

OP250 Analysis Report

Elena Savoia

Knowledge Outcomes

Impact of the intervention on Question 42 and 43 (for each question)

Q42 Please rate how much knowledge you believe you have about the following issues: *For each statement, indicate how much knowledge you believe you have about it is by CIRCLING the appropriate answer.*

Circle only one answer in each row

a. In-Groups vs. Out-Groups bias = OP250_in_out_bias_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
b. The meaning of hate = OP250_meaning_of_hate_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
c. How to recognize expressions of hate = OP250_recognize_hate_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
d. The difference between hate historically and hate today = OP250_hate_hist_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
e. How hate can affect us = OP250_hate_affect_us_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
f. How hate becomes popular thinking = OP250_hate_popular_think_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
g. Proper ways of approaching hate = OP250_ways_approach_hate_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4

RESPOND TO ALL QUESTIONS

Q43 Please rate how much knowledge you believe you have about the following issues: *For each statement, indicate how much knowledge you believe you have about it is by CIRCLING the appropriate answer.*

Circle only one answer in each row

RESPOND TO ALL QUESTIONS

a. What might be considered a “risky” decision online = OP250_risky_decision_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
b. Online places where you can be unsafe = OP250_online_unsafe_place_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
c. Online places where you can find unsafe people = OP250_online_unsafe_person_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
d. Ways an unsafe person can talk to you online = OP250_ways_unsafe_person_talk_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
e. Proper ways to react to someone or something unsafe online = OP250_react_unsafe_online_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4
f. Why we may act differently online compared to offline = OP250_act_differently_online_pre	No knowledge at all = 1	A little knowledge = 2	Some knowledge = 3	A lot of knowledge = 4

For the individual questions I fit ordinal regression models to the repeated measures post-intervention (post1, post2) with a random effect for student and fixed effects for intervention group, visit, baseline scale score, school year, gender, white, grades/score and study indicator (School B vs School F). The significance test for intervention group for each endpoint is given in the table below. Only for OP250_1 (a. In-Groups vs. Out-Groups bias) is there a significant intervention group effect. For this endpoint, the active intervention group had 9.6 times higher odds of being in a higher response (more knowledgeable) category than the controls.

Mixed model for ordinal regression	
Dependent variable	Intervention grp p-value
Question 12	0.5226
OP250_1	<0.0001
OP250_2	0.8330
OP250_3	0.6890
OP250_4	0.3666
OP250_5	0.8238
OP250_6	0.8802
OP250_7	0.4927
OP250_8	0.4058
OP250_9	0.6152
OP250_10	0.6968
OP250_11	0.5606
OP250_12	0.7079
OP250_13	0.5232

Risk Perception Outcomes

Impact of the intervention on Question 29 (for each question) – “risk perception” questions

How risky do you think it is for the PERSONAL SAFETY of someone your age to engage in the following online behaviors? For each statement, indicate how risky you think it is by **CIRCLING** the appropriate answer.

Circle only one answer in each row

a. To chat online with a stranger	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk
b. To follow a thread of sexual images/videos	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk
c. To follow a thread of images/ videos of violence	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk
d. To chat online with someone who expresses feelings against people because of their race, ethnicity or beliefs	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk
e. To chat online with someone who is involved in criminal activity	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk
f. To chat online with someone your age who says they have a weapon	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk
g. To chat online with someone who sells drugs or alcohol	No Risk	Low Risk	I am not sure	Some Risk	High Risk

For the individual questions I fit ordinal regression models to the repeated measures post-intervention (post1, post2) with a random effect for student and fixed effects for intervention group, visit, baseline scale score, school year, gender, white, grades/score and study indicator (School B vs School F). The significance test for intervention group for each endpoint is given in the table below. For none of the items was intervention group a significant predictor.

Mixed model for ordinal regression	
Dependent variable	Intervention grp p-value
Risk1	0.7878
Risk2	0.1765
Risk3	0.2256
Risk4	0.7892
Risk5	0.1077
Risk6	0.2189
Risk7	0.1805

A factor analysis of the seven items found a single factor was retained whether using the pre, post1 or post2 data. Internal consistency for the seven items was also high at baseline (Cronbach alpha=0.8473), post 1 month (0.8618) and post 2 months (0.8917). The seven items were summed to create a risk scale

RESPOND TO ALL QUESTIONS

with a range from 7 to 35. Changes in the scale from baseline to post-intervention (post1 and post2) were modeled using a linear mixed model with student as the random effect and fixed effects for intervention group, visit, baseline scale score, school year, gender, white, grades/score and study indicator (School B vs School F). Both intervention groups exhibited a decline in the scale post-intervention with controls having a LSM change of -1.347 (SE=0.3838, $p=0.0006$) and the active intervention having a LSM change of -0.3116 (SE=0.3949, $p=0.4316$). The difference between treatment groups was marginally significant with LSM difference of -1.0354 (SE=0.5293, $p=0.0528$). The difference between genders was significant with LSM difference of -1.7268 (SE=0.5577, $p=0.0024$) with males tending to decline (LSM change = -1.6927, SE=0.4491, $p=0.0003$) while females did not change (LSM change = 0.0341, SE=0.3421, $p=0.9207$).