

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **Name of Program/Strategy: Media Ready**

### **Report Contents**

1. Overview and description
  2. Implementation considerations (if available)
  3. Descriptive information
  4. Outcomes
  5. Cost effectiveness report (Washington State Institute of Public Policy – if available)
  6. Washington State results (from Performance Based Prevention System (PBPS) – if available)
  7. Who is using this program/strategy
  8. Study populations
  9. Quality of studies
  10. Readiness for Dissemination
  11. Costs (if available)
  12. Contacts for more information
- 

### **1. Overview and description**

Media Ready is a media literacy education program for 6th- to 8th-grade students. The goal of the program is to prevent or delay the onset of underage alcohol and tobacco use by encouraging healthy beliefs and attitudes about abstaining from alcohol and tobacco use and by enhancing the ability to apply critical thinking skills in interpreting media messages, particularly those related to alcohol and tobacco products. Media Ready consists of 10 45-minute lessons based on established models of decision-making and research on the message interpretation process. The program includes homework and extension assignments to further students' understanding of media literacy and to provide additional opportunities for practicing newly learned skills. The curriculum is adaptable to a variety of classroom settings and skill levels of students. The Media Ready program kit contains all materials needed to teach the program, including a teacher manual, poster, and CD with media examples. Also available is a comprehensive 1-day training workshop, which provides an introduction to the theory and research underlying the program model and instructions for facilitating each program activity. Those who successfully complete an online test at the end of this training receive certification of completion. Media Ready is related to Media Detective, a media literacy education program for 3rd- to 5th-grade students.

### **2. Implementation considerations (if available)**

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **3. Descriptive Information**

<b>Areas of Interest</b>	Substance abuse prevention
<b>Outcomes</b>	1: Intentions to use alcohol 2: Intentions to use tobacco 3: Media deconstruction skills for alcohol and tobacco
<b>Outcome Categories</b>	Alcohol Social functioning Tobacco
<b>Ages</b>	6-12 (Childhood) 13-17 (Adolescent)
<b>Gender</b>	Male Female
<b>Races/Ethnicities</b>	American Indian or Alaska Native Asian Black or African American Hispanic or Latino White Race/ethnicity unspecified
<b>Settings</b>	School
<b>Geographic Locations</b>	Suburban Rural and/or frontier
<b>Implementation History</b>	Since its development in 2005, Media Ready has been implemented in an estimated 411 classrooms with approximately 10,275 middle school-aged students in the United States (mostly in North Carolina). Media Ready has been used in both public and private schools as well as in after-school programs. One evaluation study of the program has been conducted.
<b>NIH Funding/CER Studies</b>	Partially/fully funded by National Institutes of Health: No Evaluated in comparative effectiveness research studies: No
<b>Adaptations</b>	No population- or culture-specific adaptations were identified by the applicant.
<b>Adverse Effects</b>	No adverse effects, concerns, or unintended consequences were identified by the applicant.
<b>IOM Prevention Categories</b>	Universal

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **4. Outcomes**

### **Outcome 1: Intentions to use alcohol**

<b>Description of Measures</b>	<p>Project staff administered a paper-and-pencil questionnaire to students at pre- and posttest. Four items assessed each student's intention to use alcohol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Before you are 21 years old, do you think you will drink beer, wine, or hard liquor (more than just a few sips)?"</li> <li>• "Before you are 21 years old, do you think you will get drunk or drink a lot of alcohol at one time?"</li> <li>• "During the next year, do you think you will drink beer, wine, or hard liquor (more than just a few sips)?"</li> <li>• "During the next year, do you think you will get drunk or drink a lot of alcohol at one time?"</li> </ul> <p>Students responded using a 4-point Likert scale that ranged from 0 (I definitely will not) to 3 (I definitely will). Scores for intentions to use alcohol were derived from the average of responses across the 4 items, with higher scores indicating a stronger intention to use alcohol. Pretest scores for the outcome variable were included as covariate prediction variables; therefore, outcome variable means were reported as adjusted posttest scores.</p>
<b>Key Findings</b>	<p>At posttest, boys in the intervention group had lower mean scores for intentions to use alcohol compared with boys in the wait-list control group (0.48 vs. 0.65; <math>p &lt; .05</math>). The scores for girls did not differ significantly between groups.</p>
<b>Studies Measuring Outcome</b>	<p>Study 1</p>
<b>Study Designs</b>	<p>Experimental</p>
<b>Quality of Research Rating</b>	<p>2.6 (0.0-4.0 scale)</p>

### **Outcome 2: Intentions to use tobacco**

<b>Description of Measures</b>	<p>Project staff administered a paper-and-pencil questionnaire to students at pre- and posttest. Four items assessed each student's intention to use tobacco:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Before you are 18 years old, do you think you will smoke cigarettes?"</li> <li>• "Before you are 18 years old, do you think you will chew</li> </ul>
--------------------------------	--

## ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

	<p>tobacco or use snuff?"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "During the next year, do you think you will smoke cigarettes?"</li> <li>• "During the next year, do you think you will chew tobacco or use snuff?"</li> </ul> <p>Students responded using a 4-point Likert scale that ranged from 0 (I definitely will not) to 3 (I definitely will). Scores for intentions to use tobacco were derived from the average of responses across the 4 items, with higher scores indicating a stronger intention to use tobacco. Pretest scores for the outcome variable were included as covariate prediction variables; therefore, outcome variable means were reported as adjusted posttest scores.</p>
<b>Key Findings</b>	<p>At posttest, students in the intervention group had lower mean scores for intentions to use tobacco compared with students in the wait-list control group (0.08 vs. 0.23; <math>p &lt; .0001</math>). Among students who had previously used tobacco, those in the intervention group had lower mean scores for intentions to use tobacco compared with those in the wait-list control group (0.42 vs. 0.96; <math>p &lt; .001</math>). The scores for students who had not previously used tobacco did not differ significantly between groups.</p>
<b>Studies Measuring Outcome</b>	Study 1
<b>Study Designs</b>	Experimental
<b>Quality of Research Rating</b>	2.5 (0.0-4.0 scale)

### **Outcome 3: Media deconstruction skills for alcohol and tobacco**

<b>Description of Measures</b>	<p>Project staff administered a paper-and-pencil questionnaire to students at pre- and posttest. The questionnaire asked students to deconstruct one alcohol and one tobacco print advertisement. Three open-ended items assessed each student's critical thinking in regard to each advertisement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Tell me about this advertisement in the space below (the more detail the better)."</li> <li>• "How are the advertisers trying to get someone to buy this product?"</li> <li>• "What type of magazine would have this advertisement in it and why?"</li> </ul> <p>The resulting qualitative data were coded by four trained coders, producing scores in five categories:</p>
--------------------------------	---

## ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The product score, which ranged from 0 to 3, captured a student's ability to recognize the product being advertised.</li> <li>• The graphic elements score, which ranged from 0 to 2, assessed a student's understanding of how advertisers use graphic elements (e.g., font, color, placement of items such as warning labels) to capture attention or to make the product seem more appealing.</li> <li>• The language score, which ranged from 0 to 3, evaluated a student's understanding of how slogans and advertising claims are used in advertisements.</li> <li>• The target audience score, which ranged from 0 to 3, assessed a student's understanding of the term "target audience" and also his or her ability to recognize the target audience of a particular advertisement.</li> <li>• The implied messages score, which ranged from 0 to 3, assessed a student's ability to recognize implied messages in advertisements.</li> </ul> <p>The five scores were summed to create the deconstruction skills score, which had a possible range of 0 to 14, with higher scores indicating greater ability to apply critical thinking about advertisements. Each student's score was calculated as the average of the four coders' scores for that individual. Pretest scores for the outcome variable were included as covariate prediction variables; therefore, outcome variable means were reported as adjusted posttest scores.</p>
<b>Key Findings</b>	At posttest, students in the intervention group had higher mean scores for deconstruction skills compared with students in the wait-list control group (10.78 vs. 9.00; $p < .005$ ).
<b>Studies Measuring Outcome</b>	Study 1
<b>Study Designs</b>	Experimental
<b>Quality of Research Rating</b>	2.3 (0.0-4.0 scale)

**5. Cost effectiveness report (Washington State Institute of Public Policy – if available)**

**6. Washington State results (from Performance Based Prevention System (PBPS) – if available)**

# **Excellence in Prevention** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## 7. Who is using this program/strategy

Washington Counties	Oregon Counties

## 8. Study populations

The studies reviewed for this intervention included the following populations, as reported by the study authors.

Study	Age	Gender	Race/Ethnicity
<b>Study 1</b>	6-12 (Childhood) 13-17 (Adolescent)	56.6% Female 43.4% Male	60.4% White 13.6% Hispanic or Latino 10.7% Race/ethnicity unspecified 8.3% Black or African American 6.3% Asian 0.7% American Indian or Alaska Native

## 9. Quality of studies

The documents below were reviewed for Quality of Research. Other materials may be available. For more information, contact the developer(s).

### Study 1

Kupersmidt, J. B., Scull, T. M., & Benson, J. W. (2009). Improving media interpretation processing skills to promote healthy decision making about substance use: The effects of the middle school Media Ready curriculum. Manuscript submitted for publication.

### Supplementary Materials

Kupersmidt, J. B., & Barrett, T. (n.d.). Media Ready. Durham, NC: innovation Research and Training.

Scull, T. M., Kupersmidt, J. B., Parker, A. E., Elmore, K. C., & Benson, J. W. (2010). Adolescents' media-related cognitions and substance use in the context of parental and peer influences. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(9), 981-998.

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **Quality of Research Ratings by Criteria (0.0-4.0 scale)**

External reviewers independently evaluate the Quality of Research for an intervention's reported results using six criteria:

1. Reliability of measures
2. Validity of measures
3. Intervention fidelity
4. Missing data and attrition
5. Potential confounding variables
6. Appropriateness of analysis

For more information about these criteria and the meaning of the ratings, see Quality of Research.

<b>Outcome</b>	Reliability of Measures	Validity of Measures	Fidelity	Missing Data/Attrition	Confounding Variables	Data Analysis	Overall Rating
1: Intentions to use alcohol	2.5	3.5	2.3	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.6
2: Intentions to use tobacco	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.5
3: Media deconstruction skills for alcohol and tobacco	1.8	2.0	2.3	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.3

## **Study Strengths**

The internal consistency of the scales was good. The scale items have face validity and are similar to other well-known items that have shown good predictive validity in both cross-sectional and longitudinal contexts. The study used a randomized wait-list control group design. Teachers completed a fidelity checklist after teaching each lesson. Most students (73%) attended all scheduled lessons, and missing data and attrition were minimal (only about 3% of the students who completed the pretest did not complete the posttest). Statistical analyses were appropriate and thorough.

## **Study Weaknesses**

Neither test-retest reliability nor validity of the measures (other than face validity) was provided. Only the students' and teachers' self-reports were provided as fidelity measures. Only five schools were randomized into the intervention and control groups, which increased the chances of unmeasured differences between the schools in each group. Relative to the control group, students in the intervention group were much more likely to be in the 6th or 7th grade than in the 8th grade; although the investigators included students' grade level as a covariate, this approach did not necessarily equalize the groups because of the very small number of schools. The interval between the administration of the pre- and posttests was very short and only captured short-term effects.

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **10. Readiness for Dissemination**

The documents below were reviewed for Readiness for Dissemination. Other materials may be available. For more information, contact the developer(s).

### **Dissemination Materials**

Innovation Research and Training. (2005). Media Ready: Media Literacy Substance Abuse Prevention Project (grades 6-8). Teacher manual. Durham, NC.

Innovation Research and Training. (2008). Media Ready. Teacher training workshop fidelity checklist. Durham, NC: Author. innovation Research and Training. (n.d.). Media Ready. Media literacy questions poster. Durham, NC.

Innovation Research and Training. (n.d.). Media Ready: Media Literacy Substance Abuse Prevention Project. Facilitator's guide for conducting teacher training workshops. Durham, NC.

Innovation Research and Training. (n.d.). Media Ready: Media Literacy Substance Abuse Prevention Project. Student workbook. Durham, NC.

Innovation Research and Training. (n.d.). Media Ready. Teacher fidelity of implementation checklist. Durham, NC: Author.

Media Ready teacher certification test. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/FLKBRWJ>

Media Ready training consumer satisfaction survey. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/YWCCR7H>

Media Ready Web site, <http://www.irtinc.us/products/mediaready/index.html>

### **Readiness for Dissemination Ratings by Criteria (0.0-4.0 scale)**

External reviewers independently evaluate the intervention's Readiness for Dissemination using three criteria:

1. Availability of implementation materials
2. Availability of training and support resources
3. Availability of quality assurance procedures

For more information about these criteria and the meaning of the ratings, see Readiness for Dissemination.

<b>Implementation Materials</b>	<b>Training and Support Resources</b>	<b>Quality Assurance Procedures</b>	<b>Overall Rating</b>
3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4

# ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

## **Dissemination Strengths**

The teacher manual is well organized, detailed, and easy to read, and it includes clear, logically sequenced sessions and guidance for conducting a hands-on practicum and other interactive activities. The facilitator's guide for conducting teacher training workshops is also well organized and logically sequenced, with clear guidance on how and when to incorporate other implementation tools. Each training module contains interactive components that help teachers build mastery of the intervention. Teachers must successfully complete an online certification test to validate their ability to conduct the program. Fidelity checklists include open-ended questions that give users an opportunity to detail adaptations.

## **Dissemination Weaknesses**

No guidance is provided on the optimal class size or methods for incorporating the intervention into existing classroom curricula. Because the teacher training focuses on the procedures associated with each session, it is unclear whether there are skills particular to the program model as a whole that teachers need to learn to implement the program effectively. The fidelity checklist is self-administered by teachers, which raises questions about whether its results can serve as an objective basis for improvement. No guidance is provided for measuring the outcomes of objectives.

## **11. Costs (if available)**

The information below was provided by the developer and may have changed since the time of review. For detailed information on implementation costs (e.g., staffing, space, equipment, materials shipping and handling), contact the developer.

<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Required by Program Developer</b>
Curriculum kit (includes teacher manual, media examples, Key Questions poster, templates of student handouts, Key Questions bookmark, and Common Implied Messages bookmark)	\$105 each with CD of media examples, or \$120 each with overhead transparencies of media examples	Yes
CD of media examples	\$5 each	No
Overhead transparencies of media examples	\$28 per set	No
Student workbooks	\$13.50 for 10	No
Key Questions poster	\$5 each	No
Bookmarks (Key Questions or Common Implied Messages)	\$3.75 for 30	No

## ***Excellence in Prevention*** – descriptions of the prevention programs and strategies with the greatest evidence of success

---

1-day, on-site teacher training workshop (includes teacher certification test)	\$2,800 for up to 25 participants, plus travel expenses	No
Limited phone and email consultation	Free	No
Pre- and posttest outcome assessment instruments	Free	No
Fidelity checklists	Free	No
Implementation design and monitoring consultation	\$175 per hour	No
Evaluation services consultation	\$175 per hour	No
Contractual evaluation services	Varies depending on the number of participants, types of services, and number of evaluation reports needed	No

### **Additional Information**

The ongoing costs of program implementation are optional and include the purchase of the preprinted, collated student workbooks and one or more bookmarks for each student.

## **12. Contacts for more information**

### **For information on implementation:**

Tracy Scull, Ph.D.  
 (919) 493-7700  
 tscull@irtinc.us

### **For information on research:**

Janis Kupersmidt, Ph.D.  
 (919) 493-7700  
 jkupersmidt@irtinc.us

**Learn More by Visiting:** <http://www.irtinc.us/products/mediaready/index.html>