Executive Summary

- The overall sample size for the feedback data was 213 cases (70 Pilot study cases, 143 Beta study cases).

- The mean degree of support for the You & Five-O program was very high (= 14.42). Additionally, the data were not skewed (Md= 16).

- The data suggested that adult participants (= 15.06, Sd= 2.681) had greater support for the You & Five-O program than juvenile participants (= 12.58, Sd= 3.694).

- Non-minority participants in the pilot study displayed statistically higher support for the program than minority participants (t= 2.23, p= .029).

- Pilot study participants had a 24.04% increase in the level of knowledge about their rights after completing the program.

- Pilot study participants had a 5.92% increase in their level of comfort in interacting with law enforcement after completing the program

- Beta study participants had an 18.06% increase in their knowledge of their rights after participating in program.

- Beta study participants also experienced a 2.95% increase in their level of comfort interacting with law enforcement officers after completing the program.

The following analysis is of data collected from two samples of data for the "You & Five-O" program. The data were collected from multiple sites during the pilot study and the Beta sample. The purpose of this comparative analysis is to assess any differences in program components between the two samples. The overall sample size for the feedback data was 213 cases (70 Pilot study cases, 143 Beta study cases).

In order to measure the degree of program support, researchers used a composite scale. The support scale was comprised of 8 items. The individual scale items were tested for validity and reliability before being collapsed into a scale. The reliability analysis easily surpassed the reliability threshold of .700 and attained a Cronbach's Alpha of .909. Additionally, a factor analysis revealed that each of the items produced an Eigen value which exceeded the .400 requirement for validity (See Tables 1a and 1b). The Support Scale had a range from 0 (having no support for the program) to 16 (having the highest degree of support for the program). The normalized version of the scale showed that respondents who scored in the 0-8 category had low program support and those who scored in the 9-19 category had high program support.

Table-1a (Pilot Sample)	Eigen Value	Cronbach's Alpha	Range
1	Did you enjoy the training?	.774		
2	Do you think the training was informative?	.764		
3	Do you think the training was helpful?	.821		
4	Would you recommend the training your friends?	.855	.909	Low= 0-8
5	Would you recommend the training your family?	.774		High= 9-16
6	Do you think children would benefit from the training?	.678		
7	Do you think teens would benefit from the training?	.843		
8	Do you think adults would benefit from the training?	.862		

Table 1b shows that the scales from both the pilot and the beta studies were both found to be valid and reliable. While there were only minor fluctuations in the Eigenvalues between the two samples, all of the individual questions met the .400 threshold. Additionally, the Cronbach's alpha of the Beta sample was also found to be reliable (See Table 1b).

Table-1b (Beta Sample)	Eigen Value	Cronbach's Alpha	Range
1	Did you enjoy the training?	.809		
2	Do you think the training was informative?	.696		
3	Do you think the training was helpful?	.722		
4	Would you recommend the training your friends?	.840	.917	Low= 0-8
5	Would you recommend the training your family?	.806		High= 9-16
6	Do you think children would benefit from the training?	.764		
7	Do you think teens would benefit from the training?	.844		
8	Do you think adults would benefit from the training?	.874		

Table-2a displays the results of the univariate analysis of the study variables collected from the pilot study. The mean degree of support for the You & Five-O program was very high (= 14.42). Additionally, the data were not skewed (Md= 16) nor was there a high degree of heterogeneity in the sample (Sd= 2.962). The majority of participants in the pilot study were middle-aged with no discernable skew in the data (= 42.60, Md= 48). However, there was a high degree of heterogeneity in this variable. The youngest participant was 14 years old and the oldest was 85 years old.

Most participants in the pilot study were well educated (= 14.20, Md= 16). The data suggested that there was a high degree of homogeneity when considering participants' education

(Sd= 3.085). The You & Five-O pilot study used a North Carolina General Statutes questionnaire to determine if there was any change in the participants' knowledge about their rights after completing the You & Five-O program. The data suggested that post-test scores were higher (= 8.34, Md= 8) than the pre-test score (= 7.04, Md= 7) after completing the You & Five-O program. Demographically, the participants were composed of similarly proportioned groups of males (41.8%) and female (58.2%). African Americans (55.2%) and Whites (41.8%) comprised the largest two ethnicities in the study (See table-2a)

Table-2 (Pilot Sample)		or prop.	Md.	Sd.
Degree of Program Support	(Range: 0-16, Highest)	14.42	16	2.962
Age		42.60	48	22.392
Education	(in Years)	14.20	16	3.085
Pre-test Score	(Range: 0-10, Highest)	7.07	7	1.708
Post-test Score	(Range: 0-10, Highest)	8.34	8	1.110
Ethnicity	Asian	.015	-	-
	Black/ African American	.552	-	-
	White	.418	-	-
	Other	.015	-	-
Sex	Female	.582	-	-
	Male	.418	-	-

Table 2b displays the univariate findings from the Beta sample. The mean degree of support among the Beta sample was slightly lower than that of the Pilot sample (= 13.68). Additionally, the data were not skewed (Md= 16) nor was there a high degree of heterogeneity in the sample (Sd= 3.497). The participants in the Beta study were noticeably younger than those in the Pilot sample (= 26.01, Md= 17). However, there was a high degree of heterogeneity in this variable (Sd= 17.316).

Most participants in the Beta study appeared to have not finished high school as the average education was only 11 years (= 11.86, Md= 11). The data suggested that there was a moderate degree of homogeneity when considering participants' education (Sd= 3.738). Demographically, the participants were composed of similarly proportioned groups of males (56.7%) and female (43.3%). While African Americans (88.7%) and Whites (6.3%) comprised the largest two ethnicities in both the Pilot and Beta studies, the Beta study had a much greater proportion of African Americans than the Pilot study (See table-2a)

Table-2b (Beta Sample)		or prop.	Md.	Sd.
Degree of Program Support	(Range: 0-16, Highest)	13.68	16	3.497
Age		26.01	17	17.316
Education	(in Years)	11.86	11	3.738
Pre-test Score	(Range: 0-10, Highest)	5.26	5	1.815
Post-test Score	(Range: 0-10, Highest)	6.21	6	1.219
Ethnicity	Asian	-	-	-
	Black/ African American	.887	-	-
	Hispanic	.014	-	-
	White	.063	-	-
	Other	.036		
Sex	Female	.433	-	-
	Male	.567	-	-

It is important to pay special attention to the rates of change on the participant's knowledge of the law and their level of comfort interacting with law enforcement officer. Table 7a shows that there was a 24.04% increase in the level of knowledge between the pre-test and the post-test for participants in the Pilot study. Additionally, participants in the Pilot study had a 5.92% increase in their level of comfort in interacting with law enforcement after completing the program (See Table-7a).

Table-7a			Md	Sd	Δ
NCGS Knowledge	Time-1	6.78	7	1.728	+24.04%
	Time-2	8.41	8	1.612	
Officer Interaction	Time-1	18.22	18	3.441	+5.92%
	Time-2	19.30	19	3.760	

The data from the Beta study suggested that the participants in the Beta study experienced an 18.06% increase in their knowledge of their rights after participating in program. The participants in the Beta study also experienced a 2.95% increase in their level of comfort interacting with law enforcement officers after completing the program (See Table-7b)

Table-7b			Md	Sd	Δ
NCGS Knowledge	Time-1	5.26	5	1.815	+18.06%
	Time-2	6.21	6	1.219	
Officer Interaction	Time-1	17.28	18	3.98	+2.95%
	Time-2	17.79	18	4.256	

While support for the program was measured using a composite scale, the researchers also examined the individual components of the scale in order to determine if there were any specific areas that yielded stronger support than others. Table-3 shows that participants exhibited strong support for the program in all observed areas encompassed by the support scale (See Table-3a).

Table-3a		No	Maybe	Yes
1	Did you enjoy the 'You & Five-O' training?	4.3% (n=3)	7.2% (n=5)	88.4% (n=61)
2	Did you think the 'You & Five-O' training was informative?	1.4% (n=1)	2.9% (n=2)	95.7% (n=67)
3	Did you think the 'You & Five-O' training was helpful?	2.9% (n=2)	5.7% (n=4)	91.4% (n=64)
4	Would you recommend the 'You & Five-O' training to your friends?	5.7% (n=4)	22.9% (n=16)	71.4% (n=50)
5	Would you recommend the 'You & Five-O' training to your family?	8.6% (n=6)	17.1% (n=12)	74.3% (n=52)
6	Do you think children would benefit from the 'You & Five-O' training?	1.4% (n=1)	18.6% (n=13)	80% (n=56)

7	Do you think teens would benefit from the 'You & Five-O' training?	2.9% (n=2)	11.4% (n=8)	85.7% (n=60)
8	Do you think adults would benefit from the 'You & Five-O' training?	1.4% (n=1)	12.9% (n=9)	85.7% (n=60)

*Table does not include missing values.

Table-2b displays data on the individual items found in the support scale for the Beta sample. Both Tables-3a and 3b show that participants exhibited strong support for the program, especially when examining that each question produced agreement (Yes- response) that was higher than 60% in both samples. It is worth noting that the agreement (Yes- responses) were slightly lower in the Beta sample (See Table-3b).

Table-3b (Beta Sample)		No	Maybe	Yes
1	Did you enjoy the 'You & Five-O' training?	5% (n=7)	24.8% (n=35)	70.2% (n=99)
2	Did you think the 'You & Five-O' training was informative?	2.1% (n=3)	14.1% (n=20)	83.8% (n=119)
3	Did you think the 'You & Five-O' training was helpful?	2.8% (n=4)	12.8% (n=18)	84.4% (n=119)
4	Would you recommend the 'You & Five-O' training to your friends?	7.7% (n=11)	26.8% (n=38)	65.5% (n=93)
5	Would you recommend the 'You & Five-O' training to your family?	9.1% (n=13)	18.2% (n=26)	72.7% (n=104)
6	Do you think children would benefit from the 'You & Five-O' training?	4.2% (n=6)	21.7% (n=31)	74.1% (n=106)
7	Do you think teens would benefit from the 'You & Five-O' training?	5.6% (n=8)	18.2% (n=26)	76.2% (109)
8	Do you think adults would benefit from the 'You & Five-O' training?	6.3% (n=9)	18.2% (n=26)	75.5% (n=108)

*Table does not include missing values.

Table-4a displays the results of the means analysis. The purpose of the means analysis was to determine if there were any meaningful differences in support between various categories of participants. When examining the level of program support, the data suggested that adult participants (= 15.52, Sd= .943) had greater support for the You & Five-O program than juvenile

participants (= 12.50, Sd= 3.973). This difference was statistically significant (p= .002) which means the difference did not occur by chance. Additionally, the difference in program support between juveniles and adults was statistically important (d= 1.228). The difference is considered to be statistically important if the effect size is half of 1-standard deviation (d= .500), between the two groups.

The difference in program support between males and females was not statistically significant (t= 1.96, p= .054). However, it should be noted that this difference in means did approach statistical significance at the .054 level. In order for the difference to be considered statistically significant, the p-value must be ≤.05. The difference in program support between males and females was not statistically important (d= .454). When testing the difference in program support between non-minority participants and minority participants, non-minority participants displayed statistically higher support for the program than minority participants (t= 2.23, p= .029). The difference between minority and non-minority participants was statistically important (d= .675).

Table-4a	(Range: 0-16, Highest)		Sd	t	Sig.	d
Program Support	Juvenile Adult	12.50 15.52	3.973 .943	-3.51	.002	1.228
Program Support	Female Male	15.07 13.75	1.583 3.757	1.96	.054	.494
Program Support	Non-minority Minority	15.40 13.89	1.083 3.385	2.23	.029	.675

Table-4b displays the means analysis from the Beta sample. The data from the Beta sample suggested that there was a statistically significant difference in the level of program support between juvenile participants and adult participants. The data suggested that adult participants (= 15.06, Sd= 2.681) had greater support for the You & Five-O program than juvenile participants (= 12.58, Sd= 3.694). This difference was statistically significant (p= .000)

which means the difference did not occur by chance. Additionally, the difference in program

support between juveniles and adults was statistically important (d= .768).

Table-4b	(Range: 0-16, Highest)		Sd	t	Sig.	d
Program Support	Juvenile	12.58	3.694	4.535	.000	.768
	Adult	15.06	2.681			
Program Support	Female	13.95	3.436	.893	.373	.156
	Male	13.40	3.574			
Program Support	Non-minority	12.33	3.570	-1.223	.224	.416
	Minority	13.80	3.484			

Table-5a displays the result of a bivariate correlation of the study variable from the pilot

study. Program support was significantly correlated with minority status (r= -.269, p= .029), age

(r= .461, p= .000) and education (r= .517, p= .000). This suggested that minority participants had

lower support for the program than non-minority participants. Additionally, as age and education

level increases, so did support for the You & Five-O program (See Table-5).

Table-5a		1	2	3	4
1	Program Support	1	-.269*	.461**	.517**
2	Minority Status		1	-.533**	-.539**
3	Respondent Age			1	.656**
4	Education Level				1
* p≤ .05, **p≤ .01					

Table 5b shows that the Beta sample produced similar correlations to those found in the

pilot sample. The relationship between program support and minority status was not statistically

significant in the Beta sample (r= .105, p= .541). However, the correlations between program

support and age (r= .384, p= .000), as well as the relationship between program support and

education (r= .236, p= .000) maintained their statistical significance (See Table-5b).

Table-5b		1	2	3	4
1	Program Support	1	.105	.384**	.236**
2	Minority Status		1	.049	.043
3	Respondent Age			1	.684**
4	Education Level				1
* p≤ .05, **p≤ .01					

Table-6a displays the results of an Ordinary Least Squared model regressing the study variables on degree of program support for the Pilot sample. The model was statistically significant (F= 5.809, p= .001) and produced a coefficient of determination (R^2= .256) that suggested we could explain 25.6% of the variation in the support for the program by knowing the minority status, participant's sex, participant's education level and the participant's age. Of the four partial sloped found in the model, only one was statistically significant. There was a statistically significant relationship between participant's education and support for the program (b= .414, p= .010). This means that as a participant's education increases so does their support for the program (See Table-6a).

Table-6 R^2= .256 (F= 5.809, p= .001)	B	t	b	Sig.
Minority Status	.385	.733	.110	.467
Participant Sex	.386	.895	.110	.375
Participant Education	.235	2.687	.414	.010
Participant Age	.024	1.704	.291	.094
DV= Program Support				

Table-6b shows that the Beta sample OLS model was also statistically significant (F= 5.382, p= .001). However, the coefficient of determination (R^2= .133) was approximately half the size of the coefficient of determination from the Pilot sample. This suggested that the same OLS model explained approximately 25% of the variation in program support among the Pilot study

participants but only explained approximately 13% of the variation in program support among

the participants in the Beta sample. Unlike the OLS model of data from the Pilot sample, the

OLS model from the Beta sample only had one variable that produced a statistically significant

impact on program support and that was age (b= .445, p= .000). This suggested that the older the

participant, the more program support (See table-6b).

Table-6b R^2= .133 (F= 5.382, p= .001)	B	t	b	Sig.
Minority Status	1.463	1.338	.118	.184
Participant Sex	.602	.978	.090	.330
Participant Education	-.068	-.625	-.076	.533
Participant Age	.084	3.638	.445	.000
DV= Program Support				