was renamed the executive committee and retained to meet monthly with the
evaluators on administrative matters, however all evaluation design and interpretation
work was assumed by the expanded evaluation workgroup. The expansion of this group
allowed us to better tap the necessary local wisdom needed to design the most effective
evaluation, and to achieve local ownership of the evaluation, thereby increasing
evaluation utility (Patton, 1997). In addition, the evaluation work group was
supplemented with intermittent meetings of larger groups of teachers, principals, and
paraprofessional counselors.

From Logic Model to Theoretical Framework

The first step involved having each member of the evaluation work group provide written
answers to four basic questions about the program:

1. What problems is the program trying the address?
2. What strategies is the program employing to address these problems?
3. What are the desired results?
4. If the program is successful, how will the strategies achieve these results?

The responses to these questions from the nine participating members of the evaluation
work group were then transcribed and organized into nine visually depicted mini-logic-
models. These consisted of the verbatim responses to the questions organized into four
sequential boxes. From these, a mega-logic-model was created (see Figure 1). This
involved integrating and summarizing the nine individual models into one model, while
still maintaining the original responses from the nine participants, with wording
sometimes condensed or slightly modified for clarity or consistency.

The evaluation team then reviewed the mega-logic-model and considered a variety of
well-known health behavior change theoretical models for potential fit. We ultimately
developed an integration of Fisher and Fisher’s (1992, 1996)
Information/Motivation/Behavioral Skills Theory and Fishbein’s Theory of Reasoned
Action (Fishbein and Middlestandt, 1989.) A generic program theoretical framework was
then created for this adapted model (see Figure 2.) Finally, the individual elements
contained in the mega-logic-model were reorganized and integrated into this theoretical
framework in a series of lists.

The mega-logic-model and the generic program theoretical framework were then
explained to and reviewed with the evaluation workgroup, and the list of program
elements as organized by the theoretical framework was presented. The group was then
asked to rate within each category their first, second, and third priority importance
choices of the elements.
These ratings were then tabulated, and the lists were sorted by ratings and classified as highest importance elements, middle importance elements, and lowest importance elements (see Figure 3; highest rated items are in bold, lowest rated items are lined out, and summed ratings are in parentheses.) Finally, the most important elements were transferred onto the visual theoretical framework, and a selection of the middle-level important elements that appeared to the evaluation team to best fit within the framework were also included. What resulted was a concise and highly specific theoretical framework, closely fit to the group’s implicit theoretical framework for the project while at the same time based in formal behavioral-change theory (see Figure 4.)

**Item Development**

A panel of local program staff and outside violence prevention experts developed a pool of approximately 200 potential items. The completed theoretical framework was used as a blueprint for the development and selection of items for the assessment instrument. This involve subsets of items to measure information and knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, perceived social norms, behavioral skills: efficacy, behavioral skills: difficulty, behavioral intentions, behavioral outcomes, and behavioral impacts. Item structure was informed by the structure employed by Fisher and Fisher (1996, pp. 116-117) in a study of changing AIDS risk behavior in a college student population. Most items employ three- or four-point options, including true, sort of true, not very true, and not true at all; and always, most of the time, sometimes, and never.

The initial items developed by the panel were then reviewed, modified, deleted, and/or integrated by a second and partly overlapping panel of experts. The evaluation team then constructed a pilot version of the instrument for on site pilot testing. The pilot test involved four focus groups of five students each representing the range of ages and level of functioning included in the program. As a result of this pilot test, items were further modified, deleted, and/or integrated, yielding a field test version of the instrument for grades 6 through 8, consisting of 73 items. A subset of scales and items were selected to form the elementary school version for grades 4 and 5, consisting of 47 items. Both versions of the instrument were also translated into Spanish by a professional translation team, and verified by several other Spanish speaking reviewers.

**Field Test**

Because of the compressed schedule, the instrument field-test had to be run concurrently with the collection of fourth year pre-test data. To maintain the integrity and usefulness of the pre-test assessment data, a decision was made that any modification to the instrument resulting from the field test data would be limited to deleting the least useful items. The field test versions of the instruments were purposely designed to have approximately a third more items than intended for the final version.
Reliability analyses. All 47 grades four through eight classrooms receiving the Safe Haven curriculum across the seven program schools participated, with 811 students returning signed parental permission forms and participating in the first assessment. Approximately half of the classrooms were randomly assigned to a delayed intervention control condition. Based on data from the first assessment, frequency distributions were calculated for all items. We then calculated scale scores and coefficient alphas for potential scales, and deleted items based on (1) lack of internal consistency with its potential scale, and/or (2) insufficient variance (i.e., almost all students responded the same way.) The resulting scales consist of three items each for the middle school (grades 6 through 8) Form B, and two or three items for the elementary school (grades 4 and 5) Form A (see Tables 1 through 8).

All data reported here are preliminary, pending completion of final data cleaning and verification procedures. The median coefficient alpha was .59 for Form A and .71 for Form B based on data from the first assessment. Because these were the same data used to select best contributing items and therefore capitalized on chance, cross-validation coefficient alphas were recalculated using data from the second and third assessments, yielding similar median alphas of .58 for the elementary grades and .70 for the middle school grades from assessment 2, and increased median alphas of .70 and .76 respectively from assessment 3. Overall, all scales showed acceptable or desirable coefficient alphas with the exception of two of the knowledge scales: violence definitions and effects of alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use. The contributing items to these scales suffered from insufficient variance in that almost all students answered most knowledge items correctly. The knowledge scales were retained, however, due to the importance of these items to the curriculum approach.

Reliability estimates based on a scale’s stability over time (sometimes referred to as test-retest reliability) also were calculated by linking pre test to post test assessments. Post tests were administered approximately eight weeks after the pretest. The delayed-treatment experimental design employed provided for no intervention for Group A between assessments 2 and 3, and no intervention for Group B between assessments 1 and 2. Median test-retest Pearson correlation coefficients for the elementary school Form A were .49 and .53, and for the middle school Form B were .56 and .65 (see Tables 9 through 11).

Conclusions

We have demonstrated that it is possible to collaboratively construct the implied theory of an existing program, to frame it within a formal behavioral-change theory, and to develop a reliable assessment instrument directly tied to this theoretical framework. Construct validity analyses will next be conducted by analyzing the correlation patterns of the items and of the scales scores, and the theoretically predicted relationships among scale scores
and between scales scores and self-reported behaviors. Additional analyses will involve English and Spanish subsets of the sample, as well as other important subgroups as sample size permits.
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Figure 1. Program Logic Model

**Concept of Problem**
- **Environment**
  - High rates of gang violence
  - High rates of sexual harassment
  - Negative (unproductive) peer pressure
  - Lack of protective factors
  - High rates of school violence
  - High rates of unemployment
- **Attitudes/Beliefs**
  - Belief that violence is necessary to solve problems
  - Intolerance
  - Increasing acceptance of drugs, violence
- **Lack of skills/knowledge**
  - Inability to listen and understand others
  - Inability to solve problems constructively (win-win)
  - Inability to take responsibility for actions
  - Inability to manage anger
  - Lack of knowledge about where to go for help
- **Behaviors**
  - Physical aggression
  - Name calling
  - Use of drugs and alcohol
  - Use of weapons on and off school property

**Concept of Intervention**
- **Environment**
  - Peer mediation can address problems before they escalate into violence
  - School-wide policy sets a precedent for cooperation, teacher participation improves classroom culture
  - Whole class program and subset of mediators creates a cohesive school program
- **Attitudes/Beliefs**
  - Building self-esteem increases respect for self and others
  - Sharing feelings helps students accept others
- **Lack of skills/knowledge**
  - Use of “I messages” decreases violence
  - “Win-win” solutions are longer lasting and more effective
  - Role playing brings textbook skills to life
  - Refusal skills are empowering
- **Behaviors**
  - Recognizing triggers for anger helps kids address feelings in a positive, productive way
  - Use of dispute resolution brings people from confrontation to mutual problem solving

**Intervention**
- **Curriculum**
  - Defining violence
  - Role playing: making choices
  - Aggression vs. assertiveness
  - Healthy discussions about drugs and alcohol
  - Listening skills
  - Promoting safe school environment
  - Learning where to find help
  - Promoting self recognition
  - Short term/long term goals
  - Handling peer pressure
- **Conflict Managers**
  - Active listening skills
  - On-going training
  - Mediation provided to all students
  - Promoting win-win solutions in the school context
- **Counseling**
  - Icebreakers
  - Concentration activities
  - Anger management
  - Role plays
  - Teacher and staff education regarding identification, intervention and referral
- **Community Mobilization**
  - Planning, participation, radio broadcasts, media campaigns

**Outcomes**
- **Environment**
  - Improved school safety and environment
  - Increased evidence of conflict resolution processes
  - Process in place for disputants to reflect on mediation process
  - Improved communication between students
  - On-going, coherent violence prevention program
  - Training provided to school staff in mediation
- **Attitudes/Beliefs**
  - Decrease in students’ acceptance of violence
  - Decrease in students’ acceptance of AOD use
  - Students will feel comfortable talking about feelings and listening to others
  - Students learn that they have control over their reactions
- **Skills/Knowledge**
  - Students can define violence
  - Students understand the relationship between AOD use and violence
  - Students understand the effects of AOD use
- **Behaviors**
  - Decreased rate of students bringing weapons to school
  - Decreased AOD use in and out of school
  - Decreased physical aggression
  - Decreased verbal aggression
  - Increased positive problem solving (teachers and students)
  - Increased use of coping skills at home
  - Increased students’ ability to resist negative peer pressure
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Figure 2. Program Theoretical Framework

INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE

BEHAVIORAL SKILLS

BEHAVIORS

BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES

PERCEIVED SOCIAL NORMS

BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS
Figure 3. Program Theoretical Framework: Elicited and Rated Components

1. Information
   - Relationship between AOD abuse and violence (13)
   - Where to find help (7)
   - Right to a safe school (7)
   - Definition of violence (6)
   - Aggression versus assertiveness (6)
   - Win-win concepts (5)
   - Recognizing own strengths and limitations (5)
   - Facts about drugs and alcohol (0)

2. Attitudes
   - Respect for self (16)
   - Respect for others (14)
   - Acceptance of others (9)
   - Recognition of self (9)

3. Perceived Social Norms
   - Acceptance of violence (18)
   - Belief that violence is necessary to solve problems (12)
   - Acceptance of drugs (9)
   - Intolerance (9)

4. Behavioral Intentions
   - To take responsibility for actions (23)
   - To address anger in positive way (13)
   - To listen to others (10)
   - To help others (2)

5. Behavioral Skills
   - Anger management (15+5)
   - How to listen/active listening (11)
   - Conflict management (8)
   - Use of coping skills (7+)
   - Determining goals (4+2)
   - How to help others (3)
   - Concentration (0)

6. Behavioral Outcomes
   - Healthy/positive choices (12)
   - Positive problem solving (11)
   - AOD drug use in school (4)
   - Acts of kindness and courtesy (3)
   - Taking time before reacting (3)
   - How to listen/active listening (11)
   - Participation in healthy activities (2)
   - Protective factors (unspecified) (2)
   - Sharing feelings with others (0)
   - Filling time doing positive things (0)

7. Behavior Impact
   - Increase:
     - Verbal aggression (13+3)
     - Physical aggression (13)
     - Acts of kindness and courtesy (3)
     - Taking time before reacting (3)
     - How to listen/active listening (11)
     - Protective factors (unspecified) (2)
     - Sharing feelings with others (0)
     - Filling time doing positive things (0)
   - Decrease:
     - Verbal aggression (13+3)
     - Physical aggression (13)
     - Gang violence (3)
     - Sexual harassment (1)
     - Quarrels (1)
     - Weapons to school (0)

   - Acts of kindness and courtesy (3)
   - Taking time before reacting (3)
   - How to listen/active listening (11)
   - Protective factors (unspecified) (2)
   - Sharing feelings with others (0)
   - Filling time doing positive things (0)
Figure 4. Program Theoretical Framework with Measurable Elements

Beliefs and Attitudes
- Communication
- School environment
- Conflict management

Perceived Social Norms
- Alcohol
- Drugs
- Physical aggression
- Verbal aggression
- Communication

Information/Knowledge
- Definitions of violence
- AOD and violence
- Effects of AOD

Behavioral Intentions
- Temptation refusal
- Assertive communication
- Trusting communication
- Accepting help
- Initiating help
- Self-control

Behavioral Skills
- Temptation refusal
- Assertive communication
- Trusting communication
- Accepting help
- Initiating help
- Self-control

Behaviors
- Use of alcohol
- Use of drugs
- Physical aggression (2)
- Verbal aggression
- Communication
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**Table 1. Scale Score Coefficient Alphas from Assessment 1**  
Form A: Grades 4 and 5, Version 1  
Number of Students = 410  
Data from January, 1998 (Assessment 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION/SCALE NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>ALPHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section B (Attitudes and beliefs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLCOMM45</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-B1, -B4, -B9</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLSCEN45</td>
<td>School Environment</td>
<td>B2, B6, -B12</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLCNFM45</td>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>-B5, -B8, -B11</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section C (Perceived Norms)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNALCL45</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>C1, C3</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNPVAG45</td>
<td>Physical and Verbal Aggression</td>
<td>-C2, C4, C5</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNCOMM45</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-C7, -C8, -C9</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D (Knowledge)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNVLDF45</td>
<td>Violence definitions</td>
<td>-D1, D2, -D8</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNDAEF45</td>
<td>Effects of AOD</td>
<td>D4, -D5, D11</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E-A (Perceived Self-Efficacy)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECMTR45</td>
<td>Trusting communication</td>
<td>E2, E6, E11</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEHLAC45</td>
<td>Accepting help</td>
<td>E3, E9</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEHLIN45</td>
<td>Initiating help</td>
<td>E4, E7, E12</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESECO45</td>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>E5, E14</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E-B (Behavioral Intentions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICMTR45</td>
<td>Trusting communication</td>
<td>E2, E6, E11</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHLAC45</td>
<td>Accepting help</td>
<td>E3, E9</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHLIN45</td>
<td>Initiating help</td>
<td>E4, E7, E12</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISECO45</td>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>E5, E14</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section F (Behaviors)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHUSAL45</td>
<td>Use of alcohol</td>
<td>F2, F8, F10</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHPAG45A</td>
<td>Physical aggression - 1</td>
<td>F3, F7, F9</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHVRAG45</td>
<td>Verbal aggression</td>
<td>F11, F12</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCOMM45</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-F1, -F4, -F14</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 3, 1998

Table 2. Scale Score Coefficient Alphas from Assessment 1
Form B: Grades 6, 7 and 8, Version 1
Number of Students = 401
Data from January, 1998 (Assessment 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION/SCALE NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>ALPHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section B (Attitudes and beliefs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLCOMM68</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-B1, -B4, -B9</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLSCEN68</td>
<td>School Environment</td>
<td>B2, B6, -B12</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLCNF68</td>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>-B5, -B8, -B11</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section C (Perceived Norms)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNALCL68</td>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>C1, C8, C17</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNDRGS68</td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>C4, C6, C14</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNPHAG68</td>
<td>Physical Aggression</td>
<td>C2, C7, C16</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNVRAG68</td>
<td>Verbal Aggression</td>
<td>C5, C9, C11</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNCOMM68</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-C13, -C15, -C18</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D (Knowledge)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNVLDF68</td>
<td>Violence Definitions</td>
<td>-D1, D2, -D10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNDAVL68</td>
<td>AOD and Violence</td>
<td>D5, D11, D13</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNDADR68</td>
<td>Effects of AOD</td>
<td>-D7, -D15, -D17</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E-A (Perceived Self-Efficacy)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERFSL68</td>
<td>Temptation Refusal</td>
<td>E3A, E10A, E21A</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECMAS68</td>
<td>Assertive Communication</td>
<td>E12, E17, E19</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECMT68</td>
<td>Trusting Communication</td>
<td>E5, E8, E14</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEHLAC68</td>
<td>Accepting Help</td>
<td>E4, E11, E15</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEHLIN68</td>
<td>Initiating Help</td>
<td>E6, E18, E20</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESECO68</td>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>E7, E16, E22</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E-B (Behavioral Intentions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIRFSL68</td>
<td>Temptation Refusal</td>
<td>E3, E10, E21</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICMAS68</td>
<td>Assertive Communication</td>
<td>E12, E17, E19</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICMT68</td>
<td>Trusting Communication</td>
<td>E5, E8, E14</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHLAC68</td>
<td>Accepting Help</td>
<td>E4, E11, E15</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHLIN68</td>
<td>Initiating Help</td>
<td>E6, E18, E20</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISECO68</td>
<td>Self-control</td>
<td>E7, E16, E22</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section F (Behaviors)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHUSAL68</td>
<td>Use of Alcohol</td>
<td>F4, F11, F13</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHUSDR68</td>
<td>Use of Drugs</td>
<td>F15, F18, F19</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHPAG68A</td>
<td>Physical Aggression - 1</td>
<td>F1, F5, F10</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHPAG68B</td>
<td>Physical Aggression - 2</td>
<td>F12, F20, F24</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHVRAG68</td>
<td>Verbal Aggression</td>
<td>F14, F22, F23</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHCOMM68</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-F3, -F6, -F26</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 3 – 10 available upon request.

(additional scale score coefficient alphas for assessments 2, 3, and 4; and test-retest reliabilities)
November 3, 1998

Table 11. Median Reliability Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Form A median alpha</th>
<th>Form A median test-retest</th>
<th>Form B median alpha</th>
<th>Form B median test-retest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 1</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 2</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 3</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 1-2*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment 2-3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* no intervention group only
- Form A – elementary school (grades 4 and 5) version
- Form B – middle school (grades 6 through 8) version