2020-06-22

A Test of the WhyTry Program on Youth Resilience

Travis Guy Price
Brigham Young University

A Test of the WhyTry Program on Youth Resilience in a Public School Setting

Travis Guy Price

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Lane Fischer, Chair
Cade T. Charlton
Christian V. Sabey

Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

A Test of the WhyTry Program on Youth Resilience
in a Public School Setting

Travis Guy Price
Department of Counseling Psychology and Special Education, BYU
Master of Science

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of the WhyTry program in enhancing adolescent resilience. Ninety-four adolescents in grades seven–nine had been screened for Tier two intervention at the local junior high. The school assigned these students to either a WhyTry treatment group or an alternative treatment group. The students were all from economically disadvantaged situations and were predominantly Hispanic. The treatment group participated in the WhyTry program, led by a trained facilitator at the school. Students in the treatment and comparison groups completed a pre-test and post-test using the Social Emotional Assets and Resilience Scales (SEARS).

Split plot *ANOVA* were used to test differential change over time according to group membership, the main effect for time, and the main effect for group. Results indicated that there was no significant interaction term, main effect for time, or main effect for group. Based on these findings it appeared that the WhyTry program as administered by the school personnel was not effective in promoting differential change in resilience over time as measured by the SEARS test. Ideas for future research may include a greater focus on internal validity, as well as a larger variety of locations for the control and treatment groups.

Keywords: WhyTry, resilience training for youth, SEARS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their help and guidance in asking probing questions and challenging me to explore this topic in depth. I especially want to thank Lane Fischer for his patience and hard work in guiding me through the process. I also want to thank Kiri Price-Reeves for her help in reviewing and editing my writing. Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Shaylee, and my three children, for giving up family time in order for me to perform this research and earn a master's degree. Thank you for all your support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Study

In *The Resilience Breakthrough*, Moore et al. (2014) reportedly asked a group of youth inmates, "Anybody here ever messed up? Anybody here have any great pain in their life?" After every boy raised their hands he told them "you've got the fuel! You've got the fuel already in you! You have got to use that fuel to become greater… If you use the fuel you have the advantage over somebody at Harvard… There are people running multimillion-dollar corporations or have PhD's that don't get this. If you understand how to flip the switch, you will have the advantage (p. 29)." This concept of "flipping the switch" or changing one's mindset to use setbacks as fuel to go forward is one of many tools that Moore et al. proposed increase a person's resilience.

Moore et al. (2014) proposed resilience as the most important factor for those who struggle with life's great challenges. If a young person can increase in resilience, they can use that tool to overcome just about anything. From a young person trapped in juvenile detention, to a teenager who is struggling with a learning disability or behavioral problems, the key is to increase their resilience. Resilience is defined by Masten et al. (1990) as the "capacity, process or outcomes of successful adaptation in the context of significant threats to function or development (p. 426)." Rutter (2012) defined resilience as "reduced vulnerability to environmental risk experiences, the overcoming of a stress or adversity, or a relatively good outcome despite risk experiences (p. 336)." Moore et al. defined resilience as:

> the ability to bounce back when you have every reason to shut down--but you fight on. Resilient people have both tapped and untapped reserves enabling them to overcome and thrive as they face the setbacks, challenges, and fears of daily life. (2014, p. 11)

The WhyTry organization, based upon Moore et al.'s ideas, has developed a program aimed to help young people to see their world differently through a series of scripted lessons. Purportedly, by changing their perceptions, a student can increase resilience and be able to grow stronger in every aspect of their life. The WhyTry program is delivered in a variety of applications, but most commonly as a tiered intervention for small group settings, taught by teachers who have been trained by the WhyTry staff to provide a crafted learning experience for young people.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study was to estimate the effectiveness of the WhyTry program in enhancing the resilience of a sample of adolescents that had been screened for Tier two intervention.

Research Question

This research study aimed to answer three major questions; (1) Is there differential change over time between a WhyTry group and an alternative treatment comparison group in terms of resilience as measured by the SEARS? (2) Do students change over time in terms of resilience regardless of the treatment they receive? (3) Are there any detectable differences between the groups assigned to WhyTry vs. an alternative treatment?

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

The success of students enrolled in the public education system in the United States has long been a concern among parents, teachers and even politicians. This concern has led to different national policies such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, 1965), which was part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society program and The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002) signed into law by President George W. Bush. Later, in response to perceived shortcomings of the NCLB, President Barak Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015). Though each law had a different focus and approach, they all recognized the statistical reality of an achievement gap between the highest and lowest performing students in public school systems, and made attempts to address the issues.

However, these students were not just in danger of poor grade performance. It is not uncommon for students with behavioral and academic difficulties to also be experiencing chronic absenteeism and problems in their family or community environment (McCall, 2003).

These governmental policies mandated a need to help close the achievement gap and increase student success across the board. They also required schools to demonstrate success or be subject to negative consequences. Barlow et al. (2018) stated "the new law (ESSA) includes a number of specific provisions to help ensure success for all students and schools. The law allows districts discretion for developing, implementing, and evaluating effective school and schooling processes" (p. 1). A few of those specific provisions outlined by Barlow et al. (2018) are as follows: (a) Provide: "for a multi-tier system of supports for literacy services." As well as for specific groups of students such as at at-risk, disengaged, unmotivated, unresponsive, underperforming, or consistently unsuccessful students." (b) Provide: "a comprehensive

continuum of evidence-based, systemic practices to support a rapid response to students' needs, with regular observation to facilitate data-based instructional decision-making." (c) Institute: "Positive behavioral support systems." (d) Provide: "Services, programs, strategies, and interventions to ensure that students with disabilities, with developmental delays, who are English learners, and who are struggling with literacy can meet the challenging State academic standards" (p. 1).

Based upon these requirements of the ESSA each district in the United States is responsible to establish their own Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for students designed to improve academic and behavioral outcomes for students. Due to the freedom granted each district to develop and implement MTSS, these systems may look different district to district. Some commonalities exist, however. MTSS is a framework for identifying students who need support, making data-driven decisions, implementing research-based interventions aligned to needs, monitoring student progress, and involving stakeholders (Ehlers, 2018). MTSS is widely considered an umbrella to encompass "whole child" data (academic achievement, attendance, social behavior, emotional status) and organize interventions. Thus, MTSS combines the previously separate Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and Response to Intervention (RTI) frameworks (Ehlers, 2018). These different terms can be confusing because they are often used interchangeably. Although there is overlap there is also important differences.

School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SW-PBIS)

According to Ehlers (2018) "PBIS was first called for in the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). PBIS is initially a response to the exclusion of students with disabilities from educational opportunities due to behavior issues and disorders.

PBIS has since shifted to a "school-wide" system that applies to all students—not only students with disabilities. The 1997 reauthorization also provisioned for the creation of a national center on PBIS to develop models and provide information, training, and support around PBIS to districts. This national center continues to be a resource to professional educators to implement the ideas of PBIS in their district or individual school. Ehlers (2018) described PBIS as a framework that calls for actively teaching positive behaviors and implementing evidence-based preventative/responsive interventions to support student academic achievement and well-being. The primary focus is behaviorally based. Students are clearly taught social and behavioral expectations. These key behavioral expectations (e.g., self-respect, respect for others, hard work, honesty) are outlined and demonstrated both in a classroom environment and outside of the classroom environment as well. Teachers take time to teach, model and practice these behaviors as well. A key component to the PBIS model is to then identify student success and praise positive actions in an effort to reward positive behavior. PBIS models must be driven by data, progress monitoring, and tiered evidence-based interventions when problem behaviors occur (Ehlers, 2018).

PBIS tiers are outlined by Ehlers (2018) as follows:

Tier 1–Universal Supports/Practices: The positive behavior instruction, best practices, and positive school climate provided to all students. This tier is focused on preventing the development of new problem behaviors.

Tier two—Targeted Supports: The supports provided to students who are either not responding to Tier one supports and/or are at risk for serious problem behaviors. Students needing Tier two supports are identified based on data (e.g., number of problem behaviors). Tier two interventions are typically small-group interventions.

Tier 3—Intensive Supports: The supports provided to the small percentage of students with serious problem behaviors who do not respond to Tier two interventions. These supports are more individualized, targeted, and intense/focused.

Response to Intervention

Response to Intervention (RTI) was introduced in 2004 in connection with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The IDEA identified an increasing number of students with Learning Disabilities (LD) that were considered to be preventable if targeted (Ehlers, 2018). Prior to the 2004 IDEA, a student had to wait to fail and be identified as LD in order to qualify for intervention but the change allowed for students to receive targeted support before failure. The law intended that students simply in need of instructional support could be kept in general education and not automatically referred into special education (Ehlers, 2018).

Broadly speaking, RTI is a prevention model of multitiered instruction with a minimum of three tiers (Bradley et al., 2007). In the RTI model teachers evaluate the success of students' academic performances through progress monitoring (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). If a student is identified as needing additional support, they then receive research-based interventions according to their needs. Most RTI models include some common attributes: universal screening assessments to proactively check for struggling students; data-driven, early identification of students needing support; implementing research-based interventions that align to student needs and are tiered in intensity and/or frequency; monitoring student progress to assess intervention effectiveness; tracking the "fidelity" with which an intervention is implemented; and involving parents and other stakeholders (Ehlers, 2018). Again, due to the freedom given with the IDEA to expect each district to establish their own practice, RTI looks different across states, districts, and even schools. However, two common approaches have emerged since its inception (Preston

& Stecker, 2016) and most programs fit within one of these two approaches. These approaches were delineated by Batsche et al. (2005) and Fuchs and Fuchs (2006). Further clarification was added by Fuchs et al. (2010).

The first is the Problem-Solving Model (PSM) which uses an individualized approach that focuses mainly on tailoring instruction to fit the needs of an individual student. This approach focuses on early intervening services but attempts to unify general and special education (Preston & Stecker, 2016). This approach operates according to the notion that, if the "right" general education is provided, students will not need special education (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). If a student is not displaying adequate growth at Tier one then the teacher meets with the school team to plan out Tier two more intensive support for the student following the problem-solving model. If student continues to struggle based on progress monitoring then the teacher meets with a more specialized team which may include school psychologists and special educators, to explore Tier three options. All tiers of support are determined by individualized need and progress monitoring following the problem-solving model.

The second approach is the Standard Treatment Protocol (STP) model. STP focuses on a standard plan in place. Certain benchmarks are laid out and universal screenings are used to determine which students need more help. If a student is identified to need help at Tier one they are provided a more intensive evidence based-instruction and monitored for approximately five-eight weeks (Preston & Stecker, 2016). If a student is considered "non-responsive" to that support then they are moved to Tier two (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). Interventions at Tier two are administered in small group sessions for a minimum of 30 minutes a week for 8–10 weeks (Fuchs et al., 2010). Instruction is often from a scripted program and designed to be time sensitive meaning the goal is to get students back to Tier one or mainstream learning and not

keep them in more intensive support for long periods of time (Preston & Stecker, 2016). If a student continues to be "non-responsive" to Tier two supports they are considered for Tier three or special education services as the STP model defines it (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006; Fuchs et al., 2010).

Many research studies have been performed to examine the effectiveness of the components of RTI but few studies have looked at the effectiveness of the whole RTI model. One such study by Burns, Appleton, and Stehouwer (2005) evaluated the RTI research using meta-analysis. They identified 21 articles. Results indicated that schools implementing RTI showed improvement in unbiased estimates of effect of student achievement (UEE = 1.54) and systematic outcomes (UEE = 1.02). Furthermore, a strong effect size (ES > .80) was found for all mean and median effect sizes. In general, results suggested that RTI had a robust effect on improved student achievement and systematic outcomes.

Integrated Academic and Behavior Support in MTSS

The acronym MTSS was first introduced when the Elementary and Secondary Education/Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA/ESSA), signed into law in December 2015, and called for a "for a multi-tier system of supports for literacy services" (Ehlers, 2018). MTSS is a framework for identifying students who need support, making data-driven decisions, implementing research-based interventions aligned to needs, monitoring student progress, and involving stakeholders (Ehlers, 2018). Many aspects of MTSS overlap with RTI and PBIS which sometimes makes it seem like the same thing. MTSS is widely considered an umbrella framework to encompass "whole child" data (achievement and growth as well as attendance, behavior, and social emotion), essentially combining the previously separate PBIS and RTI processes (Ehlers, 2018). By 2015, many districts had already included behavior data in their

RTI processes, making MTSS simply an updated term for some. Depending on the district and state, MTSS may vary from RTI in other ways. A few examples: (a) MTSS is applied to all students and not just struggling students. For example, MTSS calls for us to continue challenging high-achieving students. (b) MTSS often includes language about collaborative, concurrent, and/or communicative supports. Here, there is an expectation that we are effectively working and communicating with all stakeholders to provide a unified support system (e.g., ensuring that our interventions aren't at odds with other interventions). (c) Some states and districts specify MTSS as a means to equity (Ehlers, 2018).

Overall all three models have helped to change the focus of schools to see the whole student and seek to provide services proactively or before students fail. Lane (2013) stated:

> Schools are undergoing a profound shift in the way that they address students' academic and behavioral difficulties. Rather than viewing student performance as the province of individual teachers, students, and parents, there is now a focus on using a systems approach to promote student success. (p. 100).

Student Resilience

Moore et al. (2014) identified from his own personal experiences and struggles what he felt was an underlying attribute for success in any of these tiers of support. He felt students could never succeed in education or in life if they did not possess and increase resilience. As Moore et al. defined it, "Resilience is the ability to bounce back when you have every reason to shut down--but you fight on" (p. 13). Resilience is the process of using adversity as fuel for success. Moore et al. explained that "Resilient people have both tapped and untapped reserves, enabling them to overcome and thrive as they face the setbacks, challenges, and fears of daily life." (p. 13) Moore et al. described his belief that a focus on developing underlying tools for success, rather

than just teaching concepts, can help a student find universal success in everything from academic to behavior to social to emotional wellness.

Developing Resilience in School-Based Programs

Moore et al.'s (2014) WhyTry organizations' website claims that "Students who score higher on resilience measures have improved social skills, higher grades, a greater love of learning, and better decision-making skills." The design of the WhyTry program is to be an evidence-based practice to help teach social skills to students that will improve both academic and behavioral outcomes and fit within any of the above-mentioned models. The WhyTry program is designed to be flexible in order to be a helpful resource at any tier of support. At Tier one the visual analogies can be used school wide in an effort to help students understand social expectations and norms in line with PBIS. At Tier two the WhyTry program can be taught in group sessions as a way to help students increase their learning and return to Tier one either academically or behaviorally. The WhyTry program was originally designed to be a one on one intervention so it is also recommended to be used at a Tier three level.

Empirical Support for WhyTry

Bushnell and Card (2003) did a longitudinal study focusing on 192 high school students grades 9–12. One hundred fourteen of those students participated in the WhyTry program and 88 students were used as a control group. Students who completed the WhyTry program showed an improved grade point average, fewer absences and an increased percentage of graduation over the students in the control group. Gee (2003) found statistically significant differences between students who participated in the WhyTry program and the control group in areas of motivation, peer pressure, and obeying rules. Eggett (2003) saw statistically significant results for a treatment group of 40 students in grades 9–12 in the areas of decreased school absences,

improved locus of control, and improved attitude toward school and teachers. Studies were also performed on learners of younger ages participating in the WhyTry. Acuna et al. (2008) reported a significant difference in pre- and posttest results for 30 elementary school students in south Los Angeles in the areas of increased motivation to succeed, and a decrease in negative behavior targeted toward peers. These studies seem to demonstrate that a measurable change is happening in students that participate in the WhyTry program. Though none of these studies focus specifically on measuring growth of resilience as described by Moore et al. (2014), they do demonstrate changes in attributes that seem to be linked to or associated with resilience.

Moore et al. (2014) is not the only one who is looking into a deeper approach to learning methods and the motivation behind them. Duckworth (2018) made a similar claim in her book, *Grit: The Power and Passion of Perseverance.* In her experience as a teacher she noted that the universal attribute among her students who became successful was not just IQ ratings, or even the ability to learn quickly and easily. In Duckworth's research she found that the most successful learners (as well as business leaders, military cadets, and more) were those who had a high level of grit, or the strength of character that allows a person to move forward when faced with unpleasant or painful circumstances (Duckworth, 2016). Duckworth (2016) also observed that in her teaching experience she found that every one of her students could learn the material if they worked hard and long enough. Students could succeed if given the right set of intellectual tools. One study focused on testing the importance of grit in both Ivy League undergraduates and cadets at the United States Military Academy at West Point. In that study, Duckworth et al. (2007) found that "Grit nonetheless demonstrated incremental predictive validity of success measures over and beyond IQ and conscientiousness. Collectively these findings suggest that the achievement of difficult goals entails not only talent but also the sustained focused application of

talent over time" (p.1090). One struggle Duckworth (2018) noted in her research is that despite the identified value of grit, when she was asked how to instill this trait in students or help students to increase it she responds "I don't know."

The question arises, can we train a student to increase resilience? Or is this something you are either born with or not? Moore et al. (2014) claims that although he believed a certain portion of resilience is an inherited trait, he also believed it could be taught and increased through focused learning, which is what led to the development of the WhyTry curriculum.

Yeager and Dweck (2012) supported the idea that resilience is a tool that can be developed. In a review of research titled "Mindsets That Promote Resilience," Yeager and Dweck (2012) said that "Resilience is essential for success in school, and in life. Students who believe (or are taught) that intellectual abilities are qualities that can be developed (as opposed to qualities that are fixed) tend to show higher achievement across challenging school transitions and greater course completion rates" (abstract). Yeager and Dweck further stated, "New research also shows that believing (or being taught) that social attributes can be developed can lower adolescents' aggression and stress in response to peer victimization or exclusion, and result in enhanced school performance" (p. 302).

Looking at resilience from the perspective of a behaviorist, Pasqualotto et al. (2015) stated that "According to the behavioral approach, whenever a person is exposed to aversive situations and finds strategies to remove them, avoidance skills are developed in order to find sources of reinforcement even during adversity" (p. 1848). Pasqualotto et al. went on to explain that if a student can increase the number of behavioral tools available to respond to their environment, then the student would be more resilient in the face of adversity.

Blackwell et al. (2007), in a longitudinal study exploring the role of implicit theories of intelligence in adolescent achievement demonstrated that a belief that intelligence is malleable (incremental theory) predicted an upward trajectory in performance measures for students over two years. Yeager and Dweck (2012) theorized from that longitudinal study that resilience, like intelligence can be malleable based upon a change in mindset. Yeager and Dweck suggested that not only can resilience be taught by changing a student's mindset but doing so will make a major impact on a student's academic success, quality of life, and ability to make a positive social impact on the community. With that in mind they concluded:

> Thus, a central task for parents and educators is to prepare students to respond resiliently. . . . This is why we need scientifically tested methods to tell us how to truly promote resilience. We have found that what students need the most is not self-esteem boosting or trait labeling; instead, they need mindsets that represent challenges as things that they can take on and overcome over time with effort, new strategies, learning, help from others, and patience. When we emphasize people's potential to change, we prepare our students to face life's challenges resiliently. (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 312)

It is suggested that the probability of success is enhanced if students can increase their ability to be resilient in the face of adversity. In the RTI model discussed above, there is great stress put on the importance of using evidence-based practices as a way of ensuring that our limited time with students, as well as the limited tax dollars that fund these interventions, are being used in a manner that will actually be effective for young people and bring about change. Movement does not always mean progress, so we must be careful to ensure that interventions actually provide impactful student development.

What options do we have to increase a student's resilience? In response to a collection of school-based tragedies including the Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting in 2012 and the Parkland Florida shootings in 2018, and in response to the increasing episodes of bullying and teen suicide in general, The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments (NCSSLE, 2017) began to establish a collection of evidence-based approaches to increase resilience in students as they face the ever growing challenges of today. NCSSLE cited five different programs that have been shown to increase student resilience.

Four of the approaches seem to take a "wait to fail" model, in which a student has to demonstrate failure or falls short in order to generate a response. But, one of the approaches endorsed by the NCSSLE was *The American Psychological Association Resilience Guide for Parents and Teachers*, which seems to feature a more proactive approach. In a collective effort to address growing concerns, Alvord et al. (2012) offered 10 tips for building resilience in children and teens:

- Make connections: Connecting with people (or a higher power) provides social support and strengthens resilience.
- Help your child by having him or her help others: Children who may feel helpless can be empowered by helping others.
- Maintain a daily routine: Sticking to a routine can be comforting to children, especially younger children who crave structure in their lives.
- Take a break: While it is important to stick to routines, endlessly worrying can be counter-productive.
- Teach your child self-care: Make yourself a good example, and teach your child the importance of making time to eat properly, exercise and rest. Make sure your child

has time to have fun, and make sure that your child hasn't scheduled every moment of his or her life with no “down time” to relax. Caring for oneself and even having fun will help your child stay balanced and better deal with stressful times.

- Move toward your goals: Teach your child to set reasonable goals and then to move toward them one step at a time. Moving toward that goal—even if it's a tiny step—and receiving praise for doing so will focus your child on what he or she has accomplished rather than on what hasn't been accomplished, and can help build the resilience to move forward in the face of challenges.
- Nurture a positive self-view: Help your child remember ways that he or she has successfully handled hardships in the past and then help him understand that these past challenges help him build the strength to handle future challenges.
- Keep things in perspective and maintain a hopeful outlook: Even when your child is facing very painful events, help him look at the situation in a broader context and keep a long-term perspective.
- Look for opportunities for self-discovery: Tough times are often the times when children learn the most about themselves. Help your child take a look at how whatever he is facing can teach him “what he is made of.”
- Accept that change is part of living: Change often can be scary for children and teens. Help your child see that change is part of life and new goals can replace goals that have become unattainable.

The tips found in this article are primarily focused on a parent-child relationship, but the authors do provide some wording about adaptation for a public-school setting. However, they offer no

concrete pattern for increasing resilience that would take the form of a formal curriculum or teaching experience.

WhyTry Program

The WhyTry program seems to be unique in nature as it targets a focus group with specific lessons designed to increase resilience. The program uses ten visual analogies designed to teach concepts and skills that increase resilience and help students find an answer to the question, "Why should I try?" These analogies include information about dealing with peer pressure, understanding that decisions have consequences, and the importance of plugging into support systems. The facilitators use a combination of music, hands-on activities and multimedia presentations in a multisensory approach that increases engagement in many different types of learners. An analogy is a method of presenting material in a manner that facilitates later retrieval of the concept and application in everyday life (Hutchinson & Padgett, 2007). One example of these analogies was described by Alverez and Andersen-Ketchmark (2009):

> Climbing Out, is an analogy of crabs trying to climb out of a pot. As the water in the pot heats up, the crabs fight to get out when, in reality, they are pulling each other down. The analogy also highlights how peers can try to prevent the student from changing. The accompanying activities include journaling the distinction between friends who are supportive and those who are not; an art activity focusing on how to help others; a "plug-in" activity that prompts students to identify friends who have been supportive in the past; and creation of a "game plan" to move forward in dealing with issues. (p. 59).

The information is designed to sink deep, stick with the student, and increase the probability that a student will apply what they are learning for long-lasting results by using multiple sensory inputs. Hutchison and Padgett (2007) stated that "Effective teaching is the art of

getting information to students' memory in an organized manner to facilitate later retrieval." (p.70) The WhyTry program is built upon the pattern of using these multisensory input analogies with high visuals to organize information for easy recall for participating students.

In review of the WhyTry program, Alverez and Anderson-Ketchmark (2009) said the following:

> The WhyTry program is a multi-sensory social skills program developed by a school social worker in response to a lack of curriculums that specifically address student motivation and maladaptive patterns of dealing with failure. The curriculum outcomes emphasize that as students complete each lesson, they gain more opportunity, freedom, and respect."

Alverez and Anderson-Ketchmark (2009) deemed the WhyTry program a "cost-effective program with a developing research base that can be used at tiers one through three in the Response to Intervention (RTI) process" (p. 60). The WhyTry programs unique approach is based upon their effort to help a student identify how they respond to failure, and then to identify personal strengths learned through the visual analogies that could be used to overcome or push through those failures.

Multi-sensory approaches have been used in education for several years. The use of multi-sensory approaches with children who experience special needs is now well established (Pagliano, 2001). Chilvers and Cole (2006) said "There has also been a significant focus upon therapeutic environments, which provide opportunities which provide opportunities for children experiencing emotional and behavioral difficulties or mental health issues to have opportunities to explore aspects of their own emotional state. Multi-sensory approaches have been shown in these articles to be an approach that could open students up and help them retain information.

Analogies can be an effective teaching tool as well." (p. 31) Hutchison and Padgett (2007) suggested the following:

> There are two main ways teachers can use analogies during instruction. First, ask students to create their own analogies, explain concepts, and share in groups or with the whole class. On the other hand, instructors can design the analogies for teaching tougher concepts. Either way it is vital to make connections of the landmark or target at hand with story ideas and make sure students understand their one-to-one connections. (p. 71)

WhyTry is designed to both invite students to make their own connections and participate in the analogies designed by the WhyTry organization to help explain the more difficult concepts to understand and remember. Hutchison and Padgett also cautioned that

> an analogy or narrative is only as powerful as its creator is capable of making it clearly capture the facts. Analogies have the potential for creating as many misconceptions as the can facilitate understanding. For this reason, they should be used only when the instructor is confident that, as instructional tools, they can facilitate rather than impede student understanding." (p. 71)

The question does not seem to be whether or not analogies and multi-sensory approaches can be beneficial for students, rather if these core tools of the WhyTry program are being used in a manner that is effective for participants in the program.

On paper, the design of the program seems to incorporate each of the ten tips provided by Alvord et al. (2012). It also seems to address the concerns of Duckworth (2018) in establishing a formal program to train and increase individual perseverance, while using proven tools and patterns such as multisensory approaches and analogies. What remains unclear is whether the WhyTry program is effective.

The WhyTry organization provides a research summary document of studies which looked at the implementation outcomes of the program across multiple locations and populations. The 12 studies referenced in the summary document seem to focus primarily on two different categories of outcome measures: behavior, and academics. The studies that showed primarily behavior outcomes generally used a measure of decreasing office referrals, suspension, and fighting at school. Brett (2016) measured a 58.4% decrease in office referrals, 31% decrease in school suspensions, and a decrease of 57% in reported fights in Peoria High School grades 9–12. Wicomico County School District saw discipline referrals decrease over 21% after using the WhyTry program for 5 months. ("WhyTry Program Results Wicomico County School District," 2012). Acuna et al. (2008) reported an increase in elementary school student's behavior in grades 1–3. In one year, they saw a significant increase in the areas of following directions, respecting authority, cooperating well in groups, exercising self-control, resolving interpersonal conflicts, and appropriately interacting socially with peers. Mortenson and Rush (2007) saw a decrease in the Behavioral Assessment System for Children (BASC) scores. Students' scores shifted to an average T-score of 50–59 which moved them out of the "At-Risk" and "Clinically Significant" categories.

The studies which focused more on academic performance evaluated the effects of the WhyTry program on grade point Average (GPA) from semester report cards. Williams (2009) compared a control group to an intervention group of students who participated in the WhyTry program in a regular education classroom for 38 minutes weekly over a period of 10 weeks. From semester one to semester two the control group (did not receive the WhyTry program) had 58% of students experienced a decrease in their GPA while 17% maintained their GPA and only 25% increased their GPA. In contrast, the intervention group (those who received the WhyTry

program) had 28% of students experienced a decrease in their GPA while 52% maintained their GPA and 20% increased their GPA. Wymore (2007) reported that the WhyTry program reduced failing grades in an afterschool tutoring program by 47%. These studies seemed to demonstrate academic outcomes of the WhyTry program.

Bird (2010) took a more unique approach in their study and assessed the social and emotional growth of students through surveying sixth grade classes where the WhyTry program had been taught as a Tier one support or to all students. Over 800 surveys were collected. Seventy-three percent of students reported a stronger belief that "their actions today will affect their future" (p. 11). Ninety percent of students reported a positive change in the degree of their willingness to keep trying. Ninety percent of students showed a stronger belief in a more positive future as compared to only 56% prior to the WhyTry intervention. This study both demonstrated a unique use of the WhyTry program as a Tier one intervention as well as a unique measure of the outcomes of the WhyTry program. These studies seem to demonstrate that the WhyTry program is very flexible. Seemingly, it can be used in a variety of settings, across a variety of ages and in all three tiers of intervention from general use, to small groups, to individuals. The studies also seem to indicate that the WhyTry program is demonstrating positive change on behavior outcomes, academic outcomes and even the perceptions of students of themselves in the world.

The WhyTry program was designed to address the academic and social emotional needs of at-risk youth. This program offers simple hands on curriculum which helps youth overcome their challenges and improve outcomes in the areas of behavior and academics (Mazzotta-Perretti, 2009). The WhyTry program teaches critical social and emotional principles to youth (K–12) using a series of 10 visual analogies reinforced by multi-sensory resources (Mazzotta-

Perretti, 2009). Moore (2014) proposed that the use of the WhyTry program will decrease attendance problems, lower negative attitude towards teachers and the school and increase locust of control indicating students become more responsible for their behavior.

To reiterate, the purpose of this study was to estimate the effectiveness of the WhyTry program to enhance the resilience of a sample of adolescents that had been screened for Tier two intervention. This research study aimed to answer three major questions: (a) Is there differential change over time between a WhyTry group and an alternative treatment comparison group in terms of resilience as measured by the SEARS, (b) Do students change overtime in terms of resilience regardless of the treatment they receive? (c) Are there any detectable differences between the groups assigned to WhyTry versus an alternative treatment?

CHAPTER 3

Method

Participants

Participant Demographics

Participants were selected from an overall population of male and female students in grades 7–9, ages 11 to 15. The school psychologist for Mound Fort jr high school reported that 100% of this population is economically challenged and 10% are homeless. Twenty percent of the population is comprised of English Language Learners, and 17% have a diagnosed disability. In terms of ethnic diversity, 55% of the students identify as Hispanic, 39% as Caucasian, 2% as Black or African American, and 2% as Multiracial. On average they perform low on standardized testing in all areas including English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science, where they are below 32% proficiency in all categories. The school reports a 52% consistent attendance rate (Utah State Board of Education, n.d.).

WhyTry Group Participants

The participants in the WhyTry group were males and females in grades seven–nine (ages 11–14). 94 total students were identified as needing Tier two intervention services based upon the school's own screening procedures, and 57 students were randomly selected to participate in the WhyTry group. More specific details about the participants are not available other than they represent the overall demographic of Mound Fort Junior High School.

Comparison Group Participants

The participants in the comparison group were males and females in grades seven–nine (ages 11–14). 94 total students were identified as needing Tier two intervention services based upon the schools own screening procedures, and 37 randomly selected to participate in the

comparison group. More specific details about the participants are not available other than they represent the overall demographic of Mound Fort Junior High School.

In both the comparison group as well as the WhyTry group we had to dismiss some assessments due to the absence of students at the time of pre-test or post-test. A total of 94 participants were involved in the study. There were 57 assigned to the WhyTry group and 37 assigned to the comparison group. Within the WhyTry group only 37 total scores could be used, while 20 participants scores were excused as they were missing either pre-test or post-test data. Among the comparison group of 37 students, 17 scores were not able to be counted due to missing data giving us 20 total scores to compare with the WhyTry group. In total, of the 94 participants who took the SEARS Short Form-A pre-test and post-test, 37 students' scores were dismissed due to missing information.

Procedures

Tier Two Screening Instrument and Process

Students needing additional support were identified using a survey administered two times throughout the year by faculty. Based upon the data collected, students are assessed to determine if there are deficits, and based on those determinations they are enrolled in social skills classes to ensure social-emotional learning is happening.

Participant Recruitment

All participants identified as needing Tier two intervention services were enrolled in social skills courses established by the school. The school randomly assigned half of those courses to the WhyTry curriculum. Half of the students were randomly assigned to an alternative treatment program. Students selected for the WhyTry course participated from September 2019 to January 2020. Students selected for the alternative treatment group also participated from

September 2019 to January 2020 but were taught by the assigned faculty member and did not follow a specific curriculum or program, but instead followed an ideographic pattern set up by the teacher selected from a wide variety of programs and options during the same amount of time. Each student was expected to fill out an assent form demonstrating their willingness to participate in the study. The student's legal guardian was also expected to fill out a consent form. These forms were provided in both English and Spanish (see Appendix).

WhyTry Courses

Mound Fort provides tiered services and support for students, including the WhyTry classes. They have been using the WhyTry curriculum for several years and employ teachers who have been trained by WhyTry staff to ensure the program is delivered to students accurately. This curriculum is delivered in a semester-long classroom experience from September to January, in small group settings.

The WhyTry courses met two–three times a week over the 5-month period. These courses were taught by school faculty members who had been certified by the WhyTry staff to facilitate the course. WhyTry provides its own Checklist for Fidelity, as well as a Facilitators' Competencies observation sheet to ensure consistency in the delivery of the curriculum. These fidelity measures are a recent addition and are still being evaluated for validity and reliability. Due to the WhyTry program having their own fidelity check we did not attempt to control the fidelity ourselves. We simply measured the outcome as the program was delivered at this specific school.

The WhyTry program consists of a series of ten visual metaphors that teach important life skills designed to help a student learn social and emotional tools in a way they can understand and remember. These tools help a student to answer the question of "why should I try?" These 10

visual metaphors are titled (a) Reality Ride, (b) Tearing Off Your Labels, (c) Defense Mechanism, (d) Motivational Formula, (e) Climbing Out, (f) Jumping Your Hurdles, (g) Desire, Time, and Effort, (h) Lift the Weight, (i) Get Plugged In, (j) You Can See Over the Wall.

The visual analogies are reinforced using multisensory supports such as music, learning activities, journaling and other multimedia presentations aimed to help students understand and remember the visual analogies. The WhyTry program is designed to increase resilience, mitigate academic challenges, improve behavior, and increase student motivation. WhyTry uses a three-part training cycle. Part 1: Facilitator Training: 2-day intensive training experience for teachers and counselors selected to teach the program at their local school which is taught by WhyTry employees. Facilitators are taught how to implement the program with fidelity and trained in the tools they need to make the program successful such as relationship building, and communication. Part 2: A full set of curricula is provided, including training resources for facilitators. Part 3: Journals for participants, music and artwork and visual aids and hands on kits for lessons are provided. This three-part training cycle provides a full line of tools to support the facilitator to implement the WhyTry program with fidelity.

The foundation of the program is built upon three pillars. The first is *Relationship*. WhyTry states that "The key to motivation and change does not lie in interventions alone, but in the relationship established with a student" (WhyTry, n.d., para. 1). The second pillar is *Relevance*. "Multisensory learning helps students grasp the purpose, meaning, and application of the things they are being taught" (WhyTry, n.d., para. 1). The third pillar is *Resilience*. "The first two pillars help students harness the third—resilience—and learn to see their challenges differently" (WhyTry, n.d., para. 1).

This program is designed to be flexible and can be used in a variety of settings in short-term or long-term situations. The WhyTry website reports that the program is currently being used in over 20,000 organizations across all 50 United States, as well as Canada, the UK and Australia. The overall focus is on giving the students every tool needed to increase resilience and find lasting effects in their lives. WhyTry purports to be based on empirical principles, including solution-focused brief therapy, social and emotional intelligence, and multisensory learning.

Instrumentation

The Social Emotional Assets and Resilience Scales (SEARS) assess positive social-emotional attributes of children and adolescents. For the purpose of this study we chose to use the Short Form-A. This assessment has been shown to be a significant measure of emotional and behavioral competencies, skills, and characteristics, demonstrating an internal consistency reliability measure of .82 and a correlation of the short form with the long form of .94 (Cohn et. al. 2009). As reported in the SEARS professional manual, the national normative raw score for a U.S. population by gender is; male 23, female 22. Reported by ethnicity it is Caucasian 24, African American 16, Hispanic 17, other 13 (Merrell, 2011, pp. 45–50, 107). This measurement tool focuses on four scales including self-regulation, social competence, empathy, and responsibility. The Short Form-A was chosen over the longer version of the form to make it easier on the participants as they took the same evaluation two different times for 30 minutes or more each time. The Short Form-A depends on student self-reporting rather than feedback from teachers or parents.

Comparison Group

Three classrooms full of students identified to need Tier two intervention (same as the treatment group) were randomly selected to be a comparison group. These classes lasted about 5

months from September to January and were held two–three times per week. All three classes were taught by the same teacher who provided social skills training. While no standard curriculum was taught, the teacher selected lessons from the Orange Duffle book by Sam Bracken, while also developing some curriculum himself.

Administration of Pretest

Participants in both the WhyTry treatment and other-treatment groups were given a pretest using the SEARS Short Form-A. This pretest was designed to be given before any portion of the WhyTry curriculum was taught. However, due to constraints on school staff, this pretest was not issued until two–three weeks into the course. Pretest data was collected and de-identified before being sent to the researcher to be scored and recorded. Each student was given a number to track results and connect the pretest and posttest data to observe outcome differences for each student individually.

Administration of Posttest

After completion of the 5-month course, all students in both the WhyTry treatment and other-treatment groups were then given the same SEARS Short Form-A by the faculty member in charge of teaching the course. Assessments were collected and de-identified using the same process mentioned above. These scores were then recorded in Excel spreadsheets and connected to previous scores to be analyzed. As scores were recorded it was noted that of the 94 students who participated, only 57 of them had both pre and post test data. This was attributed to students entering the course late or being absent on days when the SEARS Short Form-A was administered (as noted previously, the school struggles with pervasive absenteeism).

Data Analysis

Data collected was then analyzed using a split plot ANOVA which renders a coefficient that can be used to answer each of the three research questions. The interaction term answers the question of differential change over time according to treatment group. The main effect for time answers the question regarding overall change in resilience regardless of treatment group. The main effect for group answers the question regarding any differences between groups regardless of time. All methods were approved by both the Brigham Young University's Institutional Review Board as well as the Ogden School District.

CHAPTER 4

Results

As seen in Table 1, the mean pretest score for control group was 22.58 with a standard deviation of 4.9 and standard error of the mean of 1.02. Scores ranged from 12 to 29 with a range of 17. The mean posttest score for the control group was 21.3 with a standard deviation of 6.8 and standard error of the mean of 1.26. Scores ranged from six to 33, with a range of 27.

Table 1 shows that the mean pretest score for the WhyTry treatment group was 21.4 with a standard deviation of 6.1 and standard error of the mean of 0.69. Scores ranged from nine to 35 with a range of 26. The mean posttest score for the WhyTry treatment group was 22.3 with a standard deviation of 6.3 and standard error of the mean of 0.77. Scores ranged from 10 to 36 with a range of 26. Given the reported population average of 17 for Hispanic students in general, and given that the majority of students in this sample were identified as Hispanic, single sample t-tests were conducted to estimate whether there was a significant difference between this sample and the population average. In every calculation, aggregating all students or dividing them by treatment, the samples were significantly different and higher than the population average. The combined groups at pretest were higher than the population average [$t_{(69)} = 7.05$, $p < 05$.] The combined groups at posttest were higher than the population average [$t_{(73)} = 6.47$, $p < 05$]]. The control group at pretest and posttest were higher than the population average [$t_{(23)} = 5.50$, $p < 05$; $t_{(29)} = 3.41$, $p < 05$] The treatment group at pretest and posttest were higher than the population average [$t_{(69)} = 7.05$, $p < 05$; $t_{(73)} = 6.47$, $p < 05$].

Table 1

Comparison of Student Scores on the SEARS

Group	Statistic	Pretest	Posttest	Difference
Control	Mean	22.6	21.3	-1.28
	N	24	30	
	Std. Deviation	4.9	6.8	
	Std. Error of Mean	1.02	1.26	
	Minimum	12	6	
	Maximum	29	33	
	Range	17	27	
Treatment	Mean	21.4	22.3	0.91
	N	46	44	
	Std. Deviation	6.1	6.3	
	Std. Error of Mean	0.69	0.77	
	Minimum	9	10	
	Maximum	35	36	
	Range	26	26	

The first research question we aimed to answer was, “Is there differential change over time between a WhyTry group and an alternative treatment comparison group in terms of resilience as measured by the SEARS?” As seen below in Table 2, the interaction term that would indicate differential change over time according to group membership was not significant [$F_{(1,35)} = 0.41$, $p = 0.53$].

The second research question was Do students change over time in terms of resilience regardless of the treatment they receive? Also seen in Table 2, there was no significant change over time for all the students [$F_{(1,35)} = 0.35$, $p = 0.56$].

Table 2

Analysis of the Variance Within Subjects

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F (1,55)	p-value
Time	10.08	1	10.08	0.35	0.56
Time * Experimental Group	11.90	1	11.90	0.41	0.53
Error (Time)	1603.05	55	29.15		

And finally, the third research question was "Are there any detectable differences between the groups assigned to WhyTry vs. an alternative treatment?" As seen in Table 3 below, there was no significant difference between the groups regardless of time [$F_{(1,35)} = 0.56$, $p = 0.46$].

Table 3

Analysis of Variance Between Subjects

Source	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F* (1,55)	*p*-value
Experimental Group	25.55	1	22.5	0.56	0.46
Error (Time)	2520.74	55	45.8		

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to estimate the effectiveness of the WhyTry program in enhancing the resilience of a sample of adolescents that had been screened for Tier two intervention. Based upon the data of this study, we do not see a significant difference between the WhyTry program and the comparison group. In terms of MTSS and tiered support programs aimed to help a student find success this study finds no clear evidence that the WhyTry program is or is not an effective program for young people to increase in resilience. Within the MTSS there is a focus on using evidence based practices to support student learning and growth and though other studies looked at in the literature review of this paper have demonstrated that the WhyTry program seems to decrease office referrals, increase student academic performance (as measured by grade point average) and increase student motivation. Based on the data from this research we cannot identify evidence of a direct link between the WhyTry program and an increase in student resilience as measured by the SEARS Short Form A. The SEARS Short Form-A was used to act as an independent assessing measure. Resilience is such an all-encompassing topic and the measure of its growth should be assessed in a variety of ways. This is the only way to fully understand what impact we can have upon resilience in young people. This study hoped to measure in a different way than before, due to the expansive nature of this topic of resilience. One implication of our study could be that the SEARS Short Form-A does not accurately measure the impact the WhyTry program aims to have on the resilience of young people. Future research could use both the measures designed by the WhyTry program as well as other outside measurements in direct correlation to see if a better tool for measurement could be identified.

Another possible implication of this research could be that the current WhyTry program used to help teach students may not be an effective way to increase resilience in young people. The program may not be making the impact it has been designed to make. This would then create a discussion among those who have designed the program as to how it may be adjusted or changed to more effectively increase resilience in young people. It may also prompt further research to determine if other tools are being taught or outcomes are happening that are not measured by focusing specifically on resilience.

An additional implication of this research could be that the effects of the program take a longer time to materialize as measurable. Resilience is something that is tested by time and experiences. This study focused specifically on a student's perception of their own resilience in a relatively short time frame. The outcome may be that further research is needed to determine if resilience is a tool that takes more time to develop and is measured more effectively in the observation of response to trials overtime than on measured perception of an individual's resilience.

Another possible implication of this research is that since neither group showed particular growth in resilience there may not be an effective way to train or teach resilience in young people. Resilience may be less of a learned tool and more of an inherent attribute that develops on its own over time with experience. This would render the effort of teaching or focusing class time and intervention resources on the development of such skills meaningless. If indeed there is not a way to influence an increase of resilience in an individual, then the time and resources put towards this effort may be better used in other ways.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited in several ways. First, our student population struggled heavily with consistent attendance. In a review of our data from the pre-test to the post-test we had an attrition rate of 39%. We started with a total number of 94 participants and in the end because of missing data we had to dismiss 37 of the student participants scores from the study. Lower levels of attrition or higher numbers of participants in both the WhyTry group as well as the comparison group could have helped us to see a more accurate description in the statistics.

Another limitation was the lack of researcher control. The selection process, as well as the pre and post assessments were handled by the school administrators to keep with the established process of the school and measure the outcomes against what was already in place. This lack of researcher control led to problems such as the pretest being administered three–four weeks into the course. Consequently, the pre-assessments may not have provided a clear picture of the student's resiliency state prior to any intervention, which could render the negative findings suspect. One other area of control which would have benefited this research was the control group. The original design was to have a group that received no treatment besides time to have a full measure or understanding of the outcomes of the why try program in comparison to having no treatment option in place. After the research was conducted, we found out that the control group was also receiving some social skills training. Though not directly connected to resilience, and though no formal curriculum was used this may also add to the explanation of the null findings. Future research would benefit from a true control group.

One more limitation identified was that due to limited resources and time constraints, we had to use the Short Form-A of the SEARS. The long form provides more data and connects the self-reports from students with feedback gathered from the teachers and guardians of the

students, giving a more rounded view of the growth and resilience of the students in question. This data could also have been connected with other data points such as office referrals and report cards. A comparison of this more extensive collection of data could have yielded different results or provided a better explanation of the collected data in our research.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research designs would do well to ensure that students are selected at random from multiple locations and populations controlled by the research team. Students would then be given a full SEARS assessment and teachers and guardians would be invited to participate as well. This assessment would take place prior to any treatment experience in a classroom to act as a true pre-test. Teachers assigned to teach the course would be observed by WhyTry staff to control for internal validity.

Posttest data would be collected in the same way as the pretest data and then compared. These student outcomes could be combined with measures such as office referrals and reports cards to create a whole picture of where the students were before and after the WhyTry course. It may also be advantageous to take another measure three to five months after the original posttest data is gathered to determine whether the results are consistent across time.

The treatment group could also be better controlled to provide a more accurate measure. Research groups should ensure that students selected for the control group match the same need as the treatment group but are not given the WhyTry curriculum or other social skills training until after a proper demonstration of control can be measured. This could be done by designing a delayed treatment method.

These measures may provide a much more articulate and in-depth evaluation of the efficacy of the WhyTry program and its relationship to the outcome effects on student resilience.

References

Acuna, A., Vega, L., Meza, J., Marquez, M., & Vera, D. (2008). *Outcome evaluations methods and results for the south Los Angeles Resiliency (SOLAR) Project* [Paper presentation]. School Social Workers Association of America Conference, South Los Angelas.

Alverez, M. E., & Ketchmark, C. A. (2009). Review of an evidence-based school social work intervention: WhyTry. *Children & Schools, 31*(1), 59–61. https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/31.1.59

Alvord, M. K., Gurwitch, R., Martin, J., & Palomares R. S. (2012). *The American Psychology Association resilience guide for parents and teachers*. http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/resilience.aspx

Barlow, K., Weber, N., Koch, N., & Hendricks, R. (2018). Understanding curricular student expectations in Texas: Readiness standards vs. supporting standards. *Educational Research Quarterly, 42*(2), 3–43.

Batsche, G., Elliott, J., Graden, J. L., Grimes, J., Kovaleski, J. F., Prasse, D., & Tilly, W. D., III. (2005). *Response to intervention: Policy considerations and implementation.* National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Bird, B. (2010). WhyTry evaluation report (2006–2010). Churchill County Probation Report (p.11).https://whytry.org/wp-content/uploads/ResearchSummaries_Extended.pdf

Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention. *Child Development, 78*(1), 246–263.

Bradley, R., Danielson, L., & Doolittle, J. (2007). Responsiveness to intervention: 1997 to 2007. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 39*(5), 8–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990703900502

Brett, E. (2016). Peoria High School. Field research (p.4). retrieved from https://whytry.org/wp-content.uploads/ResearchSummaries_Extended.pdf

Burns, M. K., Appleton, J. J., & Stehouwer, J. D. (2005). Meta-analytic review of responsiveness-to-intervention research: Examining field-based and research-implemented models. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 23*(4), 381–394.

Bushnell, B., & Card, K. (2003). *Report on longitudinal effects of the WhyTry Program at Pleasant Grove High School.* (Unpublished). Retrieved June 2019 from https://whytry.org/wp-content/uploads/ResearchSummaries_Extended.pdf

Chilvers, D., & Cole, A. (2006). Using a sensory approach with children who challenge. *Support for Learning, 21*(1), 30–32.

Cohn, B., Merrell, K. W., Felver-Grant, J., Tom, K., & Endrulat, N. R. (2009). *Strength-based assessment of social and emotional functioning: SEARS-C and SEARS-A* [Paper presentation]. National Association of School Psychologists Meeting, Boston, MA, United States.

Duckworth, A. (2016). *Grit: The power of passion and perseverance.* Scribner.

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6), 1087-1101.

Eggett, G. D. (2003). *An intervention to remediate motivational shortcomings* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Nova Southeastern University.

Ehlers, L. (2018, November 15). *MTSS vs RTI vs PBIS—what's the difference?* https://www.illuminateed.com/blog/2018/11/mtss-vs-rti-vs-pbis-whats-the-difference/

Every Student Succeeds Act. (2015). Washington, D.C.: U.S. *Government Publishing Office.*

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., & Stecker, P. M. (2010). The "blurring" of special education in a new continuum of general education placements and services. *Exceptional Children, 76*(3), 301–323.

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2006). A framework for building capacity for responsiveness to intervention. *School Psychology Review, 35*(4), 621–626.

Gee, E. J. (2003). *Report to Granite School District on the WhyTry Program.* Granite School District.

Hutchinson, C. B., & Padgett, B. L. (2007). How to create and use analogies effectively in the teaching of science concepts. *Science Activities, 44*(2), 69–72.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).

Lane, K. L., Oakes, W. P., Ennis, R. P., Cox, M. L., Schatschneider, C., & Lambert, W. (2013). Additional evidence for the reliability and validity of the Student Risk Screening Scale at the high school level: A replication and extension. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 21*(2), 97–115.

Masten, A. S., Best, K. M., & Garmezy, N. (1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. *Development and Psychopathology, 2*(4), 425–444. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579400005812

Mazzotta-Perretti, J. A. (2009). *An evaluation of at-risk students' behaviors through a social skills intervention program designed to improve school success* [Doctoral dissertation]. Northcentral University.

McCall, H. J. (2003). When successful alternative students "disengage" from regular school. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 12*(2), 113-117.

Merrell, K. W. (2011). *Social emotional assets and resilience scales professional manual*. Parinc.

Moore, C., Anderson, B., & McQuivey, K. (2014). *The resilience breakthrough: 27 tools for turning adversity into action.* Greenleaf Book Group Press.

Mortenson, B., & Rush, K. (2007). *PRIDE: 28-day summer program for at-risk students* [Unpublished manuscript]. Research committee, Towson University.

National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments. (2017). *Safe supportive learning.* http://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. (2001). *Pub. L*. No. 107-110, 101, Stat. 1425 (2002).

Pagliano, P. (2001). *Using multisensory environment: A practical guide for teachers.* Routledge.

Pasqualotto, R. A., Löhr, S. S., & Stoltz, T. (2015). Skinner and Vygotsky's understanding of resilience in the school environment. *Creative Education*, *6*(17), 1841-1851.

Preston, A. I., Wood, C. L., & Stecker, P. M. (2015). Response to intervention: Where it came from and where it's going. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *60*(3), 173–182.

Rutter, M. (2012). Resilience as a dynamic concept. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24(2), 335-344. doi:10.1017/S0954579412000028

United States. (1965). Elementary and secondary education act of 1965 : H. R. 2362, *89th Cong., 1st sess.,* Public law 89-10. Reports, bills, debate and act. [Washington] :[U.S. Govt. Print. Off.]

Utah State Board of Education. (n.d.). *Recognizing excellence and improvement.* https://utahschoolgrades.schools.utah.gov/

Wicomico County School District. Wicomico County, Maryland (2012). *WhyTry Program Results.* https://whytry.org/wp-content/uploads/ResearchSummaries_Extended.pdf

Williams, L. (2009). Horizon Middle School mental health, counseling, and PBS effective education, recipe for success. *WhyTry program results (p.6)*. Retrieved from https://whytry.org/wpcontent/uploads/ResearchSummaries Extended.pdf

Wymore, S. (2007) WhyTry? A report of an after-school tutoring program. *The Counseling Interviewer, 39*(2), 9–13.

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(4), 302–314.

APPENDIX

Consent Forms in English and Spanish and IRB Letter

Child Assent Form

What is this research about?

My name is Travis Price and I am a student at Brigham Young University. I am working with Lane Fischer, Ph.D. as my advisor. Mound Fort Junior High School is going to try a new program that teaches young people how to respond to challenges in life. I am going to see if the program works. We would like for you to be a part of the study to see if it works.

If you decide you want to be in this study, this is what will happen.

Some students will participate in the Whytry program. Some students will not. All students will complete a paper-pencil survey before the beginning of the class, and again a few months later. Students who take the class will take the survey one last time a few weeks later. If the class works, other students might participate in the Whytry class later in the year or even next year. The surveys should take less than 30 minutes each time.

Can anything bad happen to me?

This is a safe process. All you have to do is fill out some papers and some students will participate in the class.

Can anything good happen to me?

We don't know if being in this study will help you. But we hope to learn something that will help other people some day.

Do I have other choices?

You can choose not to be in this study.

Will anyone know I am in the study?

We won't tell anyone you took part in this study. When we are done with the study, we will write a report about what we learned. We won't use your name in the report.

What happens if I get hurt?

Your parents or legal guardians have been given information on what to do if you are injured during the study.

What if I do not want to do this?

You don't have to be in this study. It's up to you. If you say yes now, but change your mind later, that's okay too. All you have to do is tell us.

Before you say yes to be in this study; be sure to ask Travis Price to tell you more about anything that you don't understand.

If you want to be in this study, please sign and print your name.

Name (Printed): _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Parental Permission for a Minor

Introduction

My name is Travis Price. I am a graduate student from Brigham Young University. I am working with Lane Fischer, Ph.D. as my advisor. Mound Fort Junior High School is planning to use the Whytry resilience training program for a select group of students. I am conducting a research study as an external evaluator to estimate the effectiveness of the program. I am inviting your child to take part in the research because he or she has been identified by the school as one that could benefit from the proposed outcomes of this program.

Procedures

Some students will be enrolled in the Whytry program. Some students will be enrolled as "wait-list controls." If the program proves effective, Mound fort Junior High School may enroll "waitlist control" students in the class the next time they offer it.

If you agree to let your child participate in this research study, the following will occur:

- Your child will be asked to take a brief survey in class called the SEARS test prior to participation in the class or prior to the beginning of the class.
- upon completion of the course your student will again be asked to participate in a brief in class survey and the data from both surveys will be compared to measure the outcomes of the program.
- For the students enrolled in the class this time, a follow up survey will be given a few weeks after the course to see if the outcomes are lasting.
- All information will be de-identified by the school before being given to the researcher to ensure the privacy of your student.

Risks

The risks for your student are very low, however there is a risk of loss of privacy, which the researcher will reduce by not receiving any of the student's real names or other identifier through the de-identification process. The researcher will also keep all data in a locked file cabinet in a secure location. Only the researcher will have access to the data. At the end of the study, data will be kept for a time and then destroyed to protect confidentiality.

Benefits

There are no known direct benefits to your child. We don't yet know whether the program works. Society might benefit by increasing our knowledge about programs to help adolescents respond to challenges.

Compensation

There will be no compensation for participation in this project.

Questions about the Research

Please direct any further questions about the study to Travis Price at 801-823-5780 You may also contact Lane Fischer at lane_fischer@byu.edu.

Questions about your child's rights as a study participant or to submit comment or complaints about the study should be directed to the IRB Administrator, Brigham Young University, A-285 ASB, Provo, UT 84602. Call (801) 422-1461 or send emails to irb@byu.edu.

You have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Participation

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You are free to decline to have your child participate in this research study. The school might ask you to enroll your student in the program whether they

complete the surveys or not. You may withdraw you child's participation at any point without affecting your child’s grade/standing in school.

Child's Name:
Parent Name:
Signature:
Date:

Permiso De Los Padres Para Un Menor De Edad

Introducción

Mi nombre es Travis Price. Soy un estudiante de maestría en la Universidad de Brigham Young. Trabajo con Lane Fischer, Ph.D, mi consejero. Mound Fort Junior High School está planeando utilizar el programa "Whytry resilience training" con un grupo seleccionado de estudiantes. Estoy haciendo un estudio de investigación como un evaluador externo para estimar la efectividad del programa. Estoy invitando a su hijo/ hija para que participan en el estudio porque el/ella ha sido identificado por la escuela como alguien que puede beneficiar del los resultados propuestos por el programa.

Procedimientos

Algunos estudiantes serán inscritos en el programa "Whytry." Otros estudiantes serán inscritos como "controles en la lista de espera." Si el programa demuestra su efectividad, Mound Fort Junior High School puede inscribir estudiantes de la "lista de espera" la próxima vez que ofrezcan la clase.

Si usted está de acuerdo en permitir que su hijo/hija participe en este estudio de investigación pueda suceder lo siguiente:

- Se le pedirá a su hijo/hija que tome en la clase una breve encuesta titulada "SEARS," antes de su participación en la clase o antes de que empieza la clase.
- Una vez terminada el curso se le pedirá a su estudiante que tome, mientras en clase, otra breve encuesta. La información de ambas encuestas será comparada para medir los resultados del programa.
- A los estudiantes inscritos en la clase esta vez, les dará una encuesta adicional unas semanas después del curso para saber si los resultados son duraderos.
- Toda identificación será removida por la escuela antes de ser entregada al investigador para asegurar la privacidad de su estudiante.

Riesgos

Los riesgos para su estudiante son muy bajos, sin embargo hay un riesgo de perder la privacidad, la cual el investigador reducirá no recibiendo el nombre real del estudiante o cualquier otra identificación por medio del proceso de removida de toda identificación. El investigador también guardará toda la información en un armario con candado en un lugar seguro. Solamente el investigador tiene acceso a la información. Al final del estudio la información será guardada por un tiempo y luego será destruida para proteger la privacidad.

Beneficios

No hay beneficio directo para su hijo/hija. Todavía no sabemos si el programa trabaja. La sociedad se puede beneficiar aumentando nuestros conocimientos sobre programas para ayudar a los adolescentes a responder a los desafíos.

Compensación

No habrá compensación por la participación en este proyecto.

Preguntas sobre la investigación

Por favor dirija cualquier pregunta adicional a Travis Price al teléfono 801-823-5780. También puede comunicarse con Lane Fischer a lane_fischer@byu.edu.

Preguntas sobre los derechos de su hijo/hija como participante en el estudio, o para someter comentarios o quejas sobre el estudio deben ser dirigidas al administrador de IRB, Brigham Young University, A-285 ASB, Provo, UT 84602. Llame al 801-422-1461 o envía emails a irb@byu.edu.

Participación

La participación en este estudio de investigación es voluntaria. Usted es libre para negarse que su hijo participe en este estudio de investigación. La escuela podría pedirle que inscriba a su estudiante en el programa aunque el/ella complete la encuesta o no. Usted puede rehusar la participación de su hijo/hija a cualquier momento sin afectar las calificaciones o la posición de el/ella en la escuela.

Nombre del niño/niña: _____

Nombre del Padre: _____ Firma:_____

Fecha: _____

Memorandum

To: Professor Lane Fischer
Department: CP&SE
College: EDUC
From: Sandee Aina, MPA, IRB Administrator
Bob Ridge, PhD, IRB Chair
Date: April 5, 2019
IRB#: E19058
Title: *"Outcomes of Resilience Education Program for Junior High School Aged Students"*

Brigham Young University's IRB has approved the research study referenced in the subject heading as exempt level, category 1. The approval period is from **April 5, 2019 to April 4, 2020**. Please reference your assigned IRB identification number in any correspondence with the IRB. Continued approval is conditional upon your compliance with the following requirements:

1. A copy of the informed consent statement is attached. No other consent statement should be used. Each research subject must be provided with a copy or a way to access the consent statement.
2. Any modifications to the approved protocol must be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the IRB before modifications are incorporated in the study.
3. All recruiting tools must be submitted and approved by the IRB prior to use.
4. 4.In addition, serious adverse events must be reported to the IRB immediately, with a written report by the PI within 24 hours of the PI's becoming aware of the event. Serious adverse events are (1) death of a research participant; or (2) serious injury to a research participant.
5. All other non-serious unanticipated problems should be reported to the IRB within two weeks of the first awareness of the problem by the PI. Prompt reporting is important, as unanticipated problems often require some modification of study procedures, protocols, and/or informed consent processes. Such modifications require the review and approval of the IRB.
6. A few months before the expiration date, you will receive a continuing review form. There will be two reminders. Please complete the form in a timely manner to ensure that there is no lapse in the study approval.

IRB Secretary
A 285 ASB
Brigham Young University
(801)422-3606