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A. General Scientific and Technological Aims

Current job training programs for youth concentrate on helping them to identify career interests and search for jobs. Very few emphasize how to keep those jobs. Yet, the literature clearly shows that youth entering the workforce are at high risk of losing their job. The primary reason for this is not because they don’t have the skills to do the work, but because they lack the social skills to successfully integrate into the workplace culture. At-risk teens are particularly vulnerable because they have poorer social skills than their mainstream counterparts.

The aim in Phase I was to develop, produce, and evaluate the first module of a DVD-based training program on job retention skills for the at-risk teen. Instruction focused on time management and job expectations.

B. Phase I Research Activities

Product Development

Development in Phase I centered on creating a curriculum guide and DVD on the following topics:

- **Time Management**
  **Getting to work on time**
  - Creating a plan for getting to work 10 minutes early. Steps include: having a strategy for waking up on time, preparing meals and work clothing the night before, leaving enough time to do chores, scheduling transportation.
  - Understanding what being on time means to employers.
  - Exploring the importance of being on time and the consequences of chronic lateness.

- **Job Expectations**
  **The job description, employment contract, and employee manual**
  - Having a clear and complete understanding of a job position, including: duties and responsibilities, accountability and supervision, employment effort (e.g., part-time or full-time, temporary or permanent), and work goals.

Our approach presented these skills in the broader social context of the workplace. Getting to work on time, for example, involves more than learning a list of steps. Employees also have to appreciate the value of timeliness in the workplace, and how it can affect others. Most teens, even those who already know the practical steps of getting to work on time, learn the consequences of being late or absent through direct experience in the workplace, which can also mean encountering criticism and conflict.

The same is true for job expectations. While new employees need to form reasonable expectations about their work by reading employment documents, attitudes and behavior
are largely shaped through on-the-job interactions with supervisors and co-workers. How those interactions are handled often makes the difference between keeping or losing a job.

The curriculum in Phase I, titled *Take This Job and Keep It!*, addressed both the practical and the social aspects of these skills. For example, Boarder, the main character in the story, learned strategies for getting to work on time from his mom, but his lack of perspective and experience with time management led to misunderstandings, poor follow-through and, ultimately, confrontation. Similarly, although Boarder earnestly read the employment documents and thought he knew what to expect and what others expected of him, his actual encounters had nuances and layers of reactions and difficulties that he didn’t anticipate.

In Phase I we produced an integrated curriculum and DVD (see Appendix A for the DVD, and Appendix B for the Teacher’s Guide). Instruction was organized into four, 50-minute classes. In each class, students alternated between watching a segment, or chapter, of an animated teen story on DVD and class activities related to that chapter. Each chapter ended with a word from Dale Funk, the ultra-hip animated host of the DVD who helped set up the follow-up class activities.

The content development process was guided by the following general principles:
• Make the content relevant for teens.
• Model social skills.
• Present skills in the context of the workplace.
• Simplify the language.
• Graphically enhance instruction for the visual learner.
• Provide opportunities for students to interact with the content.

Curriculum Content
The following describes how the principles listed above were applied.

*Class 1*: The first class focuses on three important employment documents: *The Job Description, The Employee Manual, and The Employment Contract.*

In the first chapter on the DVD, *The Job Description*, Dale Funk introduces the program, then the story segment plays. In the story, Boarder puts together a great résumé and portfolio and gets the job with Glassart. His new boss orients him to the job: what the tasks are, how he should dress, when he starts, what his hours are, and what he needs to bring on his first day. That’s all cool with Boarder; he’s keeping mental notes on everything. Boarder also gets a quick tour of the shop and meets his supervisor, José; a co-worker, Sierra; and Laurie, the office administrative assistant. He also gets some important employment documents to look over: his Job Description, the Employee Manual, and the Employment Contract.

Dale Funk returns and sets up the follow-up class activities.
• First impressions of Boarder’s first day on the job.
• Exploring Boarder’s Job Description.

In the chapter on *The Employee Manual*, Boarder’s back home and being his nonchalant self, but both his mom and friends cut to the chase: Did he get the job?!
Boarder fills them in about the job and his prospects. His mom is busting proud, and his friends think it’s cool. Boarder starts to take care of one piece of business, finding out where his tools are from his buddies. Boarder’s got lots to think about, including looking over the Employee Manual.

Dale Funk sets up the follow-up class activity:
X Exploring the Employee Manual.

In the third chapter, *The Employment Contract*, Boarder joins up with his buddies after dinner for some skating and a movie, but it doesn’t end too well; Paa gets smacked by a car at an intersection. The doctor at the ER says he’ll be okay. Boarder has a tough time getting up the next morning. His mom has to keep nudging him to wake up. After eating breakfast and taking the lunch his mom packed for him, he stops at his friend’s house to pick up the tools he needs; then he’s off to his first day on the job. It’s a bumpy start for Boarder. He doesn’t realize it, but he’s 10 minutes late. It also turns out he didn’t understand what clothes he should wear. The boss is a nice guy, though, and reminds Boarder to be on time and says it’s okay to go home and change his clothes. Before he actually can start work he has to look over and sign the Employment Contract. Finally, the boss asks him for the two pieces of I.D. he was supposed to bring in... uh oh, he forgot those.

Dale Funk sets up the follow-up class activities:
X Impressions of Boarder’s actions.
X Exploring Boarder’s Employment Contract.

Class 2: The second class focuses on what to do when you feel angry at a supervisor, and getting to work on time.

In the chapter, *What’s Up with José?*, Sierra gives Boarder the rundown on what to do and he gets right on it. Boarder’s hard at work when something unexpected happens: a run-in with his supervisor, José. Boarder gets mad when he thinks José accuses him of taking a tool. Later, José notices Boarder talking on his cell phone. By lunchtime, Boarder’s stressed and ready for a break. His co-worker, Sierra, helps him out a little with some advice. First, keep your personal business out of the workplace. Second, if you do your job, you won’t have to worry about José. Third, if you don’t know what to do, just ask.

Dale Funk returns and sets up the follow-up class activities:
X What to do and what not to do when a supervisor gets mad.
X Thinking before acting.

In the chapter, *About Time*, Boarder finishes up the day with a flurry of work: putting crates together, lifting, packing. He likes working with Sierra. It seems like he found someone he can trust and listen to. He got her hint, for example, about personal business this time he turned his cell phone off and fixed the situation before it became a problem. Back at home, Boarder and his mom talk about the job over dinner. He definitely digs it. Before Boarder goes to the hospital to visit Paa, his mom goes over some strategies for getting to work on time. It’s something he’s got to get together for himself now.
Dale Funk returns and sets up the follow-up class activities:
X Overall impressions of Boarder’s first day.
X Developing a plan for getting to work on time.

Class 3: The third class has more on getting to work on time, and covers conflicts with employees, listening to instructions, and apologizing.

In the chapter, *Do This, Do That*, Boarder thought he was getting some things right that he actually wasn’t. First, he didn’t realize that Saturday’s hours were different. Good thing, though; he would have been late again. His boss figured out what the mix-up was, but made sure that Boarder understood that being on time was non-negotiable. Boarder was asked to step in for Sierra who had a personal problem and help get an important order ready for shipping. José gave him his instructions, fast and furious. Boarder rolled up his sleeves, turned on the shop radio, and went to work. When Boarder finished, instead of getting kudos, José blasted him because he shouldn’t have double-boxed the catalogs.

Dale Funk returns and sets up the follow-up class activities:
X Boarder’s understanding of being on time.
X Making an apology.

In the chapter, *Boxing Match*, Boarder knows he’s made some mistakes, but he’s determined to move on. Sierra comes in later to get back to the job that Boarder started. She notices that he made a bunch of other procedural mistakes and tells him... not too sweetly either. The job has to get done, so Sierra takes it over. Boarder feels a little put down and starts to get testy about it. But he gathers himself together, and he even tells Sierra about the catalogs he double-boxed. That seems to defuse the situation, and Sierra apologizes to Boarder for being grumpy. Later that night... Boarder and his buds are at the arcade, and he’s telling them how he kept it together at work and that he’s probably going to get a chance to do some glassblowing at the job soon.

Dale Funk returns and sets up the follow-up class activity:
X Working out conflicts with co-workers.

Class 4: The last class gives students the opportunity to practice the problem-solving skills they’ve learned.

In the chapter, *You Make The Call*, there are 6 job scenarios to choose from. Students select a scene and do the follow-up class activity:
X Working out conflicts with co-workers and supervisors.

Process for Developing Content
The media materials were developed in several stages by the project team, which included Lee White, the Principal Investigator; Dr. Caesar Pacifici, Co-Investigator; Keith Qiao Jin, the lead programmer; Dr. Michael Bullis, the advisor on social skills for youth in the workplace; Scot Deils, the cartoon animator; and Mike Novotny, the cartoon artist. The characters were developed and scripts written for the animated story; and scripts were subjected to an iterative review process by the team. The final draft of the script was
converted into an animatic, which is a storyboard with rough hewn animation. This was reviewed until the script, audio, and visuals were finalized.

The graphic artist designed the player (graphical interface), and the programmer authored the media elements into a complete version of the program. These were then subjected to two stages of preliminary feedback from at-risk youth and Dr. Bullis.

**Technical Development**

The entire creative team participated in analyzing and storyboarding the scripts to allow each member’s input on the animation in pre-production. 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 and Sound Forge 5.0. Original sound effects and music were composed by in-house musicians and added to the soundtrack.

The artists and Flash Animator developed drawn characters, then animated and edited storylines according to approved storyboards. The Flash animator used final audio files and graphic elements to create a first rough-cut according to the script, using Macromedia Flash 5.0 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 in production and revision. However, once approved, all files were outputted to SonicDvDitPE, and authored as our final medium on DVD. This process required the Flash Animator to undo the interactive programming in the Flash files, and export each story segment as an audio visual image (AVI).

The graphic designer reproduced the buttons and menu screens and provided these in a format usable by the DVD author and designer. The DVD authoring was completed and then reviewed and menus were added for user clarification. As a final step, we burned the final DVD files, designed and created graphic labels and packing, and replicated the DVD as a final product.

**Alpha Test with At-Risk Youth**

Six youth, 3 males and 3 females, from an alternative high school in Eugene, Oregon participated in the alpha test. They ranged in age from 15-19 and represented a variety of ethnic and racial groups. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained. The goal of this activity, conducted at the high school by the project’s Co-Investigator, was to gather preliminary feedback on both the format of the outcome measure to be used in the evaluation study and the program itself. At the outset, participants completed a background information questionnaire and a very brief, two-item version of the outcome measure, a adaptation of the Scale of Job-Related Social Skill Knowledge (Bullis, Nishioka, Fredericks, & Davis, 1995). We administered the latter by reading the two workplace scenarios to them and having them respond in writing what they would say or do if they were in a situation like that. Participants reported no comprehension problems with the two items, and we were able to read and understand their responses, giving us confidence that the measure’s format would be feasible with the targeted group of at-risk youth.
We next showed the group the animated story via DVD video using a large-screen television, stopping after each chapter, as per the curriculum, and asking them to briefly comment on questions based on the curriculum. In general, students responded easily to the prompts. They seemed to have a fairly good grasp of the social skills being targeted. Their feedback can be summarized as follows:

- They made several reinforcing remarks about the material.
- They liked Dale Funk, in particular, who elicited lots of laughs.
- The only critical remark concerned abrupt transitions in the animation (e.g., objects suddenly disappearing).
- One student, when asked, said that even though he may know what the right thing to do is, he may not do it in an actual situation.
- All said they learned something from the curriculum, at least in the form of reminders about the importance of such things as conducting themselves appropriately with others in the workplace and getting to work on time. They said the program was clear and informative. When we asked, if the program were on the cartoon network and they had a remote in their hand, would they watch or change channels, they said they would keep it on the screen and watch it, especially if it were a Dale Funk segment.

Immediately after viewing the program, participants completed a measure of user satisfaction. The first nine items asked them to rate individual aspects of the program, such as how entertaining, cool, and useful it was, on a scale of 1 (the worst) to 10 (the best). Means on these items ranged from 8.3 to 10.0, and the group mean on a scale composed of all nine items was 8.95. The tenth item asked participants for their overall rating of the program on the same scale. All but one of the students gave the program a A10. Finally, there was an open-ended question, asking if there were anything else they’d like to say about the program. The comments from the four students who chose to respond were as follows: AIt was really understandable and educational, I thought it was very interesting and pretty useful, I think there should be more cartoons like this, and You are doing a good thing.

The alpha testing activity lasted about 1.5 hours, and at its conclusion each student received $15.

Preliminary Review by Expert Advisors

We contracted with Dr. Michael Bullis, a professor at the University of Oregon and a long-time researcher in the area of job-related social behavior, to review and critique a preliminary version of the Phase I job retention curriculum (on CD, with an accompanying teacher’s guide). He prefaced his comments as follows: AAt the outset I should say that I had a positive reaction to the curriculum and believe it is extremely useable in a number of educational, rehabilitation, and correctional settings....This is already a solid product; I hope that my comments will serve to make it better.

One suggestion Dr. Bullis made, which we incorporated, was to use Dale Funk’s comments as an advance organizer for the instructional points to follow -- and to do this consistently throughout the program. Dr. Bullis also suggested that we Aclean up the language in a place or two, which we did. For example, we changed the description of
Boarder at one point from being ashed to being amad. Although we wanted the language in the program to be familiar and appealing to the targeted at-risk youth, we also agreed with Dr. Bullis that a few of our choices had been inappropriate.

Among the suggestions Dr. Bullis made for the teacher’s guide were to expand the introduction, which he felt was too brief for most teachers, and to include in it an outline of the curriculum’s four classes. We followed both of these suggestions.

In addition to the preliminary review by Dr. Bullis, we received some useful feedback from Job Corps staff who viewed the program in anticipation of its testing at a Job Corps center. They expressed concern about the informal, somewhat sloppy, way Boarder was dressed in the early version that they saw. They felt this would send the wrong message to Job Corps trainees, to whom they had been teaching the importance of appropriate dress in the workplace. In response to their concern, we decided to dress up Boarder a little to make his appearance more appropriate for his job interview.

Project Evaluation

The purpose of this analysis was to evaluate the effectiveness of the Take This Job and Keep It curriculum with youth enrolled in the Job Corps. As indicated above, the outcome measure was an adaptation of the Scale of Job-Related Social Skill Knowledge (Bullis et al., 1995). The results are presented according to two types of data: descriptive information on operational aspects of the program and demographic characteristics of the sample, and inferential data on group differences on the outcome measure.

Participants

Participants included 86 trainees, 16-26 years old, enrolled in educational and vocational training at a Job Corps (JC) center in the Pacific Northwest. The Job Corps provides comprehensive services in 118 residential settings to over 70,000 economically disadvantaged youth annually (U.S. Department of Labor, 2002). This JC center had a total of 230 trainees.

The study sample consisted predominantly of male trainees (23.5% female). The ethnic breakdown of participants was 15.0% Hispanic, 56.3% not Hispanic, and 28.8% unknown. Racially, the majority of the sample was White (63.8%), with African Americans constituting the second largest racial group (10.0%). (See Appendix C, Tables 1 and 2 for further description of the sample.)

Participation in the study was voluntary. Participants received $10 for participating: $5 for completing each of the two assessments.
Procedure
To control for extraneous sources of variability as well as threats to internal validity, we randomly assigned trainees who agreed to participate to either an intervention condition or a wait-list control condition. In the final sample there were 44 trainees in the Take This Job treatment group and 42 in the no-treatment control group.

The entire study took place over a period of one week. During the first 2-3 days of the study, trainees in both conditions completed a background information questionnaire and the outcome measure. Over the rest of the week, participants in the intervention condition met in small groups (no more than 15) and viewed the Take This Job and Keep It curriculum on DVD. The same JACS staff person who recruited participants and obtained their informed consent performed the role of trainer for all of the groups, running the DVD player and facilitating the group discussions and other class activities. Immediately following the fourth class session, participants again completed the outcome measure, as well as a user satisfaction questionnaire. Participants in the control group took the posttest assessment over the same time interval as those in the intervention group, but they did not complete the user satisfaction questionnaire. They were given the opportunity to view the DVD after the completion of the study.

Measures
Copies of all measures are included in Appendix D.

Χ Scale of Job-Related Social Skill Knowledge (SSSK) - Short Form:
The original SSSK (Bullis, et al., 1995) is a 40-item scale that was developed specifically for use with adolescents and young adults with emotional or behavioral disorders (E/BD) to assess their level of social skill awareness in types of interactions they are likely to encounter in job-related situations. This measure was developed in a manner consistent with the behavioral analytic model (Goldfried & D=Zurrilla, 1969) and is based on two components of social skills: knowledge and behavior. The SSSK measure focuses on individuals= knowledge of social skills (i.e., knowing how to behave). The SSSK is a self-report measure and is presented in two subsections: Interactions with Work Supervisors and Interactions with Coworkers. Each item is presented individually using a verbal role-playing approach. Following administration, each response is scored on a three-point scale: ineffective, fair, or effective. Male and female norms are provided for this measure, and scores are reported as the overall mean rating. The SSSK can be completed and scored in approximately 45-60 minutes. The SSSK was developed with careful consideration of the social interactions that at-risk youth typically encounter within the work environment. In addition, the measure has undergone extensive evaluation procedures. Both the SSSK and its companion performance measure (the SSMP) were evaluated using 16 residential treatment facilities in seven states for a total of over 300 students. Results confirm that the SSSK reliably discriminates between persons with and without E/BD (Bullis & Davis, 1996; Bullis, Nishioka-Evans, Fredericks, & Davis, 1994). The scales and subscales of the SSSK have been empirically supported by factor analyses (Bullis & Davis, 1996).

Following his review and critique of the Take This Job and Keep It curriculum, Dr.
Bullis recommended that we follow an evaluation procedure different than we had originally planned. Specifically, he suggested that, instead of using the entire 40-item SSSK as the study’s dependent measure, we use a short version directly related to the content of the curriculum. Bullis was adamant that the units included in this curriculum actually addressed a portion of the items in the SSSK, as that measure included several subunits reflecting different aspects of the broad area of job-related social behavior. Dr. Bullis carefully reviewed the curriculum and the SSSK and identified 12 items with direct relevance to the curriculum, such as interactions with a work supervisor and asking for assistance from a boss or coworker. We decided to follow his recommendation, which resulted in using only content-relevant items, at significant savings in terms of time and efficiency. With his approval, we also modified the method of administering the measure to paper-and-pencil and the coding scheme from a 3-point scale to a 5-point scale. Altering the original measure meant that it was necessary to re-calculate the psychometric properties of the revised measure. The content validity of the measure is evident through the connection of the items used as the dependent measure to the content of the curriculum. Internal consistency reliability was established for the revised measure by calculating this property on the youth participating in the evaluation study. (See also the final paragraph of the Assumptions of ANCOVA section, page 10.)

**Background Information:**
- Project staff developed a brief background information questionnaire that includes age, gender, ethnicity, race, education, and length of enrollment in JC.

**User Satisfaction:**
- This questionnaire, also developed in-house, elicits teens’ feedback on the appeal, clarity, and value of the job-related skills curriculum.

**Results**
Following a statement of our hypothesis, the results are summarized in two sections: preliminary analyses and final outcome analyses.

**Hypothesis**
Controlling for pretest differences, we anticipate a main effect of group. Specifically, the treatment group will outperform the no-treatment group on the SSSK, indicating a greater knowledge of social skills with respect to time management and job expectations. A .05 alpha level was used to determine significance in all statistical tests.

**Preliminary Analyses**
Given the relatively large number of participants who dropped out (nearly 29% of the original sample), we conducted analyses of possible differences between those who dropped out of the study and those who did not. We conducted independent samples t-tests and/or Chi-Square analyses on all demographic information from the Background Information questionnaire to detect any systematic differences between the two groups. Using an alpha level of .05, no significant differences were found between completers and
non-completers. Reasons for attrition included participants going on leave, departing the center for work or other unspecified purposes, and lack of interest in the study.

Assumptions of ANCOVA. Our study used a pretest-posttest design with a control group. Because we also used random assignment to groups, this experimental design was able to adequately control for all main threats to internal validity (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2001) and allow for more powerful statistical analyses through the use of a covariate. Given the power of our experimental design, we were able to address our research question using a between subjects analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). ANCOVA has superior power for detecting differences on a single dependent variable within a study. In this design, group served as the independent variable with two levels: intervention and control. Quantitative pretest scores on the SSSK were used as the covariate, and posttest scores on this same measure were used as the dependent variable.

Given our choice of experimental design, many of the theoretical assumptions of ANCOVA were met, primarily that we demonstrated an adequate control of sources of extraneous variability. However, before proceeding, we also needed to evaluate the statistical assumptions of this procedure: (a) univariate normality, (b) homogeneous regression of the covariate and dependent variable, and (c) reliable covariate. The results of these tests are summarized below.

Using visual analysis of histograms, we found the distributions in pre- and posttest scores on the SSSK to approximate normality. No outliers were found, nor were there any ceiling or floor effects noted on this measure.

We also used visual analysis of scatterplots to examine linearity of relations between and among the dependent variable and covariate. All scatterplots indicated moderate linear relations. The covariate was highly correlated with the dependent variable, $r = .65$, $p < .05$.

When assessing the reliability of our covariate, we found low moderate test-retest reliability for the SSSK ($r = .77$). Salvia & Ysseldyke (2001) recommend reliability coefficients at or above .60 for use in making group research decisions. Convinced that our statistical analysis was appropriate, we began the model selection procedure to choose the most appropriate analysis for dependent measures.

Selecting Appropriate ANCOVA Model. Because we conducted an analysis using a covariate, we considered multiple models and accepted the most parsimonious. The first model, unequal slopes and unequal intercepts, was abandoned, because the differences in slopes across the groups were neither significant ($F (1, 82) = 3.76, p = .06$) nor important ($\eta^2 = .04$).

We found the slopes in the ANCOVA model to be significantly different from zero. We therefore chose to analyze our data using ANCOVA model 2, assuming equal slopes and unequal intercepts. All output listed below is based on an equal slopes ANCOVA model.

Outcome Analyses
The main effect of the intervention was significant $F(1, 83) = 6.39$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$ and indicated that scores were, on the average, higher for those students who had participated in the intervention (see Appendix C, Table 3 for group means on the SSSK at posttest, and see Appendix C, Table 4 for a summary of the ANCOVA results).

*User Satisfaction.* Our final analysis examined the user satisfaction data for the intervention group (see Appendix C, Table 5 for means on the individual user satisfaction items and for the overall user satisfaction rating). To highlight a few of the findings, participants found the program very easy to understand, giving it a rating of 8.25 on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is the worst and 10 is the best. This was the individual feature of the program which participants rated the highest, a gratifying result, because one of our central aims was to make the job retention material understandable to the targeted at-risk youth. The next three highest rated items were how useful they thought the program would be to others, how much they liked the animated story, and how much they liked the story characters (with scores of 7.95, 7.48, and 7.30, respectively, on the same 10-point scale). We were very pleased with these results. Participants gave their lowest rating to how much they liked Dale Funk, which came as something of a surprise to us. When we looked more closely at the data, we saw that participants were split in their reactions to Dale Funk with some liking him very much and some disliking him just as much. We will give this issue further thought as we move into Phase II development.

Finally, on the overall measure of satisfaction, study participants gave the program a rating of 7.45 (on the 10-point scale), and they made a number of positive comments about the program in the open-ended item at the end of the user satisfaction questionnaire. Our favorite was the following: *A Good Job on it and THANK YOU VERY MUCH.*

*Discussion.* From the standpoint of product development, we succeeded in producing an effective first module of a DVD-based training program on job retention skills designed especially for at-risk youth. For the evaluation study, we took a risk in using an open-ended measure of social skills, considering that the Job Corps sample was composed of youth with relatively low literacy skills. However, we wanted to get beyond the simple multiple choice and true-false knowledge measures that we have typically used. We found that the Job Corps youth were, in fact, able to read and write intelligible responses to the 12 job scenarios presented. Using this measure, we obtained significant results. Although still short of being a measure of actual behavior, the modified version of the SSSK that we used is more relevant than a strictly knowledge-based measure and an important step toward measuring teens’ application of social skills in the workplace. Through the participants’ responses to the open-ended items of the SSSK, it became apparent that the curriculum’s story and practice sessions were effective in teaching the intended lessons about some social skills essential for job retention.

The study’s findings are especially impressive in light of the facts that participants had already been in the Job Corps for an average of almost 52 months and that nearly 80% of them had received other job retention training through the Job Corps prior to
enrolling in our study. We almost expected to find ceiling effects on the SSSK. Instead, we found that exposure to the relatively brief *Take This Job* program had a significant effect on participants’ ability to respond appropriately to the measure’s 12 workplace scenarios.

Two limitations of the study should be noted. First, the component developed in Phase I is only one portion of the overall job retention skills program proposed. Following the completion of Phase II development, youth will use the entire program to help them learn the whole cluster of social skills necessary for job retention.

Another limitation of the study, as noted above, is the fact that most of the trainees in our sample (nearly 80%) had already been through at least some job retention training while in the Job Corps prior to participating in our study. This did not make *Take This Job and Keep It* a superfluous intervention, because job-related skills training for these youth is still very much a work in progress. But it did perhaps limit the variability in the data and lower the measured effectiveness of the program. Our evaluation strategy in Phase II, therefore, will be modified to conduct the evaluation study with Job Corps trainees immediately after their arrival at the center, before they have had the opportunity to receive other job retention training through the Job Corps.
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TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Wait-List Control Condition</th>
<th>Take This Job Intervention Condition</th>
<th>Total Sample</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>31.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pac Islander</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In high school/Taking GED</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed HS/GED</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where spent most of upbringing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area or town</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a paid employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years or more</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had any training on job retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while in Job Corps?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Group and total percentages are based on the valid number of cases for each variable. No significant difference was found between the two groups on any of these variables.
Table 2
Sample Demographics - Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Wait-List Control Condition</th>
<th>Take This Job Intervention Condition</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>19.83 2.70</td>
<td>19.74 1.83</td>
<td>19.79 2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months in Job Corps</td>
<td>5.83 5.71</td>
<td>4.88 4.33</td>
<td>5.36 5.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Group and total means are based on the valid number of cases for each variable. No significant difference was found between the two groups on either of these variables.
Table 3
*Descriptive Statistics for Measures at Posttest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Wait-List Control Condition</th>
<th>Take This Job Intervention Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSK a,b,c</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall User Satisfactory Rating (on a 10-point scale, where 1 is the worst and 10 is the best)</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participants in the wait-list condition did not complete the user satisfaction measure.

aDescriptive statistics for the SSSK are reported as the average rating, on a scale from 0 to 4, of the 12 items in the total scale. Higher scores reflect improved job-related social skills.

bSignificant differences (p < .05) were found between the *Take This Job* intervention group and the wait-list control group.

cEstimated marginal means and standard errors are reported, as group differences for the SSSK were evaluated at covariates appearing in the model.
Table 4  
*ANCOVA Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.39*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.30*</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.98*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>&lt;.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>&lt;.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Model 2, equal slopes ANCOVA, was used for all analyses. Values enclosed in parentheses represent mean square error.

* $p < .05.$
Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Individual Items and Overall User Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On a scale of 1 (the worst) to 10 (the best), How entertaining was the program?</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How cool was it?</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How easy to understand was it?</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful was it for you?</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How useful would it be to others?</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you like the animated story?</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you like the story characters?</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you like Dale Funk?</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you like the class activities?</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate the program, on a scale of 1 (the worst) to 10 (the best)?</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

MEASURES