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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The San Diego County Anti-Defamation League (ADL) received funds from the California Endowment to implement a prevention and intervention program to educate youth about bias-motivated behavior and tolerance. This program is for youth who have committed hate crimes, been involved in bias-motivated incidents, or are at risk of committing such, and who are court-ordered to participate in the program. To fulfill the evaluation requirements of the grant, ADL contracted with researchers from the Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). This report includes final evaluation results.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

PATHWAYS to Tolerance is a psycho-educational program for youth designed to help them confront their biased attitudes and behaviors. The program serves youth and young adults who were referred by Probation or ordered by the San Diego Juvenile Court to participate specifically in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. Participants are selected because they are at risk of or have committed either a hate crime or a bias-motivated offense. Before entry into the program, the Program Director conducts the intake interview in order to make sure the youth is appropriate for the program. Through this intake interview, the Director assesses problems such as significant substance abuse or mental health issues that may inhibit program success.

The main goal of PATHWAYS to Tolerance is to decrease participants’ risk of committing a hate crime by increasing the participants’ tolerance of those who are different. This change should be demonstrated through attitudes and behaviors.

Structured as a twelve-week group therapy program, PATHWAYS to Tolerance synthesizes education with cognitive-behavioral, experiential, and self-psychological interventions to develop changes in attitudes and behavior. The twelve sessions are facilitated by the Program Director and a volunteer who has completed facilitator training. Group sessions are two hours long, except for the seventh session, which includes a trip to the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles.

PATHWAYS to Tolerance started its first group session on September 25, 2002. Since then, 10 twelve-week sessions have started and nine have been completed. The program served 62 youth, 38 short of the target of 100 that was identified in the grant proposal.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A required component of this program was the evaluation effort to determine if the program was implemented as designed and measure if the expected outcomes were realized. A variety of different methods was used to collect the qualitative data necessary to document program implementation. These included attending Steering Committee meetings; surveying program staff, steering committee members, and key community leaders; and conducting case studies of selected participants.

A pre-post design, using a six-month follow-up period after program completion, was used to collect data for the impact evaluation. Information regarding program impact was captured through data collection from ADL case files, the Regional Juvenile Information System (REJIS), the Probation Case Management System (PCMS), the San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up (SDRRC) (which is a 60-item standardized instrument that measures protective and risk factors on six dimensions), a pre- and post-test, and six-week and twelve-week reports to Probation.

Between September 25, 2002, and January 30, 2004, there were 90 referrals to the program, of which 62 clients participated. Descriptive data were available for all participants. These data show that the majority of the participants were White, male, and had an average age of 16.4 years. The youth came from across San Diego County and many had used drugs or alcohol prior to entering the program.

Slightly more than one-half (53%) of the participants did not have a prior referral to Probation for an offense (not including the current offense). Only five percent had a prior referral for a bias-motivated offense. Over one-half (54%) of the referring offenses were for a misdemeanor. As a result of the recent referral, 74 percent of the youth were currently WIC 602 wards of the court and under formal probation supervision.

PROCESS EVALUATION RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was the program implemented as originally designed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholders felt the program implemented most of the program goals. Their experience with PATHWAYS to Tolerance was positive and they noted the efforts of staff in working with the youth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the stakeholders perceive the program as effective in reducing the risk of youth to commit bias-motivated incidents or hate crimes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twelve of the thirteen stakeholders thought the program was effective in reducing the risk of youth committing bias-motivated incidents or hate crimes. The majority also felt the program was very useful in addressing prejudice and bias.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the program reach the intended client population?

The program was intended to reach youth who have committed a hate crime or are at risk of doing so. The program reached this target population by including youth who were members or associated with a gang or non-inclusive group, had committed a bias-motivated incident or hate crime, or had tattoos or other signs that portrayed hate. The intake interviews showed that 73 percent knew someone who was involved in a group that does not like people of different ethnicities, religions, or sexual orientations, putting the youth at risk of adopting similar attitudes. However, the Bias Screening Tool revealed only a mild bias score on average. Since this tool is completed using the intake interview, bias may have been under-reported at this time. Further analysis indicated that family and friends' beliefs and attitudes played an important role in the participants' own bias.

What was the level of risk for participants?

Results of the analysis of the SDRRC showed that risk scores were very high for the youth, with more than 80 percent having at least one risk factor in the peer, individual, delinquency, education, and family domains. The greatest percent of youth were described as at risk in terms of associating with delinquent friends, not managing anger, and demonstrating sensation-seeking behaviors.

Were participants actively engaged in the program?

Approximately three-quarters of the participants successfully completed the program. For those that had completed twelve weeks, more than two-thirds did not have tardies and most were described as actively participating.

Which clients were most likely to successfully complete the program?

Factors that appeared to have a negative impact on successful completion of the program included non-inclusive group association and having tattoos or other symbols. Such tattoos or symbols may be related to associating with a non-inclusive group. Those youth who were unsuccessful had more risk factors and fewer protective factors.
IMPACT EVALUATION RESULTS

Was participation related to a decreased probability that the youth would re-offend by committing a hate crime or bias-motivated crime?

The recidivism rate for the program was very low for the intervention period and six-month follow-up, with no youth committing hate crimes or bias-motivated crimes during either of these periods. Around ten percent had a probation violation in the intervention period or six-month follow-up.

Was participation related to an increase in knowledge about tolerance and personal biases?

Program participants completed a knowledge test regarding tolerance, personal biases, and behavior before the first session and during the last session. Overall, the post-test scores were better than those from the pre-test, indicating an increase in the knowledge of participants.

Was participation related to an increase in understanding of personal biases and a commitment to addressing them?

As a result of the program, for those youth who had completed twelve weeks, six in ten had admitted their biases and four in ten had taken responsibility for their behaviors. However, only one-quarter were committed to addressing their biases.

Was participation related to a decrease in risk factors and an increase in protective factors?

The results of the intake and exit comparison of the SDRRC showed that the percent of youth with one or more risk factors in each of the six domains was lower at exit than at intake. Likewise, the percent of youth with one or more protective factors increased in five of the six domains. At exit, the average protective score had increased and the average risk score had decreased compared to intake.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results from the process evaluation demonstrated that the program was implemented as designed. There were 62 youth who participated and three-quarters of these successfully completed the twelve sessions. Those that completed the program were described as constructively contributing and actively participating.
The findings of the impact evaluation showed that, as expected, the recidivism rate for participants was low. In addition, none of the youth committed a hate crime or bias-motivated incident in the intervention period or six-month follow-up. Through participation in the program, the youth learned more about tolerance and, after exiting the program, they were more resilient.

Some of the limitations of this research included a small sample size and unavailability of data for unsuccessful clients. Recommendations for other researchers in this field include working with program staff to ensure administration of instruments to all participants, allowing program start-up time before the evaluation begins, and using a number of pre- and post-tests to measure changes over the period of the program and in follow-up. Program recommendations include keeping participation in the program mandatory, continuing to provide outreach to Probation Officers, adding more experiential field trips to the curriculum, and keeping groups to a maximum of six to ten participants.
CHAPTER 1
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND PROGRAM BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

San Diego County was shocked in the summer of 2000, when a group of local high school youth attacked elderly migrant workers. Shortly after, the tragedy of Columbine High School hit home with the Santana High School shooting; the alleged perpetrator having been the target of constant, homophobic harassment due to his small stature (Anti-Defamation League, 2002a). The shooting at Granite Hills High School shortly followed. According to the report, Hate Crimes: An Annual Report to the People of San Diego County (Anti-Defamation League, 1997), in 1997 almost one-half (47%) of assailants who committed hate crimes were under 21 years old. Local San Diego hate crimes registry data show that 39 percent of the hate crimes committed between 1992 and 2002 were committed by individuals under 20 years old (Anti-Defamation League, 2004a).

The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) often uses the analogy of a “Pyramid of Hate” to explain that seemingly mild behaviors, such as name calling and exclusionary cliques, lay the foundation for more serious prejudice and violence. The early stages of bias and intolerance can lead to acts of discrimination, property damage, and violence (Anti-Defamation League, 2002b).

The high profile incidents of hate committed in the last few years, combined with the alarming fact that youth are committing nearly one-half of all hate crimes, indicated to the ADL that a program was needed in San Diego to address both the early stages of bias and intervene once youth had committed bias-motivated crimes. The San Diego County ADL received funds from the California Endowment to implement such a program.

To fulfill the evaluation requirements of the grant, the ADL contracted with researchers from the Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to conduct a process and impact evaluation. The information in this final report describes the implementation of PATHWAYS to Tolerance and the results of the program evaluation. The program will end on March 31, 2004, unless funds from other agencies are provided to support continued operation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Steering committee members that represented Probation, San Diego Court and Community Schools, the District Attorney’s office, the ADL executive committee, ADL staff, the Juvenile Court, and SANDAG began meeting in June 2002 to design prevention and intervention programs to address bias and prejudice in youth. Initially, the ADL developed a prevention program that used high
school forums to educate students about tolerance and an intervention program for youth on probation. Due to circumstances beyond the control of the ADL (e.g., inability of the schools to set aside time for the forums), the prevention program could not be implemented. As a result, the California Endowment reduced funding to provide support only for the intervention component, PATHWAYS to Tolerance. This program is for youth who have committed hate crimes, have been involved in bias-motivated offenses, or are at risk of committing either. A bias-motivated offense is defined as an offense committed with the intent to threaten or cause harm, and is based primarily on prejudice toward another person or group (Anti-Defamation League, 2002b). Bias-motivated offenses are not necessarily crimes that are classified as hate crimes by the District Attorney.

PATHWAYS to Tolerance is a psycho-educational program designed to help youth confront their biased attitudes and behaviors. The program serves youth and young adults who are referred by Probation or ordered by the San Diego Juvenile Court to participate specifically in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. While most participants described here were on informal or formal juvenile probation, there were a few young adults who had committed crimes as juveniles but were convicted as adults. These participants were selected because they were determined to be at risk of committing or had already committed a hate crime or a bias-motivated offense.

Probation Officers make referrals to the Program Director of PATHWAYS to Tolerance. After the program receives the referral, an intake interview is scheduled with the youth and a parent. The Program Director conducts the intake interview in order to be certain that the youth is appropriate for the program. Youth who at intake show significant issues concerning substance abuse, mental health, or cognitive dysfunction that would impede learning, are determined not to be appropriate for the program.

PATHWAYS to Tolerance uses a twelve-week curriculum (Appendix A). Vanessa Davies developed the curriculum in 1999 for the Colorado regional office of the ADL. However, Colorado was only able to implement the program as part of mandatory requirements for juvenile detention centers. The San Diego regional office of the ADL augmented this curriculum to use locally and was able to successfully collaborate with the court to have the youth court-ordered to participate in the program so that it could be executed as originally designed.

As a part of this program, the youth met for twelve weeks and attended one two-hour session per week. The Program Director, who has a Master of Social Work and is an Associate Clinical Social Worker (working under the supervision of a Licensed Social Worker), and a volunteer who had completed facilitator training, facilitated the twelve groups. The volunteers who helped co-facilitate attended a half-day training and received a copy of the curriculum. The co-facilitators for PATHWAYS to Tolerance were generally Probation Officers and other law enforcement personnel. These sessions alternated between experiential, team building, and psychotherapeutic processes disguised as play. Rather than just discussing bias and prejudice, these activities helped the youth understand and respond to these concepts in a safe, therapeutic environment. The sessions also included an educational component and a period for processing what was taught. The co-facilitators took turns explaining concepts and ideas related to bias and tolerance and provided the youth with opportunities for discussion to help them process and remember the information. Some sessions also included interaction with victims of hate, such as a holocaust survivor. One session was dedicated to an all-day field trip to the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles, California.
As described in the curriculum, the first two sessions focus on defining and understanding concepts that involve prejudice and bias-motivation. The goal of session three is to help the youth understand how they are situated in society and recognize their privileges or lack of privileges. Sessions four through eight highlight specific suspects and victims of hate by educating the youth about hate crime law, gangs and hate groups, genocide, and diverse sexual orientations. The remaining four sessions introduce effective communications skills and non-violent conflict resolution. There also is an emphasis on the results of bias-motivated attitudes that result in action and the benefits of thinking before acting. Program participants were required to keep a journal every week, in which they discussed their reactions and thoughts about that week’s topic.

Program Goals and Objectives

The main goal of PATHWAYS to Tolerance is to decrease participants’ risk of committing a hate crime by increasing his/her tolerance of those who are different, demonstrated through changes in attitudes and behaviors. As stated in the San Diego ADL’s (2002b) curriculum for PATHWAYS to Tolerance, the primary objectives of the program included the following:

- acknowledge personal biases;
- begin to formulate a sense of identity that is not based upon being different or better than others;
- take responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors;
- develop non-violent conflict resolution skills;
- develop the ability to identify with individuals who are perceived as “different,”
- empathize with victims of hate crimes; and
- have a positive group experience with members of other racial, cultural, or religious groups.

Program Implementation and Modification

The term of the grant was from March 1, 2002, to March 31, 2004. However, as the timeline in Table 1.1 shows, PATHWAYS to Tolerance started the first group session on September 25, 2002. The delay in program implementation was due to several factors, including:

- late hiring of the Program Director in June 2002;
- continued development of the curriculum after March 2002;
- implementing policies and procedures in order for the program to function; and
- developing a referral system that included the Juvenile Court and Probation.

Since September 2002, ten sessions were started and nine were completed. The tenth session will finish by the end of March 2004. Table 1.1 also shows the milestones for the program. Agency staffing changes directly affected the Program Director by increasing her responsibilities. From April 2003 to July 2003, she was responsible for reviewing referrals and ensuring all paperwork was completed for participants prior to program entry, creating participant files, conducting intake interviews, facilitating group sessions, completing case notes, and communicating with Probation Officers about the progress of the youth. Due to funding reductions, the ADL could hire only a part-time Program Assistant to assist the Director. The position originally was expected to be full-time. Even with the challenges faced, there was no staff turnover in the Program Director position during the program period.
Table 1.1
PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE MAJOR MILESTONES
PATHWAYS to Tolerance Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk
of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Endowment grant awarded to the ADL</td>
<td>March 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering committee began meeting</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ADL hired a Program Director for PATHWAYS to Tolerance</td>
<td>June 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 started (5 participants)</td>
<td>September 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First co-facilitator training</td>
<td>October 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 started (5 participants)</td>
<td>November 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director/Director of Education position vacated</td>
<td>December 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 started (11 participants)</td>
<td>January 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 started (5 participants)</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for prevention program was reduced from the grant award</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to inability to implement this component</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second co-facilitator training</td>
<td>March 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant position vacated</td>
<td>April 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5 started (5 participants)</td>
<td>April 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6 started (6 participants)</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7 started (4 participants)</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Assistant position filled</td>
<td>July 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer facilitators start</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8 started (5 participants)</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 9 started (3 participants)</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 10 started (9 participants - still in progress)</td>
<td>January 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the end of the grant term, the ADL will discontinue running group sessions after March 31, 2004. However, the steering committee currently is looking for other funding sources so the program can continue.
REPORT OVERVIEW

The remainder of this report provides the details about the evaluation efforts and the results of the hypothesis testing. Chapter 2 provides the framework concerning how the process and impact evaluations were conducted and includes the four hypotheses that were tested. The results of the process evaluation are included in Chapter 3. These include processes such as program implementation, reaching the target population, rate of successful completion, and program participation by the participants. Chapter 4 provides the results of the impact evaluation, which was aimed at measuring the risk of youth for committing a hate crime or bias motivated offense through decreased recidivism, increasing knowledge of tolerance, and a change in attitudes. Chapter 5 includes narratives for seven case studies from a diverse group of youth who completed the program. Lastly, Chapter 6 explains the limitations of research and makes recommendations for future research and other agencies considering implementing a similar program.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Key components of the evaluation include documenting how the program was implemented, describing the population served, and measuring the success of the program in decreasing the risk of committing a hate crime by increasing the youths’ tolerance of those who are different. The current chapter includes information about the process and impact evaluations conducted by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the hypotheses that were tested, as well as a baseline description of the youth who participated in the program from September 1, 2002, through January 31, 2004.

PROCESS EVALUATION

Background and Process

An assessment of the process of program implementation is valuable for two reasons. First, it facilitates future program replication because past obstacles can be avoided and successes duplicated. Second, it helps to place the findings of the impact evaluation in context. A variety of quantitative and qualitative tools were used, including standardized measures, surveys, meeting minutes, and case studies. All data collection instruments and surveys are included in Appendix B.

To determine if PATHWAYS to Tolerance was implemented as designed, the following research questions were addressed. Results from the process evaluation are presented in Chapter 3.

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: PATHWAYS to Tolerance was implemented as originally designed.

Specific Research Questions

- Was the program implemented as originally designed?
- Did the stakeholders perceive the program as effective in reducing the risk of youth to commit bias-motivated incidents or hate crimes?
Data Sources

As part of the process evaluation, steering committee members, key community leaders, and program staff completed a questionnaire toward the end of the grant period. The purpose of this questionnaire was to gather stakeholders’ perceptions about the program’s development, implementation, progress, and value.

Minutes also were taken at the monthly steering committee meetings, at which the progress of the program and modifications was discussed.

Analyses

The analyses of these data were purely descriptive, using frequencies to present the views held by steering committee members, community leaders, and program staff.

Sample Description

The stakeholder survey was created by SANDAG and completed by the respondent online. It consisted of open-ended and multiple choice questions and was sent to 19 stakeholders who were helpful in designing and implementing PATHWAYS to Tolerance. The response rate was 68 percent, with 13 individuals from a variety of agencies completing the survey. Figure 2.1 shows who completed the survey by the agencies they represented. The respondents represented Probation (46%), followed by law enforcement (15%), community-based organizations (15%), court (8%), schools (8%), and ADL staff (8%).

The majority of the stakeholders knew about the program because they were on the steering committee (38%) or had communicated individually with program staff (38%). The remaining respondents either had attended a presentation about the program (8%) or heard of it from a Probation Officer (8%). One respondent (8%) was an ADL staff member who also served as a facilitator (not shown).

Hypothesis 2: The program will serve clients who have committed a hate crime or bias-motivated incident, or who are at risk of such.

Specific Research Questions

- Did the program reach the intended client population?
- What was the level of risk for participants?

Data Sources

Five sources were used to assess whether the target population was appropriately reached. Bias motivation of the current offense and the reason why the youth was court-ordered to participate in the program was assessed using the Probation Officer report, which was included in the ADL client file.
The second source used was the intake interview. During the intake process, the Program Director completed an intake interview to assess if the youth referred was appropriate for the program. The interview also included questions about the youth’s and his or her family and friends’ prejudice, gang identification, and negative experiences with individuals. Researchers made copies of the intake interview from the case file, entered the responses into a Microsoft Word document, and then coded the responses, allowing the intake interview to be quantitatively analyzed.

The intake interview also provided information for SANDAG researchers to complete the Bias Screening Tool, the third data source. This tool provided a method of quantifying bias by scoring responses provided by the youth during the intake interview. The Bias Screening Tool includes a checklist to rate biased attitudes and behaviors on a scale from none to significant. There are 30 items in 9 categories that were assessed, including personal characteristics, family/friends’ ethnic/racial attitudes, family and friends’ religious attitudes, family/friends’ attitudes toward other groups, personal beliefs, peers’ beliefs, personal experiences, and individual and group behavior. Each of the 30 items was rated as “none,” “mild,” “moderate,” or “significant.” Overall bias scores could range from 0 to 90. Scores ranging from 1 to 30 indicated mild bias, 31 to 60 moderate bias, and 61 to 90 significant bias. Mild signifies the presence of the characteristic, belief, or attitude but
The fourth data source was the Self In Society worksheet. This questionnaire was administered in the first few weeks of the program in order to help the youth understand how they are similar to and different from other people. Like the intake interview, researchers made copies of the Self In Society worksheet and the responses were entered and coded.

The fifth source of data was the San Diego Regional Resiliency Checkup (SDRRC). This instrument was completed by the referring Probation Officer prior to program entry and again after program exit. This standardized instrument includes 30 protective factors that potentially buffer an adolescent against delinquency and 30 risk factors that may contribute to delinquency. The sum of these factors produces a protective score and a risk score; when combined, these items yield a resiliency score. The SDRRC scores were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and the data were cleaned and analyzed.

Analyses

Frequencies and measures of central tendency were used to analyze these data. Statistical tests were conducted to determine the significance of differences between pre- and post-tests.

Hypothesis 3: Clients referred to PATHWAYS to Tolerance will complete the program and actively participate.

Specific Research Questions

- Were participants actively engaged in the program?
- Which clients were most likely to successfully complete the program?

Data Sources

Data concerning active engagement in the program were obtained from the six- and twelve-week reports to the Probation Officer that were completed by the group facilitator and a matched comparison was conducted.

Client characteristics, such as substance use, gang/non-inclusive group association, and criminal history, were collected from the ADL’s client case files. A review of these characteristics for clients who successfully or unsuccessfully completed the program helped determine the characteristics of youth who were most likely to complete the program. Successful completion was defined by the program as attending the twelve-week sessions with fewer than two tardies or absences. Likewise, exit SDRRCS were analyzed to conclude if protective or risk factors contributed to status of completion.

Analyses

The data are presented using frequencies, cross tabulations, and measures of central tendency. Tests of significance were used when sample size permitted.
Sample

Since September 2002, PATHWAYS to Tolerance received 90 referrals, 62 of which were deemed appropriate for the program and participation. Five of the youth who were referred had their probation terminated before they could start the program. In addition, three never came to the intake interview or to the first session; two youth could not participate because they were serving custody time; one youth had run away from home; and one could not participate because the parent would not sign the consent form. Due to the conclusion of the program, 16 youth who were referred could not participate. These youth will be able to participate if further funding is obtained from other sources.

IMPACT EVALUATION

Background and Process

Although a true experimental design would have been preferred, due to unavailability of a control group, a pre-post design was used for the impact evaluation. Impact outcomes were measured by comparing a pre-test with a post-test. Particularly, recidivism was measured at the end of the program intervention and six months after program completion to determine if the youth had re-offended by committing any bias-motivated offenses. Additionally, knowledge about tolerance was measured using a pre- and post-test survey, which was administered prior to entering the program and at the last session. The SDRRC was administered prior to program entry and after completion and was compared in a pre-post analysis.

Statement of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 4: Participants in PATHWAYS to Tolerance decreased their risk of committing a hate crime or bias-motivated crime by increasing their tolerance toward those who are different.

Specific Research Questions

- Was participation related to a decreased probability that the youth would re-offend by committing a hate crime or bias-motivated crime?
- Was participation related to an increase in knowledge about tolerance and personal biases?
- Was participation related to an increase in understanding of personal biases and a commitment to addressing them?
- Was participation related to a decrease in risk factors and an increase in protective factors?

Data Sources

SANDAG researchers created a data collection instrument to capture demographic information, criminal history, and instances of re-offending during the intervention period and the six-month follow-up. Data concerning criminal history and the current offense were collected from the ADL case files. Re-offense data were collected from the Regional Juvenile Information System (REJIS) and
the Probation Case Management System (PCMS). In December 2003, PCMS replaced REJIS as the system used by the Juvenile Court, the District Attorney’s office, and Probation to input information about arrests, referrals, sustained petitions, minute orders, and case management. The same information was provided in both systems, only the format changed. Re-offense data were collected twice for comparison: first, at the end of the twelve-week session (intervention period), and then six months after the end of the intervention (follow-up).

Risk and protective factors were measured using the SDRRC. This tool was administered prior to entry into PATHWAYS to Tolerance and after exiting the program and matched tests were analyzed.

Changes in tolerance were measured by a pre- and post-test, collaboratively developed by ADL staff and SANDAG researchers. This 16-item test, with multiple-choice and open-ended questions, was administered to the youth on the first and last days of the program.

Items on the Program Director’s six-week and twelve-week report to Probation also were used in the impact evaluation to measure development of tolerance and the youths’ ability to admit and commit to addressing personal biases.

Analyses

Frequencies and measures of central tendency were used to describe the data. Tests of significance were applied when sample size permitted.

Sample Description

Sixty-two (62) youth participated in ten groups. Nine groups completed all twelve sessions before this report was prepared. The groups started in September 2002, and the number of participants in each group varied from three to eleven.

Demographic Information

The majority of youth (81%) who participated in PATHWAYS to Tolerance were male (not shown). More than three quarters (76%) of the participants identified themselves as White¹ and about one in five (15%) were Black (Figure 2.2). The average age of the youth was 16.4 years, with a range of 11.8 to 20.6 years. Most of the youth (94%) were between 13 and 18 years old. However, a few young adults had committed a hate crime as a juvenile but were convicted as an adult and had reached adulthood by the time PATHWAYS to Tolerance was implemented. Compared to local 2002 population estimates, which show Whites as comprising 40 percent of the population under 18 years old, Whites were over represented as program participants (SANDAG, 2002).

¹ The ethnic groups in this report are referred to as Hispanic, White, Black, Asian, and Others in the text. While many people may prefer to identify themselves as African-American rather than Black, Latino rather than Hispanic, or as a member of a particular ethnic group rather than White or Asian, SANDAG uses the terminology consistent with the 2000 Census questionnaire.
Participant Profile

Table 2.1 illustrates the profile of the youth before they participated in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. This table includes information about the youths’ living arrangements, city of residence, substance use, history of child abuse or neglect, and gang affiliation. The table also includes the percentage of youth who associated with a non-inclusive group, defined as groups that are not recognized by the criminal justice system as a street gang; but these groups do restrict membership to individuals of the same identifying group (i.e., White supremacists).

Over three-quarters (76%) of the youth had their mother and around one-half (47%) had their father living in the home. However, only slightly more than one-fourth (26%) had both their mother and father living in the home (not shown). Nineteen percent (19%) were living with a step-parent and 18 percent of the youth lived with another relative. Participants resided throughout San Diego County, with the greatest number living in the City of San Diego (32%), followed by Santee (19%), El Cajon (16%), and Lakeside (11%).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
<th>76%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-parent</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Relative</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Residence 2</th>
<th>32%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santee</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Beach</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemon Grove</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Prior Self-Report or Documented Child Abuse/Neglect 3 | 34% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Use Prior to Program Entry1, 3</th>
<th>75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Use</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gang Identification 29%
Non-Inclusive Group Association 10%

TOTAL 47 - 62

---

1 Percentages are based upon multiple responses.
2 Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.
3 Cases with missing information are not included.
Thirty-four percent (34%) of the youth had experienced child abuse or neglect. Many of the youth had used substances prior to program entry. Three-quarters (75%) each had a history of drug use or alcohol use. The rate of drug use for participants was extremely high compared to a national average of 12 percent for youth ages 12 to 17. However, substance use is reported to be from 21 percent to 69 percent nationally if the youth are involved in delinquent behavior such as serious fighting, carrying a handgun, or stealing (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2003).

Almost three in ten youth were in a gang (29%) and one in ten associated with a non-inclusive group (10%). Of the six youth who identified with a non-inclusive group, three were Skinheads, two were White supremacists, and one associated with White pride (not shown).

Criminal History

The review of the participants’ criminal history revealed that for many, their current offense was their first contact with the juvenile justice system. Over one-half (53%) of the program participants did not have a referral prior to the current offense and over three-quarters (81%) did not have a sustained petition. A referral is a written request from a police department, school, or parent asking the juvenile court to take action regarding a specific illegal act by a juvenile. A petition is a legal document filed by the District Attorney formally charging a juvenile with certain delinquent or incorrigible acts. A petition is sustained if the charge is found to be true. For the 29 youth who had a prior referral, the majority (52%) had a referral for a misdemeanor, followed by 38 percent with a felony, 7 percent with a status offense and, for 3 percent, the level of the referral was unknown because the juvenile record was from another state (not shown). A status offense is defined as an offense that is a crime by virtue of the offender being under 18 years old (i.e., curfew violation), whereas a criminal offense is defined as a 602 offense.

The type of referral for almost one-half (45%) of the prior referrals was for violent offenses, followed by 21 percent for property offenses. Other misdemeanors accounted for 17 percent of the prior offenses. These included arrests for crimes such as disorderly conduct, trespassing, purchasing tobacco, and obstructing justice. The remaining referrals were for status offenses (7%), drug offenses (3%), and other felonies (3%). The charge for the one other felony was for a lewd act with a child. Three percent of the prior referrals were for an unknown type. Only five percent of the youth had a prior referral for which bias motivation could be determined (not shown). Bias-motivation was collected from the Probation Officer’s report to the court and was determined to exist when the researcher could identify, by the description of the incident, that the youth had committed the offense based primarily upon prejudice toward another person and such prejudice was exhibited by words or actions. Such words may have included derogatory racial terms or the youth admitted his prejudicial motivation to the Probation Officer. Actions included such things as a youth using the hail Hitler salute in front of a Black youth.

Current Offense

The criteria for program participation was that the youth was on formal or informal probation supervision and was at risk of committing a hate or bias-motivated offense because of prior biased incidents, prejudiced beliefs and attitudes, affiliation with a group that discriminates membership, and/or having tattoos or symbols of hate.
For over one-half (55%) of the participants, their current offense involved a hate crime or bias-motivated offense (not shown). Figure 2.3 shows the bias type for the 34 youth whose current offense involved a hate crime or bias-motivated incident. Youth were most likely to commit a crime that was racially motivated (71%). For the remaining referrals, bias-motivation was based upon religious affiliation for 18 percent, 15 percent were committed against individuals based upon sexual orientation, and 3 percent involved age-related bias. An enhancement was charged to 24 percent of the youth and a true finding was made for a hate crime enhancement for 20 percent of those with a sustained petition (not shown). A sentencing enhancement for a hate crime increases the allowable penalties for time in jail for certain bias-motivated felonies. This proportion for bias-motivation is comparable to the rate for California. The report Hate Crime in California 2002 Trend Data shows that, from 1997 to 2002, 60 percent or more of the hate crimes were racially-motivated. In 2002, 63 percent of hate crimes were based upon racial bias, followed by 22 percent that were based upon sexual orientation, and 14 based upon religion (Criminal Justice Statistics Center, 2003).

Figure 2.3
BIAS MOTIVATION FOR RECENT REFERRAL
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

Note: Percentages based upon multiple responses.
In response to the most recent referral, the court acted in a variety of ways. Figure 2.4 shows the supervision level for program clients at the time they entered the program. The majority (74%) of the youth were active 602 wards of the court. Additionally, 16 percent were on informal probation and 3 percent were 601 wards. Juveniles who have been adjudicated because of a criminal act are 602 wards of the court whereas, 601 wards are those who have committed status offenses. A few of the youth (6%) were convicted as adult felons for their charges and were on adult probation.

Figure 2.4
CLIENT PROBATION STATUS AT INTAKE
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

Note: Percentages do not equal 100 due to rounding.
All of the youth who participated in the program had a recent referral to Probation. The highest charge for 50 percent of the referrals was for a felony and 45 percent were for a misdemeanor. The rest were for status offenses and probation violations (not shown). Figure 2.5 shows the types of charges on the current referral. One-half (50%) of the clients had committed a violent offense and over one-third (35%) committed a property offense. The remaining 15 percent of the referrals were for other misdemeanors or felonies (10%), status offenses (3%), and probation violations (2%). Other misdemeanors and felonies included crimes such as possessing a weapon at school and driving while under the influence of alcohol.
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**Figure 2.5**
**HIGHEST REFERRAL TYPE FOR THE CURRENT REFERRAL**
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

- Violent: 50%
- Property: 35%
- Other Misdemeanor or Felony: 10%
- Status: 3%
- Probation Violation: 2%

**TOTAL =62**
The petitions were sustained for 95 percent of the youth. For these 59 youth, the level of the referral was nearly split between felonies and misdemeanors, with 49 percent with the highest petition sustained for a felony and 47 percent for a misdemeanor. In addition, three percent were status offenses. When considering the type of charge that was sustained, slightly more than one-half (51%) were for a violent offense and 37 percent were for a property offense. Other types of offenses included other felonies or misdemeanors (10%), and status (3%). Of the 22 referrals for a violent offense, 82 percent had a racial bias-motivation. Religious bias-motivation accounted for 44 percent of the property crimes, followed by 22 percent each for bias based upon sexual orientation and race (not shown).

Many of the youth had been court-ordered to pay fines, pay victim restitution, or complete community service. Figure 2.6 describes the percentage of youth with these court orders upon program entry. More than three-quarters (82%) of the youth were ordered to complete community service, and over one-half were ordered to pay a fine (59%) and/or victim restitution (53%).

Figure 2.6
PARTICIPANTS WITH COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

TOTAL = 62
More than one-third of the youth (38%) had received an institutional commitment for the current offense. Youth who had a commitment were sentenced within the following durations: less than three months (8%), three to six months (25%), six to twelve months (38%), and more than one year (8%). There were also 21 percent who were ordered an institutional commitment but had already completed the time prior to the commitment (not shown).

SUMMARY

The majority of the 62 participants was male and around two-thirds were White. Few of the participants had prior contact with the juvenile justice system through a referral or sustained petition. Over one-half of the participants had a referral that was bias-motivated, with the majority as racially-motivated. Youth who had referrals with bias-motivation were most likely to commit a violent crime against someone based upon race, whereas individuals who committed property crimes were more likely to have a bias based upon religion. As a result of their offenses, most of the youth were under formal Probation supervision. The majority had court orders to complete community service, almost two-thirds were ordered to pay victim restitution, and over one-half were ordered to pay a fine.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the report presents the findings for the process evaluation. The first three research hypotheses are addressed, which pertain to whether the program was implemented as designed, the appropriate population was targeted, and the youth completed the program and actively participated.

STAKEHOLDERS’ ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

A month prior to the end of PATHWAYS to Tolerance, the stakeholders completed an online survey in order to provide their views on program implementation. Many of the respondents were directly involved with program implementation as members of the steering committee (62%) or co-facilitated during the group sessions (31%). Only one respondent stated that their primary reason for contact was to make referrals (not shown).

Was the program implemented as originally designed?

According to the stakeholders, the primary goals of PATHWAYS to Tolerance included the following:

- to teach tolerance toward individuals of different races, religions, and sexual orientations;
- to educate youth about the negative effect of their attitudes and behavior on others;
- to provide therapy to help the youth modify their biased beliefs and attitudes; and
- to expose youth to a diverse mix of cultural, sexual, and religious lifestyles.

Based upon these goals, 85 percent of the stakeholders felt that the program implemented “all” or “most” of the goals. However, 65 percent also thought that there were challenges to program implementation. One of the challenges, mentioned several times, was in educating Probation Officers about the program and ensuring that they referred the appropriate youth. In addition, one respondent said, “The population being served is transitory; as they move through the [juvenile justice] system, they may or may not be able to attend all groups.” Since the program included only twelve sessions, the policy was that youth could not miss or be tardy to more than two sessions. Youth often were terminated from the program for violating this policy.
Another respondent noted that a challenge was that the youth had other issues that needed to be addressed and, therefore, could have benefited from follow-up counseling with the Program Director. However, as the program was designed and because of ADL policies, such counseling could not be provided; rather, the Program Director used the six- and twelve-week Probation Officer reports to highlight recommended referrals to other services.

The stakeholders also mentioned that a challenge was in changing embedded biased beliefs. However, the goal of the program was not to change beliefs but to educate the youth about tolerance and how their attitudes and beliefs affect others, in order to keep the youth from committing future bias-motivated offenses or hate crimes.

Respondents were asked to evaluate the referral process for PATHWAYS to Tolerance. Even though 15 percent of the stakeholders specifically noted the referral process as a challenge to implementation, 90 percent of those who used the referral process said they were satisfied with it. One respondent suggested that the referral process could be improved by allowing youth who had not been court-ordered to the program to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. However, youth did not have to be court-ordered in order to be able to participate. In addition, 90 percent of the stakeholders also were satisfied with the process for receiving feedback concerning the referrals. One respondent was not satisfied. It was noted that it was helpful for the Probation Officer to know about the first absence in order to help ensure the youth did not miss another group session.

All of the respondents noted that their experience with the program was positive. Through the survey, they had the opportunity to discuss what they thought were the most effective components of the program. Several stated that the field trip to the Museum of Tolerance was the most effective component. One respondent explained, “I have heard a lot of the minors on my caseload state that the museum was a wake-up call.” Stakeholders also applauded the staff for the excellent job they did in getting the youth involved in the program. One mentioned that the Program Director’s style in speaking with the youth “allowed her to reflect their opinions and belief systems back on them.” Others felt that the program covered appropriate topics and helped the youth develop insight on how their behavior negatively affects others. There were a wide variety of positive experiences that the stakeholders had with the program, including being able to co-facilitate and discuss issues of tolerance with youth, seeing participants become role models for other youth in the program, using a simple referral process, and observing the enthusiasm of staff. One respondent stated that, as a co-facilitator, “this experience has given me a deeper appreciation of the program’s goals and it has allowed me to learn about the current issues youth face.” Simply stated, another stakeholder responded that he/she liked “seeing youth change for the better.”

Only two respondents discussed negative experiences. One stakeholder mentioned that it was difficult seeing how entrenched some of the youth were in their beliefs. The other explained, “It would seem that many youth were unable to finish the program due to absences. If the program was changed to a more therapeutic environment, I believe that it would help the youth complete the program.”
Did the stakeholders perceive the program as effective in reducing the risk of youth to commit bias-motivated incidents or hate crimes?

The stakeholders were asked how useful they thought the program was in addressing prejudice and bias. Over 90 percent thought it was “very useful” and only one respondent (8%) thought it was “somewhat useful.” Sixty-two percent (62%) thought the program was “very effective” in reducing the risk of the youth to commit a bias-motivated or hate crime, while about one-third (31%) thought it was “somewhat effective” and only one respondent (8%) thought it was “not very effective” in this regard. Some stakeholders held a pessimistic attitude about behavioral change and stated that, for some youth, their bias will never change. Recommendations made to improve the effectiveness of reducing risk included providing the program at a location in East County, having parents attend sessions with their children or having a similar program targeted to parents, and including more therapeutic components to the program.

The target population for the program was youth and young adults on probation who were at risk of committing a bias-motivated offense or hate crime. Over three-quarters (83%) of the respondents thought that this target population was appropriate for the program. The other two (17%) respondents thought this group was “somewhat appropriate” and recommended that other youth who had less or no contact with law enforcement also could benefit from the program.

CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

Did the program reach the intended client population?

The target population for PATHWAYS to Tolerance was youth and young adults who were at risk of committing a hate crime or bias-motivated incident. Research has shown that there are several motivations for individuals to commit hate crimes. These types of crimes may be committed with the intent to terrorize a broad social group or to show hate of a social group. A crime of vandalism, in which anti-Semitic graffiti is scrawled on the wall of a synagogue, is perpetrated in order to terrorize. Another motivation for a hate crime is to target another person based upon fear or despising another group. For example, a member of a White supremacist group might assault a Black man in order to make a statement about not accepting Blacks. Lastly, motivation may be based upon status and elevating one’s self-esteem among peers. A gang member who attacks another racial group might be hoping his status will increase in the eyes of his peers (Green, McFalls, Smith, 2001).

Researchers reviewed the Probation Officer’s report, which provided a summary of the circumstances leading to the program referral, in order to code why the youth was referred to the program. Youth who are involved in gangs or non-inclusive groups, identify with White supremacy or White pride, or have a history of bias-motivated behaviors may be at risk of committing hate crimes in the future (Green, McFalls, and Smith 2001). In addition, the program was designed to address bias that has not resulted in action but is apparent in attitudes and beliefs. By addressing bias at this stage, it was hoped that the youth understand how their attitudes and beliefs can affect others if they go unchecked. This section of the report reviews the reasons the youth were referred to PATHWAYS to Tolerance and assesses their level of bias through the Bias Screening Tool.
Figure 3.1 shows that 40 percent of the youth were referred because they were a member or associated with a gang or non-inclusive group. Other reasons for referral included committing a bias-motivated incident (32%), having tattoos or other signs (such as swastikas or iron crosses on clothing) (21%), and committing a hate crime (16%). The remaining 16 percent were referred for other non-criminal reasons, such as prior association with White supremacist group or at risk of joining a White supremacist group because relatives were members.

Figure 3.1
REASON FOR REFERRAL TO PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

Note: Percentages based upon multiple responses.
Assessment of Bias During Intake

An intake interview was conducted by the Program Director prior to the youth participating in the program. This interview provides information on the bias, prejudice, and attitudes of family and friends toward groups that are different from them.

Analysis of the intake interview shows the following regarding bias and prejudice:

- Almost three-quarters (73%) of the participants admitted that they knew someone who was involved in a group that does not like people of other races, religions, and/or sexual orientations.

- Two-thirds (66%) discussed a negative experience that they or someone they knew had with a person of another race, religion, or sexual orientation.

- One-third (33%) admitted that they were members of a gang or non-inclusive group.

The Self in Society worksheet also provided some interesting viewpoints of the youth concerning equality in the United States. These include:

- Over one-half (60%) believed that inequality is due to social injustice.

- Almost one-quarter (24%) believed that inequality is justified because some races or ethnicities are better than others.

Risk for committing a bias-motivated or hate crime also was measured by the Bias Screening Tool, which was developed by the ADL. Overall bias scores can range from 0 to 90. Scores ranging from 1 to 30 indicate mild bias, 31 to 60 moderate bias, and 61 to 90 significant bias. The average score for the 56 youth for which a Bias Screening Tool could be completed was 18.4 and ranged from 0 to 49, showing that, on average, participants entered the program with a mild bias score. Since the Bias Screening Tool was completed using the participant intake interviews, the bias score could be lower than the youth’s actual level of bias because bias could be under-reported by the youth.
The overall average bias score indicates a mild level of bias for the participants. However, analyses of specific factors on the instrument revealed that youth entered the program with higher levels of bias toward other races and religions and were influenced by family and friends concerning such bias. As noted earlier, a moderate score indicates an active intolerance that warrants a slight degree of concern, whereas a significant score warrants serious concern. Figure 3.2 describes the percent of youth who were rated as having a moderate or significant level of the top five bias characteristics. The greatest percent of youth (47%) had family and/or friends who showed active dislike toward other races. This might be exhibited through verbal statements such as “we hate them” or hostility to the point of violence. Over one-third (39%) of the youth had been involved in group incidents where racial or religious slurs were used to incite conflict or threaten violence and 37 percent agreed with their family and friends’ negative attitudes toward other races or religions. Also, one-third (34%) of the participants had family members and/or friends who were intolerant toward other religions or used religious stereotypes that invoke fear and may influence their actions against others by purposefully using inflammatory language such as “kyke.”
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**Figure 3.2**

PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS WITH THE TOP FIVE BIAS CHARACTERISTICS

PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family/Friends Use Religious Stereotypes</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Friends Lack Tolerance Toward Other Religions</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees With Friends/ Family Negative Attitudes Toward Races</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates With Group That Verbally Assaults</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Friends Lack Tolerance Toward Other Races</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL = 62**

Note: Cases with missing information are not included.
Figure 3.3, which depicts the lowest five bias characteristics, indicates that the youth had low levels of bias concerning prior victimization and involvement in serious bias-motivated offenses. Specifically, four of the five lowest categories were for involvement in bias-motivated crimes or victimization. These included being involved in an offense that involved a weapon (2%), being a victim of a property crime (3%) or incident that involved a weapon (4%), and being involved in a property crime that was bias-motivated (8%). The Bias Screening Tool revealed that only ten percent of the participants acknowledged being members of a street gang. It should be noted that while bias scores for these five characteristics were relatively low, it does not factor in mild levels of bias in these areas, of which many of the youth demonstrated, especially regarding involvement in a bias-motivated offense. These data may indicate that, for these youth, bias and prejudice are based less upon previous victimization and involvement in crime, and are more related to influence of friends and family.

Note: cases with missing information are not included.
What was the level of risk for participants?

Risk also was assessed through the San Diego Regional Resiliency Checkup (SDRRC). Information from the SDRRC was available for 53 participants. Figure 3.4 shows the percent of participants with at least one risk factor in the six domains. The greatest percent (96%) of participants was at risk on the peer and individual domains. Risk factors in the peer domain include being socially isolated, having few pro-social acquaintances, maintaining gang affiliations/associations, having delinquent friends, and not having a meaningful relationship with any adult. Factors in the individual domain include not having pro-social interests, being supportive of delinquency, having anger management issues, demonstrating sensation-seeking behavior, and being manipulative and deceitful. A high percentage of participants also were at risk in terms of delinquency (92%), education (91%), family (81%), and substance use (77%).

Figure 3.4
PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS AT RISK AT INTAKE
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004
Figure 3.5 shows the six risk factors that were associated with the greatest level of risk. The most common risk factor, shared by 91 percent of the participants, was having delinquent friends (peer domain). In addition, almost nine in ten youth were described as having anger management issues (89%) (individual domain) and had demonstrated sensation-seeking behaviors (87%) (individual domain). Over eight in ten youth (83%) had poor academic achievement (education domain), and over three-quarters (77%) were described as being manipulative or deceitful (individual domain) and having a delinquent orientation (delinquency domain).

Figure 3.5
PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS WITH THE MOST COMMON RISK FACTORS AT INTAKE
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

TOTAL = 53
The youth who participated in this program had fewer protective factors than risk factors. The importance of protective factors is in their potential to buffer against delinquency. As Figure 3.6 shows, over three-quarters (79%) of the participants had at least one family protective factor, such as communicating well with parents, making constructive use of time, engaging in family activities, having family support, or having unconditional parental regard. In addition, over two-thirds (68%) had at least one protective factor in the peer domain and over one-half in the substance use (58%) and education (57%) domains. Less than one-half had a protective factor in terms of delinquency (49%) and individual (42%) domains. The delinquency and individual domains also had two of the highest risk scores, showing an inverse relationship. On average, the youth were highly at risk in the delinquency and individual domains and may have difficulty overcoming this risk as their protective factors in the same domains were low.

Figure 3.6
PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS WITH PROTECTIVE FACTORS AT INTAKE
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of
Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

TOTAL = 53
Figure 3.7 presents the percent of youth having the five most common protective factors. More than two-thirds (72%) were described as having unconditional regard from their parents (family domain). The percentage of youth with the other most common protective factors included two-thirds (66%) described as having family support (family domain), 53 percent as having someone to confide in (peer domain), 49 percent as being able to make friends (peer domain), and 47 percent as having parents who modeled healthy moderation pertaining to substance use (individual domain).

It is interesting to note that the fewest youth have protective factors in the following areas: positive peer relationships, effectively manages peer pressure, and manages stress well (4% each) (not shown). The absence of these protective factors, two of which concern peers, may be an indicator of the areas for these youth that have the greatest impact on their propensity to commit a hate crime or bias-motivated incident.
The highest possible score for both risk and protective factors is 30. With these scores in mind, the average protective score was 6.8, ranging from 0 to 26 (Figure 3.8). The average risk score was 17.1, ranging from 1 to 28. The adjusted resiliency score is derived by subtracting the risk score from the protective score. Since the youth were more likely to have higher risk scores than protective scores, the average adjusted resiliency score was -10.2, with a range from -26 to 25. Negative resiliency scores indicate fewer protective factors than risk factors. The participants entered the program with moderate risk scores and fairly low protective scores, resulting in a sample of youth who, at the start of the program, may not have had enough protective factors to overcome the risk in their lives.

Figure 3.8
AVERAGE PROTECTIVE, RISK, AND RESILIENCY SCORES AT INTAKE
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

TOTAL = 53
ENGAGEMENT AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Were participants actively engaged in the program?

Of the 62 participants, 53 had exited the program. Of these, 74 percent successfully completed the program (including successful reinstated) and 24 percent were unsuccessful (including unsuccessful reinstated) (Figure 3.9). Successful completion was defined by the program as attending the twelve weekly sessions with no more than two tardies or absences. Since PATHWAYS to Tolerance was a condition of probation for these youth, if unsuccessfully terminated, they had the option to reinstate and finish the program during another twelve-week session. The exit status for a youth was only changed to "successful reinstated" if the youth completed the program after he/she had been reinstated; whereas, “unsuccessful reinstated” defines the exit status of those youth who re-entered the program after unsuccessful completion the first time and did not complete the program after re-entry. On average, the youth attended ten of the twelve sessions and had one tardy (not shown).

Figure 3.9
PARTICIPANT EXIT STATUS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

TOTAL = 53
Six weeks into the program and at the end of the twelve-week session, the Program Director sent reports to each youth's Probation Officer to inform him or her about the client's progress in the program. Figure 3.10 depicts the progress of the youth at six and twelve weeks, as reported to Probation. The six-week report covers the first six weeks of the group and the twelve-week report covers the last six weeks. Matched six-week and twelve-week reports were available for 38 youth. If a report was not available, it was due to the youth having unsuccessfully exited the program prior to the reporting period, or they had not reached the end of the six- or twelve-week period.

As Figure 3.10 shows, for the six-week and twelve-week reports, over three-quarters (82% and 76%, respectively) attended all of the groups during both halves of the program. There was a slight drop in the percent of youth who completed the first and last six sessions without tardies (76% and 69%). Constructive contribution (84% and 84%) did not drop off after the first half of the program and active contribution also remained about the same (82% and 76%). As defined by the Program Director, constructive contribution refers to participation by youth, with or without verbal prompting from the facilitator, in which the youth provides comments that are related to the topic and their comments are honest and thoughtful. Active participation differs from constructive contribution in that the youth participates in discussions without verbal prompting from the facilitator.

Figure 3.10
PROGRESS REPORTS AT SIX AND TWELVE WEEKS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004
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Which clients were most likely to successfully complete the program?

Figures 3.11 through 3.15 provide a review of various characteristics, such as gang membership, substance abuse, criminal history, and having hate tattoos or other hate symbols that may be predictors of successful completion of the program. The category “successful” includes youth who successfully completed the program either after the first entry or after being reinstated. Likewise, “unsuccessful” includes the youth who did not complete the program and those who were reinstated yet still did not complete the program after the second entry. For the 53 youth that completed the program, 37 (70%) were successful and 15 (30%) were unsuccessful (not shown). Because the number of individuals in some groups was small, some caution should be used when interpreting these results.

Analysis of substance abuse showed that having a history of drug use did not significantly impact program completion. Successful and unsuccessful participants were equally as likely to have a history of drug use (73% versus 77%) (not shown).

Gang Identification and Non-Inclusive Group Association

Figure 3.11 depicts participants’ gang identification and non-inclusive group association by exit status. It appears that youth who identified with a gang were more likely to be successful compared to those who identified with a non-inclusive group. Youth who were successful were more likely to be a gang member than those who were unsuccessful (88% versus 25%). Those who were unsuccessful were more likely to be in a non-inclusive group than were successful participants (75% versus 13%, respectively).

Criminal History

Figure 3.11 compares exits status for youth who had no referrals and those who had one or more referrals prior to program entry. Successful participants were less likely than unsuccessful to have a prior referral (43% versus 69%), but the difference is not statistically significant.

Youth who were successful were actually more likely to have committed a bias-motivated offense than those who were unsuccessful (64% versus 33%). These data on bias-motivated crimes show that unsuccessful program completion may not be related to the participant’s involvement in a bias-motivated crime since many of the successful participants had previously committed a bias-motivated offense (not shown).
An analysis of characteristics that may impact program completion revealed that youth whose referral reason was for having hate tattoos or other hate symbols that signify prejudice and hate were less likely to be successful than those who were not referred for this reason. Over 80 percent (85%) of the successful clients did not have a tattoo or other symbol, whereas 54 percent of the unsuccessful clients did. This difference was significant ($\chi^2(1, N = 52) = 5.20$ $p < .05$). While tattoos and symbols may seem insignificant, for this population they symbolize the youth’s association with a hate group. These data support the analysis discussed earlier that showed youth who identified with a non-inclusive group were less likely to be successful compared to those that identify with a gang. Often, youth who wear symbols of hate and prejudice, associate or are members of hate groups (non-inclusive). Therefore it appears that the wearing of such symbols could be an indicator of risk.

Figure 3.11
PRIOR REFERRALS BY EXIT STATUS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

![Graph showing prior referrals by exit status](image)

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.
San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up

Intake SDRRCs were available for 41 of the 52 youth whose completion status was successful or unsuccessful. Figures 3.13 and 3.14 show the percent of youth with one or more risk factors in the six domains based upon exit status. Every one of the unsuccessful clients was at risk in each of the domains except substance use, of which over two-thirds (67%) were at-risk (Figure 3.13). Differences between risk scores for successful and unsuccessful clients were not significant.

Figure 3.12
PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS AT RISK AT INTAKE BY EXIT STATUS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004
The greatest difference for protective factors at intake in relation to exit status was in the delinquency domain, with 52 percent of the successful clients having had one or more protective factors compared to only 25 percent of the unsuccessful clients (Figure 3.14). Likewise, successful clients had more protective factors than those who were unsuccessful in the domains of family (79% versus 67%), substance use (62% versus 50%), education (59% versus 58%), and individual (41% versus 33%). Only in the peer domain was there a higher percentage of unsuccessful clients than successful (75% versus 55%, respectively). Differences between protective scores for successful and unsuccessful were not significant.

Figure 3.13
PERCENT OF PARTICIPANTS AT INTAKE WITH PROTECTIVE FACTORS BY EXIT STATUS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of
Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004
Figure 3.14 shows that, overall, intake resiliency scores were low for both groups. Likewise, the protective score was slightly higher and the risk score was slightly lower for the successful clients compared to unsuccessful. The differences between the means were not significant.

Figure 3.14
AVERAGE PROTECTIVE, RISK, AND RESILIENCY SCORES AT INTAKE BY EXIT STATUS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004
SUMMARY

The results of the process evaluation were discussed in this chapter. The majority of the stakeholders indicated that the program had implemented all or most of its goals. One of these goals was reaching the intended client population. This was achieved by including participants who had committed bias-motivated crimes, associated with gangs or non-inclusive groups, or had tattoos or other hate symbols. While the Bias Screening Tool indicated that participants entered the program with a mild bias score, moderate to significant bias was found in areas associated with family and friends’ influence on bias beliefs. Youth also entered the program with fewer protective factors and numerous risk factors, as indicated by the SDRRC.

The majority of youth (74%) successfully completed the program. Youth who were in a non-inclusive group were less likely to be successful. Similarly, youth with tattoos or symbols of hate were less likely than youth who did not have these symbols to be successful. A comparison of SDRRC scores showed that protective factors were slightly higher and risk factors were slightly lower for the successful compared to the unsuccessful clients.
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INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the impact evaluation. The hypotheses in the areas of re-offending, developing tolerance, risk factors, and complying with program objectives are stated and the results discussed.

CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

As discussed in Chapter 2, all of the youth referred to PATHWAYS to Tolerance had a referral to Probation; therefore, they all were at risk of committing another offense, and possibly one that was bias-motivated. Re-offense data were collected twice, first at the end of the program (intervention period) and then six months after the program (follow-up period).

Was participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance related to a decreased probability that the youth would re-offend by committing a hate or bias-motivated crime?

For the 53 youth who had completed the program (either successfully or unsuccessfully), only four (8%) had a referral for a new offense during the intervention period. None of the referrals were for a bias-motivated incident or hate crime. Of the four new referrals, three were misdemeanors and one was a felony. Only one of these youth (2%) had a sustained petition, which was for a misdemeanor. In addition, five of the youth (9%) received a probation violation during the intervention period for failure to comply with court orders, including not attending PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

Six-month follow-up data were available for 36 youth. Similar to the intervention period, the recidivism rate remained low for program participants, with just two youth (6%) having a referral for a new offense, only one of whom had a sustained petition. However, four youth (11%) were charged with a probation violation and two (6%) received an institutional commitment. Even though a few youth had referrals during the intervention period or at the six-month follow-up, none of the youth had a referral for a bias-motivated or hate crime (not shown).
As expected, since most of these youth did not have previous contact with the juvenile justice system, the recidivism rate for program participants was low. Due to this low rate, the analyses between successful and unsuccessful clients did not yield significant results. All four of the referrals during the intervention period were for youth who had successfully completed, and the two referrals during the follow-up period were split between successful and unsuccessful.

KNOWLEDGE CHANGE

Was participation related to an increase in knowledge about tolerance and personal biases?

Pre- and post-tests were administered to measure the change in knowledge about biases and attitudes. Table 4.1 shows the answers for the pre- and post-tests for the eleven multiple choice questions. Only the cases that had both a pre- and post-tests were used for analysis.
In the pre-test, the question most often answered incorrectly pertained to the sexual orientation of pedophiles. Only 21 percent of the youth answered this question correctly. The greatest change between the pre- and post-test responses was for this question as well, with 71 percent answering it correctly in the post-test. This increase in the post-test score was significant (McNemar, n=34, \( p<.001 \)). The second question most often answered incorrectly concerned the definition for bias. The change in the percentage of correct answers increased from 41 percent to 53 percent, though the difference was not significant. The third question most often answered incorrectly on the pre-test pertained to the kinds of feelings that can produce prejudice. The percentage increased from 56 percent on the pre-test to 79 percent on the post-test, which was significant (McNemar, n=34, \( p<.05 \)). The question pertaining to defining scapegoat was the fourth question most often answered incorrectly on the pre-test and the change from 71 percent to 94 percent was significant (McNemar, n=34, \( p<.05 \)).

Table 4.1
PERCENT OF CORRECT ANSWERS FOR THE PRE- AND POST-TESTS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

| Possible to change behavior even though attitudes may stay the same | 94% | 94% |
| Program is designed to help the youth take responsibility for offense | 85% | 91% |
| When stereotyping, people are not considered as individuals | 88% | 79% |
| Homophobia is defined as people who fear and dislike homosexuals | 82% | 88% |
| During the Holocaust, 6,000,000 Jewish people were killed | 76% | 88% |
| Prejudices are unfavorable attitudes toward any person or group of people and these attitudes are not based upon facts | 74% | 82% |
| Eighty percent of hate crimes are committed by people under the age of 21 | 71% | 79% |
| Scapegoating involves blaming others for own issues | 71% | 94% |
| Feelings that can cause prejudice include fear, anger, and frustration | 56% | 79% |
| Bias is a negative or positive belief about a person who has a “different” identity | 41% | 53% |
| Ninety-five percent of pedophiles are heterosexual males | 21% | 71% |
| TOTAL | 34 |

The highest possible score for the multiple-choice questions was eleven. The mean total score on the pre-test was 7.6, ranging from 3 to 11. The mean increased to 9.0 on the post-test, ranging from 5 to 11. This increase was also statistically significant (t (34) = -3.91, \( p<0.001 \)).
ATTITUDE CHANGE

Was participation related to an increase in understanding of personal biases and a commitment to addressing them?

As discussed in Chapter 3, data for 38 matched six- and twelve-week Probation Officer reports were available for analysis. The structure of the program was aimed at helping the youth understand his or her bias, admitting bias, taking responsibility for having such biases, and committing oneself to addressing them. Those youth who have not committed to addressing biases may have made progress in the program but are still somewhat at-risk.

The percent of youth who accomplished these changes are shown in Figure 4.2. The majority of youth refrained from threatening behavior during the sessions (100% versus 95%). About the same percent of youth admitted their bias at six and twelve weeks (58% versus 61%). Youth who admitted their bias, verbally acknowledged their biased attitudes during one of the sessions. The percent of those youth who took responsibility for their biases increased from 29 percent at six-weeks to 42 percent at twelve-weeks. These youth not only verbalized their biased attitudes but had shown remorse for their actions. However, the percent of youth committed to addressing biases was low at the end of both periods (18% versus 26%). These youth had admitted biases and, during a session, stated that they plan to do something positive to change their biases.

![Figure 4.2](image-url)
RISK AND PROTECTIVE FACTORS

Was participation related to a decrease in risk factors and an increase in protective factors?

Matched pre- and post-test San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up (SDRRC) scores were available for 25 youth. Figure 4.3 presents the six domains of risk on the pre- and post-test SDRRC and the percentage of youth in each who had at least one factor related to being at risk or somewhat at risk. At post-test, the percent of youth at risk decreased in five of the six domains. Both the individual and peer domains changed from 92 percent on the pre-test to 88 percent on the post-test. The greatest decrease for risk was in education, from 92 percent to 68 percent. There also were decreases in the family (80% versus 76%) and substance use (68% versus 60%) domains. Delinquency slightly increased from 88 percent to 92 percent.

Figure 4.3
PARTICIPANTS WITH RISK FACTORS AT ENTRY AND EXIT
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004
Figure 4.4 shows the change from intake to exit for the top six risk factors at intake. All six had some degree of reduction, with the greatest change occurring for poor academic achievement (84% versus 52%), followed by being manipulative (80% versus 60%), and having a delinquent orientation (76% to 60%). The change in poor academic achievement was significant (McNemar, n=24, p<0.01).
Figure 4.5 illustrates the increase in protective factors for five of the six domains. The greatest increase in protective factors was for the peer domain, increasing from 56 percent on the pre-test to 76 percent on the post-test. Increases also occurred in the education (60% versus 68%), substance use (56% versus 60%), delinquency (48% versus 56%), and individual (36% versus 52%) domains. Only in the family domain was there a decrease in protective factors (80% versus 72%). This decrease possibly could be due to the Probation Officer having a better understanding of the youths’ protective factors in the family after getting to know the youths over time and understanding their family dynamics better.
Figure 4.6 shows changes in protective and risk scores on the pre- and post-test SDRRC. The average protective score increased from 6.5 on the pre-test to 10.1 on the post-test. As desired, the average risk score decreased from 16.6 to 14.2. However, since the average risk score was higher than the average protective score, a combination of these scores yielded a negative resiliency score that increased from -10.2 to -4.0.

Figure 4.6
AVERAGE PROTECTIVE, RISK, AND RESILIENCY SCORES AT INTAKE AND EXIT
PATHWAYS to Tolerance: Changing Attitudes of Youth At Risk of Committing Hate Crimes, March 2004

TOTAL = 25
SUMMARY

The impact evaluation shows that none of the youth committed a bias-motivated offense or hate crime within six months after exiting the program and that the recidivism rate was low. As a result of participation in the program, knowledge of issues related to tolerance and the youths’ own personal biases showed some improvement. Likewise, attitude changes that were captured in the six-week and twelve-week reports to Probation indicated that the youth were making a commitment to understanding and addressing their biases. The results of the pre- and post-test comparison of the SDRRC showed that risk factors decreased and protective factors increased. Likewise, there were decreases in those risk factors that had the highest percentages at intake, with the change for academic achievement being significant.
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CASE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

As a part of the evaluation, seven case studies were conducted. Case study subjects were selected after completing their intake interview with the PATHWAYS to Tolerance Program Director and signing a consent form. The participants that were selected for the case studies represent the diverse group of youth that have participated in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. All of the case study subjects completed the program successfully.

As part of the case study process, a researcher attended group sessions at various points throughout the youth’s participation in the program. The researcher documented each group session, including observations made pertaining to the group and the case study participant. She also reviewed assessment forms and therapist notes and conducted an exit interview with the participant. The exit interview includes questions about biased beliefs and attitudes, satisfaction with the program, changes in attitudes and behavior, and knowledge obtained from the program. The intake and exit interviews comprised the majority of the case study, since they provided a great deal of detailed information about the youth, their attitudes and behaviors, biases, and personal changes due to the program. The case studies provide a qualitative analysis of participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance and offer the program suggestions on how to make the group sessions more effective. In order to protect the identity of each youth, the names used in the report are fictional.

ERICA

Client History

Erica was a 13-year-old Black girl who lived in the central region of San Diego County. She attended a public middle school and had an average academic performance. She explained in the exit interview that she feels safe at school, particularly because of the teachers and security guards. However, she recalled during the intake interview that a racially-based riot had occurred at her elementary school a couple of years ago.

Erica was court-ordered to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance due to an offense that involved fighting at school. In reaction to rumors that a Mexican girl started about Erica, she and members of a female gang confronted the Mexican girl with threats of violence and pushed her. Due to the District Attorney's determination of the racially-based motivation for the crime, Erica was charged with an enhancement for a hate crime. She explained in the exit interview that she was referred to the program because of racist comments she has made in the past. In the intake interview however,
she denied she committed a hate crime. At this time, Erica explained to the Program Director that she did nothing wrong because the Mexican girl that she threatened was talking about her and that is why she threatened her, not because of her race. As a result of the fighting at school, she was adjudicated as a 602 ward and ordered to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

Erica did not have a criminal history prior to this offense. In her intake and exit interviews, she explained that she does have some friends who are instigators and get her into trouble. In the past, she has had some friends who were gang members. Although she denied any gang membership, the offense for which she was referred to the program was committed with known gang members. She did not have a documented history of alcohol or drug use.

Throughout the intake interview, Erica had positive comments to make about her family, especially her mom and step-dad. She stated that her mom and step-dad have had the greatest influence in her life because they have helped her get through tough times. She appreciates that they do not try to act like her friends and at the same time they are not too strict. She feels very safe in her neighborhood, especially because she often stays around her home where her mom and step-dad are there to protect her. Most of her friends are family members or people she has known for a long time. However, the Program Director was concerned about influences from some family members and friends who were involved in gangs. Likewise, the neighborhood Erica resides in is influenced by gangs. Some of the new friends that she has been introduced to are the ones who played a part in getting her into trouble. In her intake interview, she stated that she, her family, and her friends do not have negative beliefs about people from other races, religions, or sexual orientations. In the exit interview, she stated that she and her friends were willing to make friends with everyone and there was not a certain group of people with which she had difficulty making friends. When asked how many friends she had from various groups, she responded she had “more than 15” friends that were of a different ethnicity, “11 to 15” friends who were male, and “fewer than 5” friends who had different religious beliefs than hers.

During the intake interview, Erica told the Program Director that she thought she could bring a sense of peace to the group and that she was respectful of everyone. When asked in the exit interview how she had initially felt about participating in PATHWAYS to Tolerance, she explained that it seemed like a good program and that there was a lot that the therapist could teach her.

Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

Erica was a soft-spoken girl who rarely interacted with the other participants in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. During the three group sessions that a SANDAG researcher observed, Erica never volunteered her opinions or entered into discussions with the group. During the observations, the researcher noticed that Erica only responded when asked a question and frequently had to be asked to speak up because her responses were inaudible.

In two of the sessions, several of the White participants expressed racial stereotypes and extreme dislike for Blacks and other minorities. Erica never responded to these comments nor expressed her frustration or disagreement with the stereotyping and negative attitudes. However, her frustration and disagreement with these comments were expressed in the exit interview on several occasions. First, when she was asked if there ever was a time she wanted to say something to the group but had not, she explained that she would have liked to respond to the youth in the group who made
negative comments about Blacks. The response she suggested she would have made was vengeful. However, she explained that she did not respond to these youth because of her respect for the facilitator. Second, she commented that what she liked least about the program was her experience at the first group session, in which several of the other youth made racist comments about Blacks. Her lack of response to such racial comments showed her respect for ground rules and other people, yet the impact of what was being discussed caused her distress that she felt she could only have verbalized in a negative manner. In the groups observed, it did not appear that Erica had found a way to appropriately express her anger about racial comments. While she had learned not to instigate such comments, she still was unable to partake in a heated discussion involving racial slurs and stereotypes without becoming angry and, therefore, chose not to participate.

Erica willingly participated in all of the activities that occurred during the three sessions observed. She was never the leader in any of the activities, but she followed directions and was appropriate with her interactions with the other youth. During one session, the facilitator showed Erica’s homework as an example of what was expected from the other students. Erica explained in the exit interview that she felt one of the ways she contributed to the class was through the homework she completed. She explained that she put a lot of effort into the homework assignments and the facilitator made positive comments about her work. She felt that this provided an example to the other youth who turned in unsatisfactory homework.

Overall, Erica was not resentful about her participation in the program and willingly joined in on activities. Her lack of participation in discussions, particularly during times when the other students made racial comments, was similar to other youth of color who also were in the group. During the three sessions observed, the SANDAG researcher rarely saw any of the minority youth enter into the racially-biased discussions. It appeared that their method of dealing with such negative comments was to remain silent.

Impact of the Program

Erica was very willing to discuss her experience of participating in PATHWAYS to Tolerance with the SANDAG researcher. She noted that, since the beginning of the program, she felt that it was a good program to participate in and that she would learn a lot. One week before the end of the program, she still felt “good” about participating in the program and rated her experience with PATHWAYS to Tolerance as “positive.” The trip to the Museum of Tolerance was what she liked best. She explained that the Holocaust was one thing she did not know about prior to the program. However, when asked why she thought the Holocaust had occurred, she responded that it was due to one group of people not liking the other. The two groups of people she believed were involved in the Holocaust were “Whites and Blacks.” She also equated the cause of the Holocaust with war, therefore believing that another Holocaust could occur because of the war with Iraq and that Muslims were at risk of being victimized. She also envisioned that the continued tension between Whites and Blacks could cause acts of violence to occur between these groups, with each group being both the perpetrator and victim. She believes that such violence could occur simply because some people do not like other people.
During the exit interview, Erica was asked what she thought played a role in why youth would act violently against another person. She believed violence could be a product of a “home situation, an individual’s personality, friends, drugs, and prior victimization.” In her own experience, she explained her “friends” played the biggest role as to why she was on probation and involved in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. As a result, she explained that she would recommend this program to her friends, particularly because she feels she has some friends who are racist.

According to her responses in the exit interview, Erica “always felt safe” in the group sessions. However, she did “not always” feel comfortable providing her point of view in the group. She reflected back on the first day of the program and explained that one of the things she did not like was that on that day, several of the other youth were saying mean things about Blacks. Through racial comments, other youth were breaking the ground rules that were set the first day. In light of this experience, a recommendation she would make to improve the program would be that, if a youth breaks a ground rule, such as making racial comments, there should be a consequence, such as an extra homework assignment. She believed that consistency in giving consequences to those who break the ground rules may help all the youth feel more comfortable in participating appropriately in the group.

As a result of PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Erica felt she got along “somewhat” better with others. She explained that the program helped her realize that she should not make racial comments. One of the priorities of the program is to help youth understand how their attitudes, actions, and words negatively affect others. Her closing comment in the exit interview was that she feels she can help others be better by not hating other people because of skin color or sexual orientation.

Erica’s family, friends, and neighborhood play a significant role in her personal biases. The negative influences in these areas have the ability of leading her toward prejudicial attitudes and behaviors. The facilitator noted that these influences are significant risk factors for her and that she will need to develop her own identity and self-confidence to overcome these risks.

JASON

Client History

Jason is a 17-year-old White male who lives in the east part of San Diego County. He used to attend a public high school in El Cajon but currently attends court school. Jason was court-ordered to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance due to an offense that involved a fight with a Black youth. The exact exchange of dialogue is unclear, but it appears that Jason was shouting inappropriate racial slurs out of a vehicle window. When provoked by the Black youth, he jumped out of the vehicle, approached the youth, and claimed he was a Peckerwood while making a “Hitler salute,” and then began to fight with the boy. Jason was arrested for an assault with a deadly weapon (not a firearm) and the District Attorney included this law enforcement referral and an enhancement for a hate crime in the petition to the court. In his intake interview, he denied being racist. However, he stated in the exit interview that he was referred to PATHWAYS to Tolerance because of a racially-motivated crime, thus acknowledging his bias-motivated incident. As a result of the instant offense and prior racial issues at school, he was adjudicated as a 602 ward and ordered to complete community service, pay fines and restitution, and participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance.
Prior to the current offense, Jason had one offense that was a Penal Code 422 (threaten with intent to terrorize). During this offense, Jason placed a threatening note into a Black student’s backpack. The note was found to have racially-based threats. Jason also was found to possess small cards displaying Nazi symbols, confederate flags, and lightning bolts accompanied by the words “White power.”

In his exit interview, Jason admitted that he used to have racist friends and that he identified himself as an “El Cajon Peckerwood” for two years, but explained that these were just the kids he happened to grow up with and that it was more of a clique (a group of his friends that would always hang out and stand up for each other) than a gang. When Jason was asked what the gang name meant, he said that in the past, Black people used the word “Peckerwood” as an insult, similar to the term “redneck.” By identifying themselves as Peckerwoods, this group attempts to change the insult into something positive. According to answers provided by skinheads on the Meta-religion Web site (2003), Peckerwood is “a term used to describe a White person in prison who stands up for himself.” However, according to an article on the ADL web site (2003), “the term Peckerwood is a reference both to White youths who have loose ties to White power gangs, as well as actual skinhead gangs who have adopted the term "Peckerwood" in their name.”

In an interview with the facilitator, she stated that Jason was an “avowed skinhead” at the time of his referral. After the duration of PATHWAYS to Tolerance, she stated that she would no longer identify him with any White Pride groups. However, this change cannot be entirely attributed to the program. Jason showed signs of reformation before beginning the weekly sessions. The facilitator said he “began disassociating two to three months before PATHWAYS.” She said that he was looking for “protection from his buddies in Juvenile Hall and when he didn’t get it, he began to change his identification.” Another reason, she said, was that because of other offenses he had committed, Jason was really “under the gun to shape up and stay out of jail.”

During his intake interview, Jason stated that one of his weaknesses was being easily misled by what everybody else was doing instead of making his own responsible choices. However, as discussed at the intake and exit interviews, Jason revealed a desire to start making better choices. He frequently talked about “dropping” all of his old friends, those he knew had a negative influence on him.

During the exit interview, the minor stated that he had only felt “somewhat safe” when attending his previous school. He knew that a lot of people wanted to fight with him because of his racist beliefs and because of the people he hung out with. He reported feeling safe in his neighborhood, however, because it is made up of mostly older residents and nobody wants to fight him there. He said he makes sure he keeps the fighting out of his neighborhood so that his family does not get involved. He also reported feeling “very safe” at the court school he currently attends and said that he no longer has problems with anyone. It remains unclear whether or not this change can be attributed to a reform in Jason’s attitudes and beliefs or if it is simply an incidental effect due to transferring to a new school.

In both the intake and exit interviews, Jason claimed he was not racist and that he would make friends with just about anyone. In the exit interview, he said that the only people he would not be friends with are “cocky” people and “Black gang members.” When asked why it would be hard for him to be friends with a Black gang member, he stated that he “just can’t relate to the way they carry themselves,” thus showing an inability to acknowledge differences in other people. During
one of the sessions, he shared a traumatic event that he witnessed at close proximity, in which one Black male shot another Black male in the head. He stated in the exit interview that this experience probably contributes to the intolerant attitude he holds toward Black gang members. Another contributing factor may be his father's violent past experiences with Blacks.

In the exit interview, Jason briefly discussed his father's history. His father grew up in a predominantly Black neighborhood and, much like Jason, got into a lot of fights during his youth. Jason admitted that his father fought with many Blacks, but said that his father was never in a gang, nor does he hold any racial grudges. Although the facilitator, during her interview with the researcher, stated that she saw nothing but “healthy dynamics and good interactions” between Jason and his father, it is possible that the father transferred to his son the idea of using violence as a solution to problems. However, it is impossible to estimate to what extent the violent adolescent experiences of his father may have influenced Jason’s own behavior.

Throughout the intake interview, Jason had positive comments to make about his family, especially his older sister. He stated that his sister is his best friend and that his parents always have been there for him. He said that his brother “got into some bad stuff” (dropped out of school and had a child at a young age), but they are still a very close family. His great-grandfather had the greatest influence on him when he was younger. The World War II veteran always would make him laugh, he said. In the intake interview, he also said his family was fairly accepting of other races.

At the time of the exit interview, Jason stated that he had two Black friends and one Mexican friend, many female friends and even two gay friends (both female). He also stated that his uncle was gay and that he didn’t have a problem with homosexuals. However, in the intake interview, he had stated, “being gay is wrong, but people can do whatever they want.” The fact that Jason had started to diversify in his choice of friends at the time of program completion reveals significant progress.

Jason began smoking marijuana at age 13 and admitted that he smoked at least three times per week. Jason also claimed he used alcohol on a monthly basis. He has experimented with several types of pills and also admitted to having tried the potent hallucinogenic plant called Jimsonweed. At the time of the exit interview, he was smoking tobacco cigarettes daily. In an interview with the facilitator, she stated that the “continued sobriety” of Jason is crucial to his continued good behavior. She said he has the skills necessary for success, but needs to stay away from drug use and the lifestyle that so often accompanies it.

Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

Jason is a very articulate youth who always interacted appropriately with his peers, the group facilitator, and the co-facilitator. A total of five sessions were observed by a SANDAG researcher, and at no point in these sessions did Jason refuse to contribute to the group. Jason always was punctual and appeared very comfortable in the program environment. He followed directions with a positive attitude and often helped the facilitator keep a few distracted youth on topic. Jason did not seem to treat the White youth in the program any differently than he treated those who were Black, showing equal respect for both groups. Jason seemed to be absorbing the information that was taught and had no trouble when prompted to discuss a lesson or a vocabulary word. In the exit
interview, he stated that he had learned only a little from the program but only because he already knew most of everything that was taught.

Observation by the SANDAG researcher revealed one sign of disobedience and nonconformity from Jason. He repeatedly wore a hat to the group sessions, despite several admonishments from the facilitator. It was a plain black hat without any signs or symbols associated with White Pride, but the youth are not allowed to wear any hats or other headwear. Once asked to remove his cap, he did so, but continued to arrive at each session with the hat on. In doing so, he either demonstrated an inability to foresee the consequences of his actions or he simply did not care about the consequences. He also showed that he was still somewhat incapable of following the rules without extra guidance and supervision.

Overall, Jason willingly participated actively in all of the activities and discussions and did not make any blatantly racist or disrespectful comments. An exception was a time when the facilitator caught him using the expression “that’s gay” to make a negative comment. He quickly exchanged this expression for another, less offensive expression that showed that he was becoming more conscious of how his words affect others. His efforts to follow the rules and to modify his behavior appeared to be sincere. Jason also was very open to sharing his personal experiences with the group.

Impact of the Program

Jason was very willing to discuss his participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. During the intake interview, he said the group could teach him “different ways to handle his peers” and that he could contribute to the group by sharing his experiences as an example. In the exit interview, he said he “always felt safe and very comfortable” in the group. However, he also said he felt that what he had to say only mattered “about half of the time” because “maybe they had already heard half of the stuff I had to talk about.” When asked whether or not there was a time when he had wanted to say something in the group but didn’t, he replied, “I pretty much said everything. I’m pretty open and vocal.”

During the exit interview, Jason said he felt as though he got along “somewhat” better with classmates, teachers, or other people with whom he may have previously had a hard time being friends. He believed that “learning about backgrounds” is what helped him make this change. Jason stated that his favorite parts of the program were the guest speaker who was a Holocaust survivor and the trip to the Museum of Tolerance. He thought the museum and the guest speaker were very interesting and beneficial. Both gave him a new and unique perspective regarding the Holocaust. He enjoyed “seeing it instead of just hearing about it.” It appears the face-to-face contact with those who had different life experiences than Jason had the greatest impact on him. However, he said he only gets along “somewhat” better with others because he is still “kind of hard-headed about things” and he still has “some old feelings,” referring to his racial biases.

In the exit interview Jason explained that he did not think the program covered enough information. He felt that they talked about the same subjects over and over again and ignored other issues that could have been more beneficial. He recommended that the program be improved by including topics that deal more with the roots of racism, such as problematic friendships and family relationships, instead of repeating so much about racism itself. It appeared Jason had the desire to learn more about the different factors that made up his own identity as a youth. When
Jason was asked in the exit interview what he thought played a role in why a youth would act violently against another person, he replied that it was mainly a product of “friends and drugs.” He also felt that these two influences played the biggest role in why he was on probation and involved in PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

When asked in the exit interview how he initially felt about participating in PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Jason explained that he had thought it would be “stupid and unnecessary” because he had already made changes and didn’t need these classes anymore. When asked how he felt after he had completed the program, he stated that he felt “good” about his participation and rated his overall experience as “positive.” He said that he would recommend it to others and felt even those youth who are not racist could benefit from the program.

The facilitator said that Jason appeared genuine in his efforts to change his thinking and he was using the information taught in the program to make positive changes in his life. She also said that it seemed Jason had the family support necessary to provide him with a healthy alternative to a delinquent lifestyle. Although Jason claimed to be a non-practicing Jehovah’s Witness, he still is influenced by his parents, who hold this strong religious faith. The facilitator felt this influence could play a significant role in providing Jason with a positive attitude and strong belief system. The facilitator felt that the youth could still use work on his anger management, taking responsibility for his bias-motivated behaviors, and acknowledging his personal biases.

STEVEN

Client History

Steven is a senior in high school, residing in north inland San Diego County. He identifies himself as White and middle class. During the exit interview, he stated he feels “safe” in the neighborhood where he lives because there are no gangs and it just feels like a safe community.

Steven attends a public high school. He feels “very safe” at his school because he has not experienced confrontation from other students, the teachers are nice, and there is a relaxed environment. He describes his friends as laid-back surfers and skaters and, while he does know some peers who have a reputation for being involved with White power, he does not associate with these youth. When asked in the exit interview about the number and types of friends he has, he explained that he has “5 to 10” friends who are of different ethnicities, “5 to 10” friends who have different religious beliefs, and “under 5” friends who identify with a different sexual orientation. He describes his relationship with his dad as “very close” but feels his relationship with his mom is not as good. He feels that she often holds grudges and does not provide praise when he does something well.

The referring offense for Steven was for a physical assault of a Hispanic male, and he was charged with a hate crime. The offense was done amongst peers. During the exit interview, Steven talked at some length about the role his friends played in committing the hate crime. In fact, he stated that this factor played the “biggest role.” He explained that sometimes youth will do things in order to keep their reputation or to have a better reputation with their peers.
From the discussion Steven had during the sessions observed by the SANDAG researcher, it was apparent that he uses alcohol often. This also was validated from information in his case files. As a condition of probation and as a minor, Steven is restricted from drinking; however, he continues this reckless behavior without considering the consequences. It should be noted that being under the influence of drugs and alcohol was a contributing factor to him committing a hate crime.

Prior to participating in PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Steven had difficulty acknowledging that his offense was bias-motivated or that it had anything to do with a racial bias. In his exit interview, he claimed he was not racist and would make friends with anyone. In fact, he stated he had a lot of Black friends. Upon entry, most of the youth who participated in the program did not have a clear understanding of bias. Often, they perceived bias as the same thing as racism, rather than understanding that bias is having either negative or positive attitudes toward people who are perceived as “different” than oneself. It is from the root of biases that racism can grow. This understanding of bias often is discussed in the program, so that the youth can understand how they perceive themselves compared to others, which can subsequently help them be more mindful of their own biased attitudes.

Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

When Steven first began PATHWAYS to Tolerance, he did not want to be in the program. As he discussed in the exit interview, he felt that “it was a waste of time and that he wouldn't take away anything.” Once he completed the program, he explained that he felt “good” about participating and that his overall experience was “positive.”

During the sessions that were observed by a SANDAG researcher, Steven was very willing to participate in all activities and discussions. His answers to questions were often complex and thought-provoking. Although he was one of the quieter youth in the group, it should be noted that those who were more vocal were not necessarily positive in their comments or discussions. Steven did not join in when the other youth made inappropriate comments or harassed the facilitator.

In one of the sessions that was observed by a SANDAG researcher, the youth participated in an activity that required teamwork and communication. During the discussion held after the activity, the facilitator inquired of each youth what communication style they used to accomplish the activity. It is interesting to note that Steven’s style was one in which he went along with what other people were doing rather than directing the activity or questioning poor decisions that were being made. It is possible that this communication style may have contributed to his involvement in a serious hate crime, in which he was not one of the more active participants but also did not attempt to stop the incident from occurring.

Steven “understood almost everything that was taught” during the sessions but felt that he “already knew most of everything that was taught.” He felt that some of the other youth in the group learned quite a bit during their participation. He also felt that the program might be more appropriate for youth who are a little younger than he is. Steven felt “very comfortable” in the group and “always felt safe.” He stated that he always said what was on his mind. Overall, he had a positive experience in the program.
Impact of the Program

Throughout the exit interview, Steven discussed that he had learned that negative talk about people who are different can affect others and cause people to act through bias motivation. He feels that now he “thinks more about what he says before he says it” and that helps him get along better with people he may have had a hard time being friends with in the past.

One of the things that he did not like about the program was the weekly journals that had to be completed. He suggested that the journals would be more helpful if, at the beginning of each session, there was time to discuss what they wrote and to reflect on the prior week. The facilitator had actually tried this in other sessions without success.

Like the other case study subjects, Steven enjoyed the trip to the Museum of Tolerance. His discussion in the exit interview about why the Holocaust occurred showed that he had gained knowledge about this historical atrocity. He had a clear understanding of the economic issues Germany had experienced and how this played a role in using the Jewish community as a scapegoat for problems in the country. He also had good insight as to why a similar event could happen in the future. He explained that people often do not take responsibility for problems that happen to them and they use others who are different from them as scapegoats. He felt that any minority group could be a target for genocide.

He also was surprised at the knowledge he attained about hate groups, particularly White supremacists. Prior to the program, he had a “textbook” knowledge of White pride and White supremacy groups but now feels that he has a better understanding. In addition, he learned that gangs can be similar to hate groups if they discriminate against others.

Steven made positive comments about the facilitator during the exit interview, when he was asked if there was anything else he would like to add. He explained that the facilitator did a good job, especially since she had to work with youth ranging from 13 to 18 years old. He felt that she kept the pace going, even though there were youth that tried to sidetrack the sessions. He expressed that he did not like the inconsideration of the other youth who would try to sidetrack the group.

One area that Steven mentioned several times in his exit interview, which also had been an issue discussed in the group sessions observed, was negative influences from his peers. As stated earlier, Steven felt that his peers played the most important role in why he committed a hate crime. When asked what he has done to change this issue, he explained that he takes responsibility for his own actions and does not let his friends make decisions for him.

In an interview between the researcher and facilitator, the facilitator explained that Steven had begun to achieve several of the objectives of the program, including the following: formulating a sense of identity not based upon being better or different, taking responsibility for bias motivated behaviors, developing non-violent conflict resolution skills, identifying with others perceived as different, and empathizing with victims of hate crimes. She also stated that he had good experiences with individuals of other racial, cultural, and religious backgrounds during his participation in the program.
The facilitator explained that, prior to the program, Steven needed to address his personal biases, take responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors, and identify with individuals who are perceived as different. After he completed the program, she felt he had adequately taken responsibility for his bias-motivated behaviors but still needed to work on acknowledging his personal biases and identifying with others who are perceived as different. She believed that Steven was a “good kid” who committed a crime that had less to do with hate than with substance use and negative peer influences. She also expressed concern about his inability to function independently of peers. Steven also has acknowledged that peer influence has played a role in prior negative incidents and is an area he needs to work on. Though he understands what is needed, one of his issues to overcome is his inability to make his own decisions and not follow negative peer influences.

It appears that, through PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Steven has a greater understanding of bias and how negative talk affects others. His participation was always appropriate and often insightful. As a result of his positive experience and his successful completion of the program, the Program Director has asked him to be a peer facilitator in future groups. The SANDAG researcher had the opportunity to observe Steven as a peer facilitator and saw him adapt to the role well. During one group session, he showed astonishment at the lack of respect that the youth in the session were showing toward a guest speaker. The researcher also observed that Steven appropriately acknowledged positive and negative attitudes and beliefs that the youth were discussing and supported the facilitators in their discussions. This experience as a peer facilitator will continue to help Steven understand the negative impact of prejudice and bias-motivated behavior.

JUSTIN

Client History

Justin is a 17-year-old, White male who lives in San Ysidro. During the exit interview, Justin discussed his background more than had been expressed in the intake interview or his case files. He dropped out of school when he was 13, at about the same time he joined the Skinheads. He explained that Probation has labeled him as a documented Skinhead and that his case was referred to the Gang Suppression Unit (GSU). His association with White supremacy was further verified by the number of White pride tattoos he had. These included skulls and flames on his elbow, the symbol for the Odin rune, a Celtic cross with 88 hail Hitler, and a skull with the number 14, which stands for the 14 words, “We must secure the existence of our race and a future for White children.” He also had two swastikas, one on his finger and the other on his chest, which he said he “earned.” Tattoos are typically earned for violent offenses committed against non-Whites.

His offense prior to his referral to PATHWAYS to Tolerance was for stealing a car. However, the facilitator explained that Justin also was referred because of past racial violence and preaching his beliefs about White supremacy.
While Justin rarely participated in the group discussions, the activity he did participate in during session 12 revealed the importance of the White supremacy doctrine in his life. In this activity, each of the youth were asked to pick four different colored pipe cleaners and choose the colors based upon something that expressed who they are. Then they were asked to create a structure with the pipe cleaners that represented who they are. Justin created the symbol for the Odin rune, which is pictured below.

Source: Anti-Defamation League (2004b), Hate on Display.

The ADL (2003) provides the following description of the use of this symbol by White supremacists.

Nazi Germany glorified an idealized "Aryan/Norse" heritage; consequently extremists have appropriated many symbols from pre-Justinian Europe for their own uses. They give such symbols a racist significance, even though the symbols did not originally have such meaning and are often used by nonracists today, especially practitioners of modern pagan religions. While not by nature a racist religion, Odinism is popular among White supremacists because its Old Norse origins are seen as representative of Aryan heritage and cultural pride. The symbol was common within Norse and ancient Germanic cultures and was later adopted by the Nazis for this reason. There are many variations of this symbol.

The colors Justin chose and their meaning were the following: White because he is White, black because he does not like Blacks, green for the color of his daughter's eyes, and he had no reason for choosing orange.

Following this session, Justin explained in his exit interview that his religious affiliation is Odinism but would not discuss the details of this religion. As noted above, Odinism has its roots in ancient Germanic cultures. Racist Odinism asserts that the White Aryan race is God's chosen race. This ideology, coupled with a self-proclaimed tendency for violence, puts Justin at high-risk for committing another hate crime. Likewise, being entrenched in values and beliefs that are supported by his family makes changing these extremely difficult for him.

Justin has few friends and explained that he does not really hang out with anyone. During the exit interview, he said that he had “under five” friends, none of whom were of a different ethnicity or had other religious beliefs.
Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

As already noted, Justin did not often participate in discussions. During the trip to the Museum of Tolerance, he was very quiet. Shortly after the group arrived at the museum, a docent accompanied them on a tour of the museum. She asked Justin if this was his first time to the museum, to which he responded, “This is my first and last.” Overall, he seemed annoyed that he had to attend this field trip. The tour guide explained that the museum had three learning objectives that fit well with the objectives of the program. First, there is an emphasis on words and how they affect behavior. The main example is Hitler’s use of speeches to instigate persecution of the Jews. Second, were compassion and empathy. The museum uses experiences and visuals to help attendees understand these. Lastly, there is a focus on choices, emphasizing that in situations when acts of prejudice occur, we can choose either to ignore them, to participate, or to confront and help out.

During the tour, Justin was particularly interested in White supremacist materials and Nazi artifacts in the museum. One area of the museum was dedicated to information on White Power that is provided on the Internet. Justin mentioned to another youth that he was familiar with some of the Web sites and was frustrated when he could not explore them further. He and one other Skinhead peer took considerable time looking at the Nazi uniform on display.

The tour terminated at a room with Jewish artifacts, some of which had been taken to be artifacts in Hitler’s Museum of the Extinct People. In this room, there was a life-size display of bunk beds in the concentration camps and a picture of a Jewish man, who was merely the size of a boy due to starvation. To show the youth the extremely poor physical condition these prisoners had been in, the facilitator asked Justin to stand next to the Jewish man. He refused and was extremely upset at the request. Justin later revealed in session 12 that he did not do what the facilitator had asked because he did not feel comfortable doing it and he thought he was being singled out. The facilitator explained the reason for her request and that she had not purposefully chosen him. It was obvious from Justin’s reaction to the request that he was very uncomfortable standing next to a picture of a Jewish concentration camp detainee.

In the session the following week, time was dedicated to a Jewish guest speaker who had lived in a Nazi concentration camp as a girl during World War II. The stories she shared were gruesome and emotional. However, most of the youth in the group did not feel compassion or empathy toward this woman who had suffered greatly. Although all of youth remained quiet during the survivor’s talk and while she was in the room, after the guest speaker left and the facilitator asked the youth what they thought, disrespect was quickly displayed. Justin stated that it did not matter to him because it did not happen to him. Three of the five youth in the group had similar feelings and, overall, showed extreme disrespect for the Holocaust survivor. It clearly showed that Justin and several of the other youth did not know how to empathize, even when the other person had been through horrific circumstances. In the case of Justin, entrenched racist beliefs overshadowed his ability to empathize with someone who endured such violence and degradation. The facilitator and co-facilitators expressed their extreme dissatisfaction with the attitudes and behavior the group exhibited to the guest speaker.
Impact of the Program

Justin’s case study is an example of how deeply ingrained values and ideology inhibit cognitive or behavioral changes. During the interview with the facilitator, the facilitator explained to the researcher that Justin had a lot of issues to work on in the area of tolerance. These included acknowledging his biases, taking responsibility for his bias-motivated behaviors, using non-violent conflict resolution, and empathizing with victims of hate. Even at the end of the program, though all of these topics were discussed and were a significant portion of the program, Justin still needed to make improvement in each of these areas. For other case study subjects, some improvement, even if only a little, was exhibited. This was not the case for Justin.

Justin evaluated the program negatively. He felt that he already knew what had been taught and was proud that he could share his knowledge of Skinheads because he believes he provided a more accurate description than what was taught. While other case studies felt more positive about participating in the program after they had completed it, Justin wished he had not come to the program. He felt the facilitator picked on him and he felt only “somewhat comfortable” because he believed the facilitator singled him out.

The facilitator explained that, coupled with a history of racism in the family, there were two other issues that limited Justin’s success in PATHWAYS to Tolerance. According to the facilitator, Justin demonstrated signs indicating the potential to develop into an adult with anti-social personality disorder. This mental health disorder restricts the individual from distinguishing between right and wrong and inhibits the development of empathy. In addition to significant mental health issues, Justin is a frequent methamphetamine user. The facilitator stated that the anti-social disorder and his use of drugs and alcohol render change of intolerance virtually impossible.

FRED

Client History

Fred is a 14-year-old Black male who lives in the City of El Cajon, where he attends a public high school. Fred was court-ordered to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance due to an offense that involved a fight with a Hispanic youth. Fred was charged with Penal Code 243(D) (battery with serious bodily injury). In his intake interview, he stated that neither he nor his family had problems with any groups of people because of their race, religion, or sexual orientation. Fred denied that his current offense was racially-motivated. However, in the exit interview with the facilitator, she discussed Fred’s prior altercations with Somalians, Chaldeans, and Mexicans. Fred was adjudicated as a 602 ward and ordered to perform community service, pay restitution, and participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

In both his intake and exit interviews, Fred admitted that he associated with members of street gangs. In his exit interview, Fred stated that he was in a gang called “Young Thugs” for about two months but described it as more of a “clique” than a gang. When asked what the name of the gang meant, the minor stated that it used to mean “bad kids” but that it now meant “nothing” to him. At program exit, he said that he continued to associate with members of street gangs such as “Crips” and “Bloods,” and his cousin remains an active member of the “Crips.”
In an interview with the facilitator, she confirmed to the researcher that Fred had been a member of the “Young Thugs.” At session five, a session that is about gangs and hate groups, Fred stated that he no longer “gang-banged.” When the facilitator questioned him as to why he continued to wear gang colors, he replied that he simply happened to like those specific colors. The facilitator showed doubt in his answer and suggested that his actions and choices in clothing reveal his desire to continue to be associated with these gangs. Fred was in violation of the dress code at another session as well, but for wearing a do-rag. A do-rag is “a scarf or kerchief (commonly made of nylon) worn as a head covering, often tied at the nape of the neck” (American Heritage Dictionary, 2000). As mentioned earlier, the participants were not allowed to wear any type of headwear during the sessions.

At his intake interview, Fred stated that one of his weaknesses was his temper. He said that it does not take much for him to start “tripping.” As proof of this quick temper, the minor had three additional charges for battery (Penal Code 242) that were dismissed by the court. Referring to his temper, the minor stated at intake that he was “starting to calm it down.”

When asked what issues played a significant factor in the minor’s delinquent behavior, the facilitator answered, “negative peer influence, mother’s denial of her son’s problems, and poor school performance.” The facilitator stressed in her interview the significance of Fred’s cognitive delays and how they have contributed in making him vulnerable to negative peer influence. Per the Probation Officer’s social study, Fred was enrolled in Special Education courses before moving to California. Since then, he had not participated in any Special Education services because he did not like the stigma that accompanies “Special Ed” classes, thus contributing to his poor academic achievement and making him even more susceptible to delinquent behaviors.

Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

In general, Fred was soft-spoken, a little withdrawn, and reluctant to participate in most group discussions. In the interview with the facilitator, she stated that Fred participated “very little” in the discussions. She explained one possible reason for his minimal participation could have been his cognitive delays. It is difficult to be fully engaged in a discussion that you do not completely understand. In his exit interview, Fred stated that he had understood only “a little” of what was taught in PATHWAYS to Tolerance, whereas most of the other case studies responded that they had understood “most” of what was taught. The SANDAG researcher remarked that Fred appeared to pay attention only when he was forced to do so by the continuous and direct prompting of the facilitator.

In his exit interview, Fred was asked what he had enjoyed most about the program. His two favorite things were the Museum of Tolerance and the candy. The facilitator brought candy to the sessions in order to encourage youth involvement. This incentive seemed to be an important motivational factor for Fred. When asked to do things in the groups, he often requested that they be given a certain amount of candy for performing the tasks.

When describing Fred’s accomplishments of the program objectives, the facilitator gave him “poor” and “fair,” the two lowest ratings, for each of the following: acknowledging personal biases, forming a sense of identity not based upon being better or different than others, taking responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors, developing non-violent conflict resolution skills, and
identifying with others who are perceived as “different.” The only area in which Fred’s accomplishments were rated as “good” was for “positive group experience with members of other racial groups.” Fred showed little or no inhibition when interacting with the White youth in his group, even one who was involved with White pride groups. In fact, a SANDAG researcher observed the two walking out of a session together, talking, and shaking hands goodbye.

Impact of the Program

Prior to beginning the program, Fred did not want to participate and felt that he was not supposed to be there, but at the end, he felt “OK” about being part of the program and rated his experience overall as “positive.” Fred reported that he “always felt safe” and “comfortable” in the group, although he also felt that the facilitator, as well as the other youth, tried to pick on him sometimes. He said they were just “trying to be funny,” but that he did not like it.

Fred has made progress in resolving conflicts without using anger or violence as he used to. During one session, he explained that he was confronted by a group of Chaldean youth at school who wanted to fight him. He reported the problem to the principal rather than immediately engaging in a fight with the youth as he may have done in the past. Fred also expressed a desire to successfully complete probation, which would not have happened had he gotten into more trouble at school, and indicated he realized that fighting at school would extend the length of his probation.

When asked if he was more accepting of other people because of something he learned in the program, Fred answered affirmatively, and discussed how he had learned to “think before acting,” as demonstrated in the school incident described above. Another thing Fred learned in the program was that using the word “faggot” was offensive. He claimed he did not really understand the implications of this derogatory term prior to involvement in PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

Several questions were asked in the exit interview to assess the degree of knowledge the youth gained about intolerance. Fred had a particularly difficult time discussing the Holocaust. When asked to remember the Museum of Tolerance field trip and why he thought the Holocaust happened, he quickly showed signs of frustration and replied, “I don’t know and I don’t really care.” Fred previously stated that the Museum of Tolerance was his favorite part of the program, yet he was incapable of discussing the Holocaust. During a session observed by the SANDAG researcher, this same phenomenon was witnessed when the facilitator asked Fred in what country the Holocaust took place. He first named one of the states in the United States, and when further prompted, changed his answer to Africa. This went on until the comments made by the other youth and the clues given by the facilitator finally led Fred to the right answer.

The PATHWAYS to Tolerance curriculum requires a high level of functioning and retention of knowledge. As a result, the program may not be appropriate or may cause frustration for youth with cognitive delays. Though Fred’s participation in the program was satisfactory, there were moments where his cognitive delays caused him frustration and may have led him to feel as though he was being picked on.

When asked what recommendations he would make to improve the program, Fred suggested that the groups include more than three participants to avoid the monotony. Fred, like other participants, also commented that he did not like keeping a journal. His reason for not liking the journals was more about not liking homework than it was about the type of assignment.
In his exit interview, when asked why he thought he had been referred to PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Fred said he thought it was because he had gotten into a fight with a Hispanic youth. However, in his intake interview, Fred stated that his family “does not have a problem with anybody” and that he, as well, is “cool with everybody, all human beings.” This contradiction between ideology and action could mean the race of Fred’s battery victim was incidental, or perhaps Fred was unaware of his own prejudices. The facilitator interview suggested the latter, stating that Fred showed intolerance in both action and speech, specifically toward Somalians, Chaldeans, Hispanics, gay men, and women, whom he constantly referred to as “the ladies.” At the end of the interview, the facilitator indicated to the researcher that Fred still needed to work on “non-violent conflict resolution skills,” “acknowledging personal biases,” and “taking responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors,” along with “formulating a sense of identity that is not based upon being different from others” and “being able to identify with these individuals perceived as different.” The facilitator also recommended in her twelve-week Probation Officer report that Fred may benefit from a referral to address his significant cognitive delays and impulse control problems.

MEGAN

Client History

Megan was a high school senior with aspirations of attending a community college and then transferring to a university. She identifies herself as White, bi-sexual, and middle class. She was a very bright girl, with friends that share her literary interests. She and her friends were labeled as “gothic,” which are youth who identify with a certain type of music, tend to have strong political interests, use symbols associated with death, and wear certain types of clothing, which is mostly black. She felt that adults judge her on her appearance and wishes they would take the time to get to know her because those adults that do, always like her. Prior to the offense that resulted in her referral to PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Megan had no involvement in the juvenile justice system. Her strong attachment to her mother, good academic achievement, and positive social activities had helped Megan. In the intake interview, Megan explained that her family and friends were very tolerant of other people but her dad was very homophobic. However, Megan did not share her dad’s viewpoint, which was part of the reason she and her dad did not get along.

Although Megan’s resilient background and attitude seem to have equipped her with tolerance, she and her friends demonstrated their intolerance toward religion through a hate crime that involved vandalism to three churches on the Saturday before Easter Sunday. Due to this incident, Megan was charged with vandalism and an enhancement for a hate crime and was adjudicated as a 602 ward of the court. The incident involved vandalizing several churches with anti-Christian words. In her intake interview, she admitted that she and her friends do not like religion in general. She further explained that the acts she and her friends committed were a result of their own bias that all Christians hold right-wing, conservative political beliefs.

Megan’s intolerance toward Christianity provides an interesting paradox. She considers herself to be very open and accepting of other people who are different, but she has a difficult time being friends with individuals who are not as accepting. Though she claims tolerance, she has a bias toward Christians, assuming that all are “right-wing conservatives.”
Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

Megan was hesitant about participating in PATHWAYS to Tolerance at first. She felt that the facilitator would be “preaching” at the participants concerning their offenses. However, she really enjoyed the program and felt that she learned a lot. She liked the diversity of information presented.

The facilitator noted in the interview with a SANDAG researcher that Megan often participated in discussions and was always tolerant toward peers in the group. Megan provided her perspective and thoughts during the sessions that the SANDAG researcher observed, and she participated in all of the activities. Megan always showed respect to her peers and the facilitator.

Megan attended all of the sessions and participated actively in most of them. Megan explained that, at first, she censored her opinions during the discussions. She was concerned she would have to be careful of what she said because it might be used against her, like when she was in court. However, as she got to know the other youths and the facilitator better, she realized PATHWAYS to Tolerance was a safe place to share her opinions.

Impact of the Program

Megan felt she learned “a lot” from the program and her experience was “positive.” She thought that some of her bias toward other races was due to the community she was raised in and the lack of interaction with minorities. She also thought she understood why other people are racist. This knowledge is important for Megan because, while she was open-minded and tolerant, prior to PATHWAYS to Tolerance, she was frustrated with people who were not accepting of others’ beliefs. Understanding why someone else has a particular bias is also an important lesson learned in the program.

Megan felt PATHWAYS to Tolerance provided her with a lot of new information that helped her understand how and why people are different. When asked how much she learned in the program, she responded, “I learned a lot, most of what was taught was new to me.” She explained she would recommend this program to her friends because it provided a lot of knowledge and that she feels that lack of knowledge can be a motivator of bias. She admitted that her own limited interaction with other races, because she resides in a predominately White community, led her to have stereotypical beliefs. Positive interaction, coupled with knowledge, was important for Megan’s positive experience in the program. She also appreciated the diversity of information that was taught. She expressed that the issue of prejudice did not just single out Whites and Blacks but factored in all kinds of differences.

The facilitator said that, prior to participating in PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Megan needed to work on the following issues: “taking responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors,” “using conflict resolution skills,” and “identifying with individuals who are perceived as different.” However, after completing the program, the facilitator thought she had made progress in all of the above areas except in “having an identity not based upon being different than others.” The facilitator explained that Megan needed to work on thinking independently from her peer group, who tend to feel that the entire world is against them. The facilitator also noted that Megan had demonstrated remorse
for the offense and offered controversial opinions in an appropriate manner. Megan was asked to be a peer facilitator for a future group.

SUSAN

Client History

Susan is a 15-year-old, White female who lives in Santee, where she attends a court school. Susan was court-ordered to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance after committing a battery offense against her mother. As a result of the referral, Probation became aware through self-report of Susan’s involvement with members of the Peckerwoods, a White supremacist gang noted for involving individuals who are or have been incarcerated. In her intake interview, Susan stated that she used to have many friends who were involved with alcohol, drugs, and White supremacy but that she no longer hangs out with them. However, this was contradicted in her exit interview when she stated that “the types of people she hangs out with” are “mostly White guys” and that she still hangs out with “White pride guys.” Susan had one prior offense that was counseled and closed by Probation. It also was a Penal Code 242 battery charge for fighting with her mother. The facilitator mentioned that, although not part of the instant offense, the minor also had “verbally assaulted a Mexican woman at a taco shop.” Susan was adjudicated as a 602 ward and was ordered to complete community service, pay fines and restitution, complete an assaultive behavior class, and to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

During her intake interview, Susan stated that one of her weaknesses was her desire to try anything. “I have an addictive personality. I will try anything,” she said. She also stated that little things can make her mad and that, if a person yells at her, she will not hesitate to yell back. As for fighting, she said at intake that she doesn’t hit anyone “unless they come after her.” However, in her exit interview and in one of the sessions, she admitted to hitting her boyfriend in the face with a closed fist during an argument and then running away “before he could hit her back.”

When asked what issues played a significant factor in Susan’s delinquent behavior, the facilitator answered, “drug and alcohol use, negative family influence with a history of physical abuse and neglect, negative peer influence, poor school performance and personal trauma.” Susan’s mother is a recovering drug addict while her biological father is currently a methamphetamine addict, although he is not residing in Santee. At intake, Susan claimed to have been “clean” from meth since April 2003.

Participation in PATHWAYS to Tolerance

In general, Susan was well-spoken and participated appropriately and without hesitation. When asked at intake what she thought she could gain from the group and what she could contribute, she said she wanted to “learn to respect everybody no matter what” and to “contribute stories about things that I went through.” In the interview with the facilitator, she stated that Susan participated “a lot” in group discussions and “always” showed tolerance to peers in the group. In her exit interview, the minor stated that she “always felt safe” in the group and felt that what she had to say “often” mattered to the group. This feeling of comfort and importance explained her willingness to participate actively. When asked if there was a time when she had wanted to say
something in the group but didn’t, she replied, “No, I said everything, even if I thought they [the
group] wouldn’t like it.”

In her exit interview, when prompted to think about why the things she had to say didn’t “always”
matter to the group and only “often” mattered, she stated this was because “at first, I had an
attitude about the White race being better than others.” She felt the group probably did not value
these prejudicial opinions. When asked what she had enjoyed most about the program, Susan said
it was the facilitator’s ability to make things fun, interesting, and interactive, instead of just
lecturing all of the time.

Impact of the Program

Prior to beginning PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Susan said she had wanted to participate because she
felt “it would be no problem, easy.” After completion, she felt “good” about being part of the
program and rated her overall experience as “positive.” When asked if there was something that
she did not like about the group, her only comment was that she sometimes felt that the facilitator
“put her on the spot,” making her uncomfortable.

Several questions were asked in the exit interview to assess the degree of knowledge the youth
gained about intolerance. Susan said that she had “learned a lot, most of what was taught was new
to me,” and that she had “understood almost everything that was taught.” Her degree of
understanding also was observed in the sessions. Susan seemed to absorb all of the material that
was taught and was always capable of responding to the questions posed by the facilitator.

In her exit interview, when asked why she thought she had been referred to PATHWAYS to
Tolerance, Susan said she thought it was because of her association with Peckerwoods. The
facilitator had stated that Susan showed intolerance in both action and speech toward people of
other races and toward gay men. Despite describing her own sexual orientation as “bi-sexual,”
Susan repeatedly expressed a negative attitude toward gay males and later admitted during her
exit interview that she would not be friends with a gay man. When probed as to why she would not
be friends with a man of this sexual orientation, she expressed disgust and admitted to having “bad
mental pictures” associated with this sexuality.

During session eight, the youth were asked to stand in the middle of two triangles and then to
move to either the yes-triangle or the no-triangle, depending upon their agreement/disagreement
with the statements the facilitator was going to read. When asked if the youth thought there
should be interracial coupling, Susan quickly placed herself at the extremely “no” zone, indicating
that she was adamantly against inter-racial coupling. When asked if the youth would be
comfortable having a son or daughter that was gay, Susan positioned herself at a mild “no.” When
the facilitator asked for the reasoning behind her choice in placement, she explained that it was
because if it were a daughter, it would not be so bad, but “hell no” if it were a son.

Despite a comment on Susan’s twelve-week Probation Officer’s report where the facilitator stated
that the minor had “made strides in stereotyping (particularly in regard to race) and had expressed
some new tolerant views,” it was obvious to the observer that, by her actions concerning interracial
marriage in the activity in session eight, Susan still was holding onto some of her past beliefs.
Susan felt that she was more accepting of other people because of PATHWAYS to Tolerance. Susan explained that the program had taught her that “people like the same things and it doesn’t matter what their skin color is.” When asked if she felt that she got along better with classmates, teachers, and other people since PATHWAYS to Tolerance, she replied “yes” because she had learned to be “more respectful and not to judge people for being different.”

When asked what recommendations she would make to improve the program, she suggested that there be more “hands-on” or “physical” activities. It appeared the minor really enjoyed moments of intense interaction and involvement with her peers.

When describing Susan’s accomplishments of the program objectives, the facilitator gave her “fair” ratings for each of the following: “acknowledging personal biases,” “taking responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors,” and “developing non-violent conflict resolution skills.” Susan received “good” ratings for “beginning to formulate a sense of identity not based upon being better or different than others” and the “ability to identify with others perceived as different,” and an “outstanding” rating for having a “positive group experience with members of other racial groups.” Despite her beliefs against interracial coupling that were shared in session eight, Susan showed little or no inhibition when interacting with the Black youth in her group. A SANDAG researcher observed her touching one youth’s Afro and laughing about something with him.

At the end of her interview, the facilitator indicated that Susan still needed to work on “non-violent conflict resolution skills,” “acknowledging personal biases,” and “taking responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors,” along with “formulating a sense of identity that is not based upon being different from others” and “identifying with individuals who are perceived as different.”
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INTRODUCTION

As part of the PATHWAYS to Tolerance program, process and impact evaluations were conducted. The results from this research are summarized here. In addition, research limitations, recommendations for future research, and program recommendations are discussed.

INTEGRATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

PATHWAYS to Tolerance was implemented and managed by the San Diego County Anti-Defamation League (ADL) from September 2002 through March 2004. This was a psycho-educational intervention program for youth and young adults on probation who are assessed to be at risk of committing a bias-motivated incident or a hate crime. Sixty-two (62) youth and young adults were reached through the program. Most were White males and many had no contact with the juvenile justice system prior to their referring offense. Over one-half already had committed a bias-motivated or hate crime and were at risk in terms of being influenced by family and friends who had moderate to significant prejudice, associating with gangs or non-inclusive groups, and wearing tattoos or other symbols of hate. Despite low bias scores, it appears that the program did target the appropriate population.

The prevention component of the program was not implemented due to the inability of schools to include in the program. The intervention program was implemented as designed according to the 13 stakeholders who responded to the online survey. Ten groups of 3 to 11 participants met once per week for twelve weeks. Of the 62 youth who participated, nearly three-quarters successfully completed. Overall, clients constructively contributed to the sessions. Clients who successfully completed admitted their bias and several had begun to address these biases.

Findings from the impact evaluation showed that recidivism rates were low for program participants, with only four youth in the intervention period and two in the six-month follow-up having a referral for a new offense, and none having a referral for a bias-motivated crime. As a result of participation in the program, participants’ knowledge about tolerance significantly improved and, at exit, they were more resilient and had fewer risk factors and more protective factors.
LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH

It is necessary to acknowledge limitations of research that could affect generalization of results. A few limitations should be considered regarding this research.

- Small Sample Size: Due to the size of the sample, tests of significance could not be conducted for all outcomes. A limited number of cases available for analyses restricts reliability and generalization.

- Unavailability of Data for Unsuccessful Clients: Post-test data for some measures, such as the Probation Officer reports and post-test questionnaire, were not always available for participants if they exited the program prior to the twelfth week. Therefore, analysis of pre-and post-test data may be weighted by a greater number of participants who were successful.

- Completion of Bias Screening Tool Through Analysis of Interviews: The best method for completing the Bias Screening Tool, as recommended by ADL, is to have it completed by the program staff who conducted the intake interview. Due to the limited amount of time the Program Director had, SANDAG used notes from the intake interviews to complete the Bias Screening Tool. This secondary data collection relies upon the interview notes and cannot account for issues discussed in the interview but not noted.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE PROGRAM

The following recommendations are based upon the results of the process and impact evaluations.

- Keep the Program Mandatory: The case studies showed that many youth did not want to participate in PATHWAYS to Tolerance prior to program entry but afterward felt positive about their experience. By having youth who are at risk of committing hate crimes court-ordered to the program, they are able to increase their knowledge of tolerance and have a positive experience with youth from diverse backgrounds. The target population would not have volunteered to participate in this type of program.

- Continue Outreach to Probation Officers: Referrals to the program increased after ADL staff made presentations to Probation Officers about youth who are at risk of committing a hate crime. Such outreach is essential in educating Probation Officers about the warning signs of youth who are in hate groups or support prejudice beliefs. Such education should be ongoing for the duration of the program.

- Include More Experiential Activities: Most of the case study subjects enjoyed the field trip to the Museum of Tolerance and discussed what they learned in detail. Activities such as the field trip, that will help them experience empathy, seemed to be greatly welcomed by the youth. These activities will provide learning experiences that will be remembered for years to come.
• Restrict Group Size to Six to Ten Participants: Groups sizes under four were too small for youth to have an experience with youth from other backgrounds and groups of more than ten made equal distribution of discussion difficult. To achieve this number, it may be necessary to Increase the number of youth assigned to the group to ensure that the groups are not too small.

• Include Family and Friends in the Program: Clearly, the beliefs and attitudes of family and friends had a significant impact upon the youth in the program. Including these individuals in particular sessions may help in dealing with social influences and assist the youth in explaining what they have learned to family and friends. Likewise, more emphasis should be placed upon how youth should deal with family and friends who have prejudiced beliefs.

• Incorporate the Bias Screening Tool as an Assessment Tool for Individuals Making Referrals: The Bias Screening Tool would best be used by Probation Officers who know the youth well and administered prior to making a referral to the program in order to determine if the youth is appropriate.

• Provide Program to Youth in Outlying Areas of the County: Solutions to transportation issues could be resolved by having the program in other areas outside the central region of San Diego County or providing resources to assist with transportation, such as bus tokens.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The following recommendations are offered to other researchers involved in similar evaluation research projects.

• Work with Program Staff and Probation Officers to Ensure Administration of Instruments to All Program Participants: The researchers learned that partnerships needed to be maintained with program staff and Probation Officers in order to elicit help in obtaining post-tests and data for youth who did not complete the program. Researcher participation in the steering committee was essential to fostering this partnership and documenting program implementation and challenges.

• Allow Project Start-Up Time: Researchers have learned from previous evaluation projects that approximately six months pass from program design to actual implementation. This also occurred for PATHWAYS to Tolerance, directly impacting the number of youth served. This start-up phase should be considered at the planning stage.

• Use Pre- and Post-Test Measures: The use of a number of pre- and post-measures is crucial to testing program impact on a one-sample study. Whenever possible, these measures should be standardized or at least tested in other programs in order to have a comparison.
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## PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE
### An Anti-Hate Program for Youth

### I. Program Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format:</th>
<th>A 12-week group therapy program. Groups are two hours long.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Population:</td>
<td>Adolescents, ages 13 to 18 who are at risk for bias-motivated behaviors based on prior offences or high score on bias screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Sources:</td>
<td>Probation officers, juvenile court judges or referees and school administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Procedure:</td>
<td>Complete and fax referral form to ADL, or call Program Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>As the program is grant funded, there is no cost to the client or referring agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Goal:</td>
<td>To reduce bias-motivated violence among youth in the San Diego community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Procedure:</td>
<td>Referring sources will be notified within two weeks following receipt of referral form of acceptance or denial. If the groups are full, appropriate referrals will be placed on a waiting list. Following approval an individual intake session with youth and parent/guardian will be scheduled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Program Description

*Pathways to Tolerance* is a psycho-educational program designed to confront biased attitudes and hate-motivated behaviors in youth as well as teach them how to resolve intergroup conflicts without violence. Participants are youth ages 13 to 18 and are referred by probation officers, juvenile court judges or referees and school district administrators. Groups are conducted at sites throughout San Diego County. The program synthesizes education with cognitive-behavioral, experiential, and self-psychological interventions to facilitate a change in attitudes and behaviors.

Appropriate referrals to *Pathways to Tolerance* include:
Youth who bully or devalue others due to differences in race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, age or disability.

Youth who use epithets such as “fag,” “spic,” “nigger,” “cracker,” or “kike.”

Youth who demonstrate a pattern of involvement in verbal or physical confrontations with persons they identify as “different” based on race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, age, or disability.

Youth who have committed a hate crime or bias incident.

Youth who display tattoos or other symbols associated with the hate movement and are found to have attitudes or beliefs also associated with that movement.

The primary goal of Pathways to Tolerance is to decrease the participant’s risk of committing a hate crime by increasing his/her tolerance of those who are different as demonstrated through attitudes and behaviors. The primary objectives of Pathways to Tolerance are for youth to:

- Acknowledge personal biases
- Begin to formulate a sense of identity that is not based in being different or better than others
- Take responsibility for bias-motivated behaviors
- Develop nonviolent conflict resolution skills
- Develop ability to identify with individuals who are perceived as “different”
- Empathize with victims of hate crimes
- Have a positive group experience with members of other racial, cultural or religious groups.

The model program design consists of therapeutic groups, facilitated by two professionals with appropriate experience working with this age group, using cognitive-behavioral therapy, applied self-psychology, and experiential therapy as the primary clinical tools. Group sessions are 2 hours long, and have a maximum of 12 participants.

The program design draws on the experience gained in similar programs whose objectives are to counteract drug and alcohol abuse, violence or predatory sexual behaviors. At the completion of treatment, appropriate referrals to ongoing community programs and resources are made to keep “graduates” moving in a positive direction. This may include speaking opportunities at subsequent groups for the most successful graduates.

Pathways to Tolerance is a 12-week closed outpatient group. Youth are referred by probation officers, juvenile court judges or referees and school administrators. Participation is court-ordered or included as dictated by the referring professional.

Outpatient participants are responsible for their own transportation. Guardians’ attendance is required at the initial assessment, a mid-way session, and the graduation. Referring professionals receive faxed weekly attendance reports, monthly written progress reports and timely phone reports of any critical incidents.
III. Theoretical Background

There are many theories of why people hold prejudices. To detail them here would not be germane, as our immediate concern is with changing attitudes and behaviors, and thus preventing hate crimes. The majority of adults who hold prejudicial attitudes do not overtly act on them. If they do, they are unlikely to commit violent hate crimes.

Adolescents with prejudicial attitudes, however, are much more likely to act on them for a number of reasons:

- The adolescent’s ability to control impulses is not fully developed, furthermore, an increasing percentage have diagnosable impulse control disturbances.
- The adolescent is at higher risk for being a victim of violence that an adult.
- The adolescent is at higher risk for being a perpetrator of violent behavior than an adult is.
- Adolescent are at a crucial stage of development where their primary task is to develop an identity. Erickson called this stage “Identity vs. Identity Confusion.” This is a highly emotionally charged, vulnerable stage. Any implied or perceived threat to their fragile sense of self could be experienced as a sort of annihilation – and could provoke behavior. The violence here is in some cases not premeditated even when it appears so by adult standards. During the experience of psychological fragmentation, the adolescent who acts out is—in that moment—committing an act of survival.

In order to facilitate change, *Pathways to Tolerance* is designed to:

- Provide an environment wherein the youth can safely examine his/her attitudes;
- Lead the youth to increased understanding of how these attitudes “serve” him/her (meet primary needs);
- Provide self-management skills/tools with which s/he can increase his/her behavioral options – leading to increased self-efficacy

In order to conceptualize this change process we use the “Cycle of Dysfunction” model, which has been used in substance abuse and domestic violence treatment modalities:
The Cycle of Dysfunction:

Unexamined, rigid attitudes

↑

reactive, impulsive, acting-out behaviors

↑

which reinforce the rigid attitudes.

Change Model:

attitudes + examination = knowledge

↑

lead to more behavioral options

↑

which in turn lead to change/modification of attitudes.
IV. Synopsis of Curriculum

The basic hypothesis of *Pathways to Tolerance* is that bias-motivated behavior stems from unfulfilled needs. Prejudices are learned from parents, from peers, from society; but whether they are expressed through verbal or physical actions depends upon the unmet needs in that individual. Behind the hatred is fear, low self-esteem, insecurity, immaturity, or lack of social skills. Invariably, youth who lash out at others have themselves been victimized whether physically, sexually, or emotionally. The overarching goal of the program is to assist participants in facing the source of their antipathy towards particular groups and developing new skills in self-care. We will show them new ways of managing their impulses that will allow them to change their behavior. In addition we will provide an environment conducive to reexamining their attitudes.

A primary goal is to help participants separate their beliefs, or attitudes, from their actions. This will allow them to change their behavior whether or not they change their attitudes towards those who are different. Cognitive behavioral therapy focuses on changing behavior because theory has demonstrated that behavioral change leads to attitudinal change more than attitudinal change leads to behavioral change.

The method of addressing bias-motivated behaviors is outlined as follows:

1. **What was the thought**, or belief, about the individual or group that started the incident?

2. **What was the feeling** that stemmed from the thought? Explain that feelings are neither good nor bad, that everyone experiences a wide range of feelings.

3. **What was the need** behind the feeling? Explain that needs, like feelings, are neither good nor bad. Needs are natural instincts for survival. For example, the feeling of being cold stems from a need for more heat. When we feel hungry, we need food. When we feel threatened, we have a need for safety.

4. **Did the behavior** result in the need being met?

5. **If the behavior did not meet the need**, what are some alternative behaviors that would?

Bias-motivated behavior is here defined as an action, whether verbal or physical, stemming from bias toward an individual or groups based on specific characteristics. A hate crime is bias-motivated behavior that falls under the jurisdiction of the legal system. They may have learned to hate by emulating a role model (parent, relative, older sibling, friend) whom they respect. They may have learned to hate because of unmet physical, emotional, or psychological needs. They may have learned to hate by being themselves a victim of hate. Or their hate may stem from a combination of these factors.
The second hypothesis is that through facilitating growth in the areas of self-concept, self-efficacy, trust, and compassion participants will exhibit a reduction in hateful attitudes and behaviors.

An important component of the therapeutic process in *Pathways to Tolerance* is sharing meaningful experiences with persons belonging to the targeted group (the groups or groups which they hold prejudices against). In the curriculum, experiential or team-building activities are carefully designed to set the stage for a meaningful group experience to occur. When participants start to work and play together for a common goal, they are connecting as human beings rather than labels, and the goal has been met. If there are not participants already in the group who belong to that target population, persons will be brought in as speakers/guest facilitators.

The therapeutic curriculum is designed to reach the youth on 3 levels of experience – affective (emotions), behavioral (actions), and cognitive (thoughts). The therapeutic curriculum is designed to be implemented exclusively by mental health professionals with knowledge/expertise in psychotherapy, group dynamics, cognitive behavioral therapy, ego psychology, gestalt and experiential therapies.

The group sessions will alternate between experiential, team building activities and psychotherapeutic process disguised as play. These activities have the power to engage even the most resistant youth in the therapeutic process because they work on the physical and emotional levels. Rather than just talking about bias, prejudice and bigotry, an emotional response to prejudice/bigotry will be facilitated in the therapeutic environment. Specific activities have been designed to set the stage. This will include interaction with victims of hate crimes such as a holocaust survivor, followed up by activities based on psychodrama in which participants experience being a target of bigotry in a safe, controlled, manner.

In one of the early sessions, participants will learn and reinforce the concepts of stereotyping, prejudice and discrimination through an interactive game called “Hate Jeopardy” based on the TV game show. This game is a powerful educational tool as well as an effective method of generating heated discussion and pertinent self-disclosure around these concepts.

One session features an activity called “Commonalties” which allows participants to experiment with diversity. The group breaks up into several “subgroups”. Each subgroup then writes a list of characteristics that they have in common but which are not physically evident. In the process of finding commonalties they are also discovering those differences which are not obvious. The subgroup with the longest list is the “winner”. The winning subgroup then acts as peer leaders in a group discussion. This is fun and promotes self-disclosure within the group, thereby enhancing the development of group cohesion.

Several sessions focus on communication skills. One introduces the method of Nonviolent Communication (“NVC”) as developed by Marshall Rosenberg. NVC is
based on a theory that classifying and judging people promotes violence. Participants are taught to observe what others are saying or doing (instead of judging), to state their feelings about the action (instead of blaming), to express their needs in relation to their feelings (and take responsibility for those needs), and lastly making a request (instead of a demand).

All concepts taught are reinforced through ROPES activities. ROPES (Reality Oriented Physical Experience Systems) is a type of “experiential therapy”. ROPES activities are effective at breaking down a client’s resistance to a therapeutic process because they access feelings as well as thoughts. It is easy to tune out of a talk session but impossible not to have an emotional reaction when you trust your peers to belay you as you walk a tightrope 100 feet above ground.

V. Curriculum Outline

Module One
“What is Pathways to Tolerance?”
Understanding the Problem of Prejudice and Hatred

Objectives:
- Develop rapport with facilitators and peers
- Build a common vocabulary with which to discuss issues of intolerance and intergroup conflict in society
- Understand stereotyping and prejudice
- Introduce concept of bias-motivated behavior
- Set personal goals
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Two
Prejudice and Feelings

Objectives:
- Identify primary feelings involved with development of prejudice
- Personalize: Identify what feelings are behind their own prejudices
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Three
Exploring Self in Society

Objectives:
- Develop an objective perspective on how prejudice and discrimination have led to underlying social ranking systems in the U.S. and other cultures
• Recognizing what privileges and/or lack of privileges are connected with social identity
• Explore how privilege or lack of affects behaviors
• Identify major influences on values; discriminate between positive and negative influences
• Self-identity any needed changes
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Four
Crime and Punishment: Hate Crimes and the Law

Objectives:
• Begin to empathize with hate crime victims
• Understand the consequences of a variety of hate crimes to victims, to perpetrators, and to society
• Build awareness of how hate crimes are being addressed by the law
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Five
Gangs and Hate Groups

Objectives:
• Increase awareness of current hate groups and their belief systems – including gangs.
• Challenge the belief systems of hate groups
• Be able to relate the existence of hate groups either to personal experience, or to a wider perspective on society
• Explore similarities/differences between gangs and hate groups
• If participants are in gangs or hate groups, discover how they became involved (Family tradition? Cultural? Economic?)
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Six
Genocide: The Holocaust and Ethnic Cleansing

Objectives:
• Sensitize to feelings of victims of the Holocaust and current ethnic cleansing campaigns
• Understand how prejudice, discrimination, and scapegoating can lead to the ultimate hate crime of genocide
• Debunk Holocaust denial
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity
Module Seven
Museum of Tolerance Field Trip

Objectives:
- Share a positive group experience with those who are perceived as “different” through experiential team-building activities.
- Relate level of self-confidence to bias and prejudice
- Build trust in peers

Module Eight
From Homophobia to Hate

Objectives:
- Learn how prejudice can lead to bias motivated behavior
- Learn current terminology of issues of sexual orientation
- Explore source of feelings and thoughts about homosexuality
- Debunk common myths about homosexuality
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Nine
Self-Empowerment through Positive Self-Talk

Objectives:
- Introduce concept of the mind as similar to a computer (garbage in, garbage out)
- Identify negative programs (cognitive distortions)
- Connect negative programs to bias-motivated attitudes and behaviors
- Learn how reprogramming can lead to increased success
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Ten
Self-Empowerment through Nonviolent Conflict Resolution
Prejudice Proofing: How to fight back without making it worse

Objectives:
- Learn how to resolve conflicts effectively and without violence
- Relate conflict to prejudice and bias
- Introduce concept of non-violent communication and conflict resolution
- Learn to work collaboratively as a group
- Reframe conflict as a key part of growth and learning
- Learn basic techniques of non-violent communication as foundation for non-violent conflict resolution
- Apply non-violent conflict resolution techniques to real situations in or outside the group
• Relate violent communication to bias-motivated behavior
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity

Module Eleven
Cultural Diversity: Developing Understanding of Minority Cultures

Objectives:
• Increase understanding of the historical contributions of several minority cultures to American society
• Develop an appreciation for the values of diversity among cultures: view differences as opportunities not problems
• Practice responding positively to cross-ethnic interactions

Module Twelve
Goal Setting and Goodbyes

Objectives:
• Reinforce learning from past modules
• Demonstrate how individuals need others to make dreams come true and meet goals – through experiential activity
• Brainstorm solutions to inter-group problems in their community
• Revisit “Galaxies”: Have they changed? Do they want them to change?
• Debrief group, share learning, and set goals
• Say good-byes

VI. Curriculum Introduction

The curriculum is broken down into three parts: educational, experiential, and process. There are 12 education modules followed by 16 experiential warm-up activities (Section IX) and 6 closing activities (Section X). Each educational module includes a set of suggested questions geared to prompt process discussions around the topics that have been presented. If the group is highly engaged you may not need any prompters. Or, you may come up with your own questions. The educational modules are numbered 1 through 12 however the order can be changed at the discussion at the discretion of the therapist. The experiential warm-up activities are in no particular order. This is because the very nature of experiential work is working in the moment, and meeting the client where they are. Therapists need to be prepared for several activities and able to switch at the last moment, using their professional judgement to determine what would best serve that group based on numerous factors including: Number of participants present, overall tone of the group, availability of materials, space considerations, etc.
Similarly, the amount of time spent on education, experiential activity, and process cannot be wholly prescribed in advance. A general rule of thumb for a two hour group is to start with a brief check-in (15 minutes), spend about 30 minutes in the educational module, about 30 minutes in the experiential activity, and about 30 minutes on the process, leaving time for a 15 minute break. Adjust according to the capacity of the group. A good rule of thumb is to increase the time spent in experiential activities for groups with short attention spans. Otherwise you risk losing their attention.

A fourth component is relaxation techniques. These are optional as some groups will benefit and others not.

VII. Tips for the Facilitator

Don’t take yourself too seriously!

Prioritize, Prioritize, and Prioritize:

First:  the participants  
Second:  the material  
Third:  the participants’ reactions  
Fourth:  YOU!

Stay in the process. Don’t get mired in the results.

Distinguish carefully between true prejudice and discernment or discrimination in the neutral sense of noticing differences.

Remember you can lead a horse…

General rule of thumb with a client group with this much resistance is

90% FACING  10% LEADING

See Marty Robbins technique with horses (The Horse Whisperer)

Keep PACING until they give a signal they are ready to follow

Move into LEADING slowly

If they BOLT, GO BACK TO PACING!!!
VIII. Curriculum Modules

MODULE ONE

“What is Pathways?”
Identifying the Problem of Prejudice and Hatred

Objectives:
• Develop rapport with facilitators and peers
• Build a common vocabulary with which to discuss issues of intolerance and intergroup conflict in society
• Understand stereotyping and prejudice
• Introduce concept of bias-motivated behavior
• Set Personal Goals
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Introductions

It is vital for facilitators of a tolerance group to be open and honest about how they identify themselves with respect to gender, race, culture, ethnicity, religion, etc. Self-disclosure around personal biases and how you have dealt with them is particularly important. Modeling is the best teaching tool. The sharing of personal experiences of bias incidents, whether as a victim, perpetrator, or bystander, is more powerful than any video.

A basic hypothesis of this curriculum is that increasing “mindfulness,” defined as active distinctions making, can decrease prejudice. This theory is demonstrated by promising new research. A study at Harvard University found that “one potentially effective way of reducing prejudice is, ironically, to increase discrimination.”¹ As cognitive work can increase mindfulness by teaching people to be more aware of their own thoughts, feelings, and how thoughts and feelings relate to behaviors; cognitive teaching is the overall theme of the curriculum.

Self introductions of facilitators and participants
Briefly describe: Format, expectations, goals, evaluation, and communication with staff or referring agency and criteria for success/rewards
Let participants know that, if they every have any questions, they can call you.

Establish Ground Rules for Behavior

Put “ROPES” on board. Elicit words that begin with those 5 letters which define behaviors or conditions that they think would contribute to a positive group environment. Discuss why they think so.

For example:

R: Respect…
O: Openness…
P: Participation…
E: Exploration…
S: Safe Environment…

Can they stay within these parameters?

II. Warm-up (see Section IX)

III. FOCUS on: Identifying the Problem

Lead discussion on why participants have been referred and how they feel about being here. Participants are present either because they have committed a hate/bias incident, or they have been identified as being at high risk for hate-motivated behaviors (through expression of strong prejudicial attitudes), or if this is an on-site group, simply because they are a member of the community which is experiencing intergroup conflicts. It is important to verbalize which is the case and admit how he feels about it.

Expect a significant degree of resistance, even more than you normally would expect with a juvenile delinquent population. Participants will have a chip on their shoulder at the first group because they fell they are being accused of being a racist. Their unanimous refrain will be “I’m not racial!” Racial attitudes are more socially sensitive than most other attitudes, which is why a person’s true attitude is difficult to assess accurately. “Individuals may express public attitudes that reflect more their impressions of socially desirable responses than their private opinions. People also are unwilling to admit to themselves that they are prejudiced—to reinforce a positive self-image and reflect an ideal self-concept.”

The method of dealing with resistance is first, to facilitate their expression of it (appropriately) and second, to REFRAME the problem as a global, social problem, not simple a personal problem. This will effectively take the focus of BLAME and redirect it

---

to a therapeutic process. Participants need to move beyond their anger at being put in “the racial group” (as they will call it) to the point where they are open to looking at how they are affected by the social problem of prejudice/hatred—whether they have already acted it out or not—and are willing to set some personal goals about learning to deal with these problems more effectively.

Start by introducing some common terminology. Ask for a volunteer scribe” from the group to write the group’s ideas on the board. Instruct the scribe to write each word and have participants help define them prior to giving them the following definitions:

**Stereotyping**
Preconceived or oversimplified generalization involving negative beliefs about a particular group. Negative stereotypes are frequently at the base of prejudice. The danger of stereotyping is that people are not considered as individuals, but rather as members of a group who all think the same way.

To illustrate how overgeneralizing can lead to stereotyping, you can use the example of a child who is bitten by a dog and then becomes afraid of all dogs. “All dogs are vicious.”

**Prejudice**
An unfavorable attitude toward any category or group of people which is formed in disregard of facts. Making a judgement about someone before knowing him or her on the basis of such aspects as the person’s race, religion, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, or ability.

Prejudice is not just an attitude but a feeling, whether positive or negative, most prejudices tend to be negative.

A person tends to stick to his prejudice even when confronted by new and contradictory information about the person.

Stress the 3 primary characteristics of prejudice:
- Prejudices Are Negative In Nature
- Prejudices Are Not Based On Facts
- Prejudices Are Resistant To Change

**Discrimination**
Unequal treatment of individuals or groups based on categorical attributes, such as racial, ethnic, religious, or social-class membership. When we act on our prejudices, it becomes discrimination. (employment, housing, educational, social exclusion)

**Epithet**
A derogatory word based in a negative image of a race, culture, ethnicity, etc. Examples are: “honky,” “Nigger,” “wetback,” “faggot.”
Scapegoating
Blaming an individual or group when the fault actually lies elsewhere. Prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory acts lead to scapegoating. Scapegoating can lead to verbal and physical violence, including death.

Racism
The false assumption that race determines psychological and cultural traits with the belief that once race is superior to another. Based on their belief in the inferiority of certain groups, racists justify domination, segregation and/or scapegoating against these groups.

Genocide
The deliberate, systematic extermination if an entire people

Activity: Pass out paper if necessary and ask participants to pick one of the above terms and write about three personal experiences of that term: one where they were in the victim role, one where they were the perpetrator, and one where they were a bystander. Then ask them to share with the group – lead into a process discussion.

Discussion prompts:
- If everybody were the same color/race/religion would there be any prejudice, discrimination, etc.?
- How do people learn stereotypes?
- What is the relationship between stereotypes and biased behavior?
- What role do the media and advertising play in perpetuating bias?
- What role do the media and advertising play in dispelling stereotypes?
- How can the use of certain words and phrase perpetuate bias and stereotypes?
- How do prejudicial attitudes develop?
- What is anti-Semitism?

IV. Experiential Activity: “Galaxy”

Objectives of this activity:
- Gain insight into sense of identity and place in world by formulating a personal “galaxy”
- Identify the major influences on their values
- Discriminate between positive and negative influences
- Identify any changes they wish to make in their galaxy
- Relate galaxy to bias-motivated attitudes and behaviors

Participants draw a “personal galaxy” (ecomap) where they are the sun and the planets around them are the people/places/things which influence them, with those closest having the most influence:

Then, instruct volunteers to simulate “models” of their galaxies by using peers, i.e., by positioning members and instructing them on who they represent, how much “pull” they
have, how much rotation, etc. Once they are in place, generate discussion with the following questions:

- Who is in your galaxy and where?
- Are the people in your galaxy the same or different ethnicity, religion, race, etc.?
- Who revolves around whom?
- Who is in the inner circle?
- Who is in outer space?
- Who has the most “pull”? (gravity)
- Who has the least “pull”?
- What is a family?
- What is a family supposed to do?
- Does your family do it?
- Do you get that from your group? (peer group/gang)

Repeat with all members, time permitting

V. Debrief

Relate to issues of their attitudes towards different races/religions/cultures etc.

**Goal Setting:** Ask participants to think of at least one personal goal that they would like to accomplish in the group. Specify that it be a self-challenge, not changing others, something that they have control over, that is not external to them.

VI. Assignment

Discuss the definition worksheet (Handout 1) with someone in your family (or a friend, if you are not in contact with family members). Be prepared to report to the group no their opinions/reactions to your discussion next week.

VII. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE TWO

Prejudice and Feelings

Objectives:
- Identify primary feelings involved with development of prejudice
- Personalize: identify what feelings are behind their own prejudices
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. Review assignment from previous module

Ask for volunteers to share how their family member or friend reacted to the discussion on prejudice, etc. Encourage them to act it out rather than tell.

III. FOCUS ON: Prejudice and Feelings

Ask participants what feelings they think are behind, or related to prejudices. Put their answers on their board. (Prompts: fear, anger, and frustration)

Ask how do they think these feelings cause prejudice?

Class Reading:

Many different emotions can underlie prejudice. Prejudice can result in fear and threat, or jealousy and envy; it can range from intense hatred to simple indifference and an absence of human compassion. But most research on prejudice has concentrated on the single, friendly-hostile dimension.

Hostility toward outsiders is generally developed in early childhood well before they know the meaning of what they are saying. Labels about “others” are taught by family, such as “white people”, “Hungarians”. Later the child learns to differentiate by pointing out exceptions, such as “some of my best friends are Jews, but I don’t like them as a group.”

Fear is an important emotion in this development of prejudice. Children pass through stages of being fearful of strangers in general; and parents may use fear as a tool of discipline. As children get older they find it important to conform their attitudes to what they feel is expected of them. Some prejudices may be “socially adaptive” in a prejudiced environment. Some people may not need to hate so much, as they need to be liked and accepted by people important to them. They may be known as “conforming bigots.”
Sometimes holding certain attitudes can serve to reduce anxiety. People may “project” their emotional problems onto the external world through particular social attitudes. For example, if you have a lot of conflicts within your own family, you may view Jews as dangerously clannish. This theory derives from Freudian psychoanalytic theory.

In the 1940s research was conducted on the personality dynamics of anti-Semites (people who hate Jews). It was discovered that anti-Semites had a certain pattern of personality traits, which was called “authoritarianism”. The characteristics of this syndrome included: refusing to look inside oneself and lacking insight into one’s own behavior and feelings. Authoritarians refuse to accept their emotions and try to deny them. This is usually cased by having punitive parents. As children they felt intense punishment. So they learn to deny their hostile feelings, and project them onto other people. Instead of feeling hatred towards their parents, they now see hatred in the dangerous outside world. They tend to view the world in black and white terms: things are either “good” or “bad” and all relationships are about power and control.

Frustration as a cause of prejudice: Frustration is created by an inability to attain desired goals. The perceived obstacles to attaining these goals are usually older, stronger, persons or institutions. So hostility gets directed onto vulnerable objects that become “scapegoats” for the original frustration. For example, there is an old story about the boss who criticizes his employee, who in turn argues with his wife, who yells at her child, who kicks the dog, who chases the cat, who then takes it out on a mouse.

A famous experiment shows how frustration increases prejudice. Attitudes toward Japanese and Mexicans held by 31 young men working at a summer camp were measured. Then the men were made to complete a series of lengthy tests when they really wanted a night out at the movies. Then their attitudes were measured again. The second test showed less favorable attitudes towards Japanese and Mexicans than the first test. A control group, which was not given the lengthy tests in-between, showed no change in attitudes.

IV. Experiential Activity: Debate

We have found that teaching youth the debate activity is very productive with this population. It is interactive and engaging, and channels adolescents natural affinity for talking and arguing. The participants learn how to express themselves around difficult issues without loosing control and becoming violent. Thus they are learning how to deal with conflict. By having to argue both sides of the same issues, they gain objectivity. They learn it is ok to have different points of view then one another.

Procedure: Pick two teams. Assign the debate question, and assign team “A” to argue “for” and team “B” to argue “against” the issue. Set a time limit” usually 10 minutes. Set ground rules: no interrupting, teams take turns speaking, one person speaks at a time, no foul language. After 10 minutes, switch positions. Now team “A” argues against and team “B” argues for the issues.
Debate questions:
- Can prejudice be eliminated in our society one day?
- Is prejudice ever justified?

V. Debrief
What thoughts and feelings came up for you during the debate?

VII. Tolerance Journal

VI. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE THREE

Exploring Self in Society

Objectives:

- Develop an objective perspective on how prejudice and discrimination have led to underlying social ranking systems in the U.S. and other cultures
- Recognizing what privileges and/or lack of privilege are connected with social identity
- Explore how privilege or lack of affects behaviors
- Identify major influences on values; discriminate between positive and negative influences
- Self-identify any needed changes
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. Review assignment from previous module

Ask for volunteers to share how their family member or friend reacted to the discussion on prejudice, etc. Encourage them to act it out rather than tell.

III. FOCUS ON: Social Inequalities

Preface with a disclaimer that talking about this stuff is not easy, but to not talk about something so obvious is like having an elephant in the room and pretending it’s not there. As a result of prejudice, discrimination, etc. there is a sort of “ranking system” in every society. In some societies it is “overt”, meaning obvious, i.e. the different ways people are treated are mandated by laws. A good example is Afghanistan, where women are increasingly not allowed to work, or even go outside. In a democratic society such as the U.S. the ranking system is much more subtle yet still exists. It is perpetuated not by laws but by prejudice attitudes.

“Now we are going to ask you to examine how that ranking system affects you. It is important because in order to overcome an obstacle, you need to know what that obstacle is. Some of you may think it is obvious, most likely those of you who self-identify with a minority group. It may be easy to identify the disadvantages you experience but not so easy to identify the privileges. And if you have more privileges than disadvantages, you may be unaware of the privileges you do have. If you don’t see it as it is, you are operating in the dark.”
IV. “Self in Society” Worksheet

Have participants complete the “Self in Society” Worksheet (Handout 2). Explain they are for personal use only, and will not be turned in or shared with anyone, unless they wish to do so.

“Self in Society” Worksheet

In order to rise above hatred and intolerance in society, it is necessary to be honest with yourself about what (if any) prejudices you are holding, as a result of upbringing or personal experiences. And, in order to be truly honest about what prejudices you do hold, it is necessary to know where you stand in society — how others see you. This may not be as obvious as you think — so answering the following questions may take some thought.

1. Do you think all races and ethnic groups are equal in American society?

2. The following categories are all aspects of your social identity:
   - Ethnic or racial group
   - Ethnic or racial group which others associate you with
   - Nationality
   - Gender
   - Religion
   - Sexual Orientation
   - Economic Class
   - Age
   - Physical condition

3. What legal privileges or advantages do you think you have because of your social identity? [If you can’t think of any, ask someone from another group to tell you about your privileges.]

4. What legal disadvantages do you think you have because of your social identity?

5. What financial problems do you have that you feel are connected to your lack of social privilege? Explain.

6. What are you psychological privileges? (Things you take for granted)

7. What are your spiritual privileges? (Can you worship without being harassed?)

8. How are you using your most powerful privilege?
V. Debrief

Preface with acknowledgement that it is difficult and painful to discuss these issues. Demonstrate through examples – the more relevant personal disclosure the better—around how getting honest with one self about where you stand in the social fabric in which you live and how you are personally affected can be empowering.

Discussion Prompts:
- Do you have more privileges than you realize? Less?
- Does this make you think differently about people in other groups?

Discuss the range of individual responses to living in an unequal society and pros and cons of each:
- Denial/avoidance of the problem
- Exaggeration of the Problem
- “Reverse Racism”: is there such a thing?
- Victim Mentality
- Racism within a subgroup

VI. Assignment: Begin keeping a “tolerance” journal:

1) Begin to watch out for examples of stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, racism, bias incidents, and hate crimes in your daily life.
2) Each day, write or draw about one example that you have observed in your Tolerance Journal. It could be an observation of your own behavior, someone else's behavior, something you saw on TV, or heard on the news.
3) How did it make you feel?
4) Did you do anything about it?

VII. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE FOUR

Crime and Punishment: Hate Crimes and the Law

Objectives:
- Begin to empathize with hate crimes victims
- Understand the consequences of a variety of hate crimes to victims, to perpetrators, and to society
- Build Awareness of how hate crimes are being addressed by the law
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. FOCUS ON: Crime Scale.

Compare the severity of consequences of different crimes to society.

Get a “scribe” to create a “Crime Scale” by putting the numbers 1—10 up along one wall.

Ask participants what are the different kinds of criminal offences and what is the order of severity? (i.e. misdemeanor, felony, etc.)

Write their opinion under the numbers.

III. Video presentation: “Crimes of Hate”

Elicit thoughts, experiences etc. about hate crimes. Have they ever committed one? Have they ever been the victim of one?

Present the fact: Hate Crimes are on the rise and 80% are committed by young people under the age of 21.

Discuss the difference between hate crimes and bias incidents:

“Bias Incident”: harmful words or actions motivated by prejudice against a person or property but which fall short of criminal conduct under either State or Federal law.

Ex: In a school hallway one student yells loudly at another “you’re a faggot.”

“Hate Crime”: a criminal act directed at an individual or property which is motivated by the actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability or gender of the victim. A hate crime always includes commission of underlying or “predicate” criminal offense. Mere expression of hatred or intolerance is not a crime, and hence not a hate crime.
Ex.: An individual spray paints a swastika on the side of a synagogue.

IV. Hate Scale

Explain that the “Crime Scale” on the wall is now a “Hate Crime Scale.” How many hate crimes were shown in the film? Get a volunteer scribe to list them on the board. Discuss each one and rate 1-10 as before.

If time left over, distribute articles about other hate crimes – as recent and local as possible. Participants take turns reading their articles out loud, rating it 1-10 where 10 is the most possible severe, and taping it under the number. Ask the others if they agree or disagree.

Discussion Prompts:
• Were their ratings similar or dissimilar to their peers? Why?
• Can hate crimes be stopped?
• Have you or anyone you know ever committed a hate crime?
• Do you think the frequency of hate crimes will change with the minority population in the U.S. reaches 50%? Do you think they will increase or decrease?

V. Hate Crime Legislation

• Model legislation, drafted by ADL in 1981 calls for penalty enhancement for bias-motivated crimes.
• Forty states have enacted laws based in or similar to the ADL model.
• Almost every state has some form of legislation to redress bias crimes.
• The ADL plays a prominent role in securing passage of Federal statues mandating both the gathering of statistics on hate crimes and a penalty enhancement for bias motivated Federal crimes.
• ADL is currently supporting efforts to amend current Federal civil rights law to give Federal officials broader authority to prosecute hate crimes.

ADL has long been in the forefront of national and state efforts to deter and counter hate-motivated crimes. Such crimes have a special emotional and psychological impact extending beyond the individual victim. They intimidate others in the victim’s community, and make them feel isolated, vulnerable and unprotected. Hate crimes polarize communities and damage the very fabric of our society.

Although prejudice and hatred cannot be legislated out of existence government can do more to deter and redress violence motivated by bigotry. ADL has pioneered the development and promotion of hate crimes statutes as well as programs educating law enforcement officials and the public about the dangers of hate crimes and what can be done in response.
The model legislation calls for penalty enhancement for bias-motivated crimes. The statue complements other ADL counteraction measures focusing on media exposure, education and more effective law enforcement.

Forty states have enacted laws based on or similar to the ADL model, and almost every state has some form of legislation to redress bias crimes.

The ADL also plays a prominent role in securing passage of Federal statues mandating both the gathering of statistics on hate crimes. And a penalty enhancement for bias-motivated Federal crimes, as well as legislation which broadens Federal jurisdiction to prosecute attacks against houses of worship. Currently we are supporting efforts to amend current Federal civil rights law to give Federal officials broader authority to prosecute hate crimes. In addition, the proposed revision would extend Federal protection to victims of bias violence who are targeted because of their sexual orientation, gender or disability.

The model legislation is also aimed at deterring attacks against houses of worship, cemeteries, schools and community centers – common targets of hate-inspired vandalism. One provision of creates a private right-of action for victims of hate crimes, which allows the victim to sue for money damages and to collect attorneys’ fees and punitive damages as well.

VI. Experiential Activity: Debate

Split into two groups and have a debate on one or both of the following issues:

Should penalty enhancement hate crime laws be passed in all states?

Should sexual orientation (or gender, or disability) be included in hate crime laws?

VII. Debrief

VIII. Assignment

Continue with daily entries in Tolerance Journal, as explained in Module 1. And, continue to rate one’s “Personal Power” each day on a scale of 1 to 10 and justify the number chosen.

IX. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE FIVE

Gangs and Hate Groups

Objectives:
• Increase awareness of current hate groups and their belief systems—including gangs.
• Challenge the belief systems of hate groups
• Be able to relate the existence of hate groups either to personal experience, or to a wider prospective in society
• Explore similarities/differences between gangs and hate groups
• If participants are in gangs or hate groups, discover how they became involved (Family tradition? Cultural? Economic?)
• Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. FOCUS ON: Gangs and Hate Groups


III. Experiential Activity

Present a guest speaker who is a reformed member of hate group. If not available, show reformed skinhead excerpt from video “The Truth about Hate”.

Alternative: if anyone in the group is a former member of a gang, ask them to make a presentation.

IV. Debrief

Discussion Prompts:
• Have you or anyone you know been associated with a hate group?
• Have you or anyone you know been victimized by a hate group or a member of a hate group?
• Are there any beliefs of the hate groups presented that you agree with? Disagree with?
• In what ways are gangs and hate groups similar?
• In what ways are gangs and hate groups different?
• Compare and contrast the nuclear family and gangs/hate groups as a family.
V. Assignment

Define “Personal Power”. Power defined as self-management skills not as power over others, as the ability to take charge and be neither victim nor victimizer. Explain the Personal Power Rating (“PPR”) on a scale of 1 to 10.

Continue with daily entries in Tolerance Journal, as explained in Module 1. In addition, begin to rate one’s “Personal Power” each day on a scale of 1 to 10 and justify the number chosen.

VI. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE SIX
Genocide: The Holocaust and Ethnic Cleansing

Objectives:
- Sensitize to feelings of victims of the Holocaust and other hate crimes victims
- Understand how prejudice, discrimination, and scapegoating can lead to the ultimate hate crime of genocide
- Debunk Holocaust denial
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. FOCUS ON: The Holocaust

This module is most effective when presented by a Holocaust Survivor. If not available use the Holocaust video.

Distribute materials on Holocaust and present highlights.

III. Debrief

Discussion Prompts:
- What were the circumstances which led up to the Holocaust?
- Could it ever happen again?
- If yes, what needs to happen to prevent this?
- How are current hate groups like the Nazis?
- How are they different?
- What do you think about the Holocaust denial?

IV. Distribute materials on Holocaust Denial and discuss

V. Have participants take turns reading several articles aloud on ethnic cleansing campaigns and discuss.

VI. Assignment:
Continue power rating
Write one page on how the speaker (whether in person or on video) has affected your self-image and view of others

VII. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE SEVEN

Boundary Breaking in the ROPES Course

Objectives:
• Share a positive group experience with those who are perceived as “different” through experiential team-building activities.
• Build self-confidence through transcending fears in the high ROPES course
• Relate level of self-confidence to bias and prejudice
• Build trust in peers

If there is not sufficient diversity within the group, invite volunteers from other missing groups to join you on the ROPES course.

I. FOCUS ON: ½ day on the ROPES course

Start with “lows” (teambuilding initiatives in the ground) and build up to the high ropes course activities.

II. Debrief
MODULE EIGHT

From Homophobia to Hate

Objectives:
- Learn how prejudice can lead to bias motivated behavior
- Learn current terminology of issues of sexual orientation
- Explore source of feelings and thoughts about homosexuality
- Debunk common myths about homosexuality
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

This module is most effective if led by a self-identified GLBTQ individual. Optimally, the participant will have already had a positive experience with a GBLTQ individual at the ROPES day. As prejudice and hatred is based on ignorance and fear, exposure in a structured setting is the most effective antidote for homophobia. And we have found that many adolescents, males in particular, have had no exposure at all to GBLTQ individuals. It is usually not safe for a GBLTQ individual to come out in a public high school environment.

We have found that the homophobia of adolescents is by far the strongest prejudice they hold. Often it is endorsed by their religious beliefs. It is wise to avoid direct arguments from a religious perspective, but to focus on exposure as the goal of compassion for those different – a live and let live attitude.

Begin with GLBTQ definitions. Get a volunteer “scribe” to write the words on the board and elicit participants’ ideas of the meanings of the words before providing the accurate definitions. (At end of session, distribute “GLBTQ Definitions” Handout)

**Gay/Bisexual/Lesbian/Transgender/Questioning (“GLBTQ”) Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homosexual</th>
<th>one whose primary or exclusive emotional and sexual attraction is to the same sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>one whose primary or exclusive emotional and sexual attraction is to the opposite sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>one who has the capacity to be emotionally and sexually attracted to either sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>a term used for both males and females who have a self-affirmed homosexual orientation; more commonly applied to males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>preferred term for women who are homosexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sexual orientation: an enduring affectionate, erotic or attraction to individuals of a particular sex

Biological Sex: the physiological and anatomical characteristics of maleness or femaleness with which a person is born

Gender Identity: a person’s psychological sense of being male or female

Gender Role: how you see yourself socially: socially constructed behavior expectations associated with being male or female

Homophobia: a personal and irrational fear or hatred of people who are gay, lesbian or bisexual. True homophobia is pathological but the term is commonly used for people who are strongly prejudiced against people who are same sex oriented.

Sexism: the social/cultural, institutional, and individual beliefs and practices that privilege men, subordinate women, and denigrate women-identified values.

Heterosexism: a system of attitudes, behaviors, cultural norms and institutional practices that denies, stigmatizes and denigrates people who are gay, lesbian or bisexual. Like other “ism’s” it represents prejudice plus power. Heterosexuals have advantages simply because they are heterosexual in U.S. society.

Heterosexual Privilege: The benefits and advantages heterosexuals receive in a heterosexist culture. Also, the benefits lesbian, gay men, and bisexuals receive as a result of claiming heterosexual identity or denying homosexual or bisexual identity.

Pedophile: An adult person who is attracted to and seeks sexual gratification with children. 95% of pedophiles are males whose sexual relationship with adults is heterosexual

Transgender: someone whose gender display at least sometimes runs contrary to what other people in the same culture expect

Transsexual: A person whose biological sex does not match their gender identity and who, through gender reassignment surgery and hormone treatments, seeks to change their physical body to match their gender identity. Transsexuals are not automatically homosexual: their sexual orientation can be heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual.
Transvestite  a person who enjoys dressing in clothes typically associated with the other gender. Most are heterosexual.

Straight  a term used to describe people who are heterosexual. Although commonly used this term is not a preferred term because it implies that people who are gay are “bent,” an old fashioned derogatory label similar to the term “faggot”.

Civil Rights  rights to fair employment, public accommodations, and fair housing; these are the rights of every citizen but are not protected who are gay except in a few states and cities.

Coming out  a process, usually occurring over time, in which individuals identify and acknowledge their sexual orientation as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Being open and out in one situation does not automatically mean the person is “out” everywhere.

III. Experiential Exercise: Experiencing loss of heterosexual privilege

Instruct participants to write 5 dreams of goals they have for their life, each on a separate piece of paper. For example “get married” or “have 3 children”.

Collect the papers and hang them up all around the room.

Have participants get up and walk around the room, reading everybody’s dreams.

Now the facilitator tells a story of a gay individual who is not able to achieve these goals due to discrimination. When he reaches the part where a particular goal is not obtained, he instructs the participants to rip that card off the wall and throw it away. There should be few cards left by the end of the narration.

IV. Debrief

Discussion prompts:
- How did it feel to have your goals ripped away?
- What do you think it would be like to be a GBLTQ individual?

V. Part Two: Heterosexual Privilege

Share this fact: One third of completed teen suicides are related to issues of sexual orientation. Gay and lesbian youth are 2-3 times more likely to attempt suicide than other younger people (1989 Task Force in Youth Suicide, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services).
Now, get a volunteer scribe to write in the board and see how many examples of heterosexual privilege they can think of. Then fill in the rest from the attached list:

1. Legal Marriage which entitles on to:
   - Recognition and support for an intimate relationship
   - Joint child custody
   - Tax benefits
   - Automatic inheritance from your spouse under probate laws
   - Sharing health, auto, and homeowners’ insurance policies at reduced rates
   - Paid bereavement leave if your spouse dies
   - Emotional support from your family

2. Being seen as “normal” which includes:
   - Having multiple positive role models of your gender and sexual orientation
   - Learning about relationships from the media
   - Having positive images of people with whom you can identify

3. Cultural Validation
   - Talking in public about your relationship without fear
   - Living with your partner without fear
   - Expressing pain if your relationship ends, and having your pain acknowledged
   - Receiving social acceptance by neighbors, colleagues, and friends

4. Institutional Acceptance
   - Better employment opportunities
   - Able to be a religious leader
   - Receive validation from religious community
   - Able to be a teacher without fear of being fired out of public fear you will “corrupt” children
   - Able to be a daycare worker without fear of being vilified as a potential child sexual abuser
   - Able to be a boy scout leader without fear
   - Able to serve in the military without hiding your sexuality

VI. Debrief

Discussion Prompts:
   - How many of these privileges have they personally experienced?
   - How would it fell not to have that?
V. Assignment

Explain that the next two sessions are on cultural diversity. Their assignment is to prepare a minipresentation on their culture. Ask them to write down 5 positive and 5 negative stereotypes about their culture. If this is an outpatient group, invite them to bring any special foods to share. In the next group they will share some positive and negative experiences related to their culture/ethnicity.

VIII. Closing (See Section X)

Additional Readings: Myth/Fact Sheet in Heterosexism and Homosexuality
Are schools safe for all our children
MODULE NINE
Self-Empowerment through Positive Self-Talk

Objectives:
- Introduce concept of the mind as similar to a computer (garbage in, garbage out)
- Identify negative programs (cognitive distortions)
- Connect negative programs to bias-motivated attitudes and behaviors
- Learn how reprogramming can lead to increased success
- Reinforce learning through experiential activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. Negative Self-Talk (Cognitive Distortions)

Present the following 8 kinds of negative self-talk, or cognitive distortions, in an interactive manner, by asking participants for feedback as you present each one. For example, with the Zebra, you might ask them: “do you ever use the word “never”, or think “: it’s all or nothing” in a situation?

1. “THE ZEBRA” (Beck’s All-or-Nothing Thinking): you see things only in black and white, the tendency to see things in an “all or nothing” fashion. Beware of words like “never,” “always,” “nothing,” and “everyone.”

   “Cool kids use; if you never use, you’re a nerd!”
   “You’re either on my side or theirs.”
   “You can never trust anyone over 30!”

   Stereotyping is a form of zebra thinking too:
   “All Asians are good at math”
   “All girls are over-emotional”

2. “MINDREADING” (Beck’s Jumping to Conclusions): The tendency to assume that others think something of you without checking it out. Jumping to conclusions, making a negative interpretation even without evidence, being a fortuneteller.

   “I know she hates me…she gave me a dirty look.”
   “She’s avoiding me…she must be pretty mad at me.”
   “My mom didn’t call me…she must not care about me.”
   “Those guys didn’t eat lunch with me…they must think I’m a geek.”

In a multicultural society you can get into many misunderstandings by assuming people are ding something because you’re _______ when it may be nothing to do with that.
3. “FORTUNE TELLING” (Beck’s Overgeneralization): The tendency to predict that things will turn out “awful” for you. One negative event is a sign of a never-ending pattern of defeat.

“When I go home, I know I’m going to mess up big time.”
“I’ll never make it to Level 3.”
“Staff will never trust me again.”
“I know I’m not going to make it through this place.”

If you are a minority member, fortune telling can really get in the way:

“I’ll never get a good job because I’m _____ so why bother.”

4. “BLAMING” (Beck’s Labeling and Mis-labeling) (Wexler’s Errors in Blaming): An extreme form of over-generalization. You immediately give yourself or others a broad negative tag, or label such as “I’m a loser” or “he’s a loser.” The tendency to unfairly blame yourself or others.

“It’s all my fault.” Or “it’s all their fault.”
“It’s my fault that my father drinks.”
“I was molested because of something I did wrong.”
“You always mess everything up for me.”

Hatred and discrimination stems from blaming.
“There’s no jobs left because there’s too many immigrants.”

5. “THRASHING” (Beck’s Disqualifying the Positive) (Wexler’s Down-putting): The tendency to put yourself or someone else down for having one problem or making one mistake. Also when you reject positive experiences by insisting they “don’t count” for some reason. In this way you can maintain a negative belief and eliminate from your mind some of the very experiences which would help you feel less depressed/angry.

“I’m overweight, so I must be lazy and stupid.”
“I failed this test, I must be dumb.”
“I’m in counseling, I must be a bad kid.”
“She doesn’t like me, I must be ugly.”

Thrashing explains how we perpetrate stereotypes even when personal experiences contradict them:
“She’s a real hard worker even though she’s ________-she’s not like the rest of them.”

6. “ASSUMING” (Beck’s Emotional Reasoning): The tendency to conclude that if you feel a certain way about yourself, then it must be true.
“Since I feel bad about myself, I must be a bad person.”
“I feel rejected, so everybody must be rejecting me.”
“Since I feel guilty, I must have done something wrong.”

Assuming can be dangerous for the minority person:
“I feel ashamed of being ________ so everybody must hate me.”

7. “Da’Nile – A River in Egypt”: Denial of responsibility based on minimizing the negative.

“I don’t have a problem with drugs – I never buy them.”
“Pot’s not bad for you – it’s not physically addictive.”
“It’s not my fault that I beat that kid up – he started it.”

Members of the oppressed minority groups can fall into the trap of denial of all responsibility by virtue of discrimination.

“It’s not my fault I’m on welfare, __________people don’t even have a chance.

III. Experiential Activity

Divide the class into 2 teams. Have them choose names for their teams. Pull straws or flip a coin to see who goes first. Read the following questions – the first team has one answer. If they get the correct answer, they get one point. If they get it wrong, the opposing team gets a shot. If the opposing team gets it wrong also, the first team gets another chance, and so on. The team with the most points wins. Prize – you determine!

Which category of faulty self-task is the following statement?

1. My probation officer told me I’m doing better, but I know he tells that to everybody.
   Answer is “trashing”

2. I feel lonely, so I guess nobody likes me.
   The answer is “assuming”

3. I know that all redheads can’t be trusted.
   The answer is “zebra”

4. Nothing’s ever going to work out for me.
   The answer is “Fortune-telling”

5. It’s your fault we never do anything fun.
   The answer is “blaming”
6. My parents got divorced – it must have been something about me.
   The answer is “blaming”

7. I sometimes don’t get things right so I must be lazy or stupid.
   The answer is “trashing”

8. He’s always smiling, but I know he doesn’t like me.
   The answer is “mindreading”

9. I hurt my mother’s feelings, so I must be an evil person.
   The answer is “trashing”

10. I work so hard, and I can tell from the way people look at me that nobody appreciates me.
    The answer is “mindreading”

11. If you weren’t so uptight about everything, our relationship would be great.
    The answer is “blaming”

12. Anybody who needs something from other people is weak.
    The answer is “zebra”

13. I just know this “pass” is going to turn out terrible.
    The answer is “fortune telling”

14. Although I did well in school, I’m not really smart.
    The answer is “trashing”

15. I saw my father get angry and out of control, so anytime someone gets angry I know things will get out of control.
    The answer is “Fortune-telling”

IV. Debrief

Relate negative self-talk to prejudice, to discrimination, to problems getting along with different groups in general.

Discussion Prompts:
- When someone calls you a derogatory name based on your race, religion, ‘hood, or sexual orientation, what is your self-talk? If it is negative self-talk, which category does it fall under? What is your action? Does the self-talk have anything to do with your action? What could you think instead?
• When you call someone else a derogatory name based on their race, religion, ‘hood, or sexual orientation, what is your self-talk? (Usually it is the Zebra, for example: “all Asians are out to pick a fight so I better show I’m tough”) What is the result of your action? What could you think instead?
• When you see discrimination in action, what is the self-talk of the person doing it? Share an experience that you’ve had with discrimination. Did you confront it? How can knowing about self-talk help you deal with it differently?

V. Assignment:

1. Continue Personal Power rating.

2. Start a daily journal entry listing 2 examples of negative self-talk and how they affected your behavior.

VI. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE TEN

Self-Empowering through Nonviolent Conflict Resolution
Prejudice Proofing: How to fight back without making it worse

Objectives:
• Learn how to resolve conflicts effectively and without violence
• Relate conflict to prejudice and bias
• Introduce the concepts of non-violent communication and conflict resolution
• Learn to work collaboratively as a group
• Reframe Conflict as a key part of growth and learning
• Learn basic techniques of non-violent communication as foundation for non-violent conflict resolution
• Apply non-violent conflict resolution techniques to real situations in or outside the group
• Relate violent communication styles to bias-motivated behavior
• Reinforce learning through experimental activity

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. Experimental Activity: "I am Thirsty" (a variation on Communication Breakdown)

(This activity requires a lot of space and is better facilitated outside where possible)

Supplies:
• Three clear cups
• Blue and yellow food coloring
• Two carpet squares
• Two borders (i.e. can use rope, line in sand)
• Two blindfolds
• Three platforms for cups

Set-up:
1. Ask for two volunteers who are willing to be blindfolded throughout the activity and two volunteers who are willing to be the voice of the group and the only ones who speak throughout the activity. It is important to go ahead and blindfold the two volunteers and place them in respective places at this point so that all four do not see where the facilitators place the cups.

2. Place the two "voices" of the group on the carpet squares at opposite ends of the activity space instructing them to face the outside space not to turn around throughout the activity, or leave the carpet square. Place the blindfolded individual back to back.
with the "voice" of the group. Instructing them that they will be receiving verbal instruction from the voice as to what to do next and to wait until then.

3. Fill two of the cups with water adding blue coloring to one and yellow to the other, leaving the third cup empty.

4. Place the filled cups at opposite ends of the activity space on improvised platforms and empty cup in the middle.

```
Group "A"

^      ^
|      |      |
|      |      |
|      |      |
|      |      |
|      |      |

Group "B"

Implementation:

The remaining people are divided into two groups. Tell them that due to extenuating circumstances (make something up i.e. a volcano erupted and there is lava everywhere) there is no longer any water. They are so thirsty that they cannot talk: they need the green water to restore their voices.
The groups cannot simply walk out and get the blue and yellow cups to make green water because there is quicksand on the other side of the boundary (see diagram). The only people who can get the cups of water are the blindfolded people because they have magic shoes. However, since they are blindfolded they cannot just walk to get the water, they need directions because they cannot talk. This leaves the two standing on the carpet squares to give directions, yet they are unaware of the location of the water and are facing the two groups. The two groups must separately communicate non-verbally to the person standing on the carpet square who will translate their message into verbal instructions for the blindfolded people to follow.

One group will go after the yellow water, and the other the blue water, keeping in mind that both groups need the green water to restore their voices.

Suggested Questions for Debriefing:

- What was it like for the blindfolded people? Did they trust the group?
- What was it like for the voices of the group? Did they get mixed messages?
- Do they ever get mixed messages and what is it like?
- What did they do to communicate successfully and what got in the way?
- What are the things that got in the way of communicating with their parents/peers/teachers?
- What are the elements of good, clear, effective communication?

III. **Non Violent Conflict Resolution**

A. **Identifying Feelings**

Contest: In 3 minutes write down as many feeling words as you can think of. (The person with the longest list gets a prize)

How many of the feelings have you personally experienced?

How many of the feelings have you expressed with someone else?

Distribute the "Feelings" Handout

B. **Feelings and Needs**

Distribute the "Needs" handout

Discuss the difference between feelings and needs.
C. Feelings vs. Thoughts

When you want to communicate effectively, it is more effective to talk about feelings than thoughts. So it is important to know the difference. It is not as easy as you may think, especially when you are mad or frustrated with someone.

For example, is the following statement about a feeling or a thought?

Ken says to Ali: "I'm angry because you're mad at your mother, but you are taking it out on me."

Although Ken states the feeling of anger, the rest of the sentence puts the focus on thoughts, and this thought is a judgement or an interpretation of the person's motivation. In other words, Ken is telling Ali what he thinks and what she is thinking and feeling.

How do you feel when someone tells you how to feel?  
How do you feel when they guess correctly about your feelings?  
How do you feel when they are totally off the mark?

If you can replace "I feel" with "I think" in a statement, it is not a feeling statement.

When "I feel" is followed by the words:
  That, like, as if, I  
  You, he, she, they, it  
  Names or nouns referring to people
The feeling statement becomes a judgement statement!

IV. 4 Steps to Fair Fighting

Distribute the "Fair Fighting" handout.

Step 1

Describe the person's behavior that is disturbing you without judging. This is a lot more difficult than it sounds. "You're making me mad" is judging and blaming, and it does not describe the behavior. What did they do exactly that resulted in your getting angry? If they called you a name, say it. Be as specific as possible.

"When you called me a ________ ."

Step 2

Describe what you felt like when they did whatever they did. To continue with our example, they called you a ________. How did that make you feel?

"I felt pissed"
Step 3

Identify the need behind the feeling. In this case, perhaps you need to feel respect.

"I'm really needing some respect"

Step 4

Ask for the concrete action that you would like taken, but don't demand! Demanding does not usually get a positive result.

"I would really like it if you didn't call me a ______"

Have participants practice the 4 steps through role-playing. Break up into pairs. First one member of the pair explains a conflict he is having with someone else (not the individual he is practicing with). Then the other member role-plays that individual as the first illustrates first what usually happens and second uses the 4 steps to fair fighting. Then switch.

Reconvene as a group and have the pairs demonstrate their "fair fighting" technique to the group, and get feedback.

Process/Debrief: How could fair fighting help with prejudice, discrimination, etc.

V. Assignment

Next module is on cultural awareness. Ask any minority members to prepare to make a presentation on their culture. Everybody: write down 5 positive and 5 negative stereotypes about their culture. If this is an outpatient group, invite them to bring any special foods to share. In the next group they will share some positive and negative experiences related to their culture/ethnicity.

Continue Personal Power rating.
Practice "fair fighting" once a day and record in a journal how it went.

VI. Closing (See Section X)
MODULE ELEVEN

Cultural Diversity:
Developing Understanding of Minority Cultures

Objectives:
• Increase understanding of the historical contributions of several minority cultures to society
• Develop an appreciation for the values of diversity among cultures: view differences as opportunities not problems
• Practice responding positively to cross-ethnic interactions

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. FOCUS ON: Minority Cultures

Participants' presentations (if any)

Ask the group what they think the African-American culture has contributed in this area?

Present information from attached "Historical Overview of Blacks on the Front Range".

Ask the group what they think the Hispanic culture has contributed to this area?

Present information from attached "Historical Overview of Latinos on the Front Range".

Ask the group what they think the Native American culture has contributed to this area?

Present information from attached "Historical Overview of Native Americans on the Front Range".

Ask the group what they think the Jewish culture has contributed to this area?

Present information from attached "Historical Overview of Jews on the Front Range".

V. Assignment

Continue the Tolerance Journal

VI. Closing (See Section X)

Discussion Prompts:
• What did you learn about yourself today?
• What did you learn about anybody else today?
• Did this experience affect your attitudes towards any other groups?
MODULE TWELVE

Goal Setting and Good-byes

Objectives:
- Reinforce learning from past modules
- Demonstrate how individuals need others to make dreams come true and meet goals - through experiential activity
- Brainstorm solutions to intergroup problems in their community
- Revisit "Galaxies": Have they changed? Do they want them to change?
- Debrief group, share learnings, and set goals
- Say good-byes

I. Warm-up (See Section IX)

II. FOCUS ON: Review of all previous sessions.

Ask participants what they have learned, what they remember. Elicit from them mini-presentations on each of the previous modules. (Prompt as needed)

III. Experimental Activity:

Conduct a debate using pairs instead of teams (one partner debates another at a time) on one of the following questions. Meanwhile, the rest of the group is the audience and they "vote" on who won each mini-debate. Use 5 minutes for the 2-person debates.

- Most people have made some personal changes in the Pathways to Tolerance group. (vs. I don't see any changes at all)
- Allow group to choose their own debate question

IV. Sharing Dreams and Goal Setting

Have participants look at the galaxies they drew early on. Have they changed? Do they want them to change?

Have participants write 3 personal goals related to the something that has come up for them in Tolerance group and write on slips of paper. Collect the slips, read aloud and discuss (anonymously) with group as a whole. Vote on the 5 most important goals.

Discuss the expression "If you're not part of the solution, you are part of the problem"
IV. Closing

"Web of Appreciation"

Take a ball of string. Toss it to one person, while stating something positive about them you have gained by being with them in the group. They toss to another. Continue until everyone is holding the string, forming a "web" connecting the circle. Then the last persons starts tossing it back, now stating one thing they want to give that person to take with them (i.e. strength, courage, etc.). Allow time for process, if any.

Note: Graduates will receive ADL tee shirts ("Hate Hurts")
IX. Warm-up Activities

1. Group Juggle

2. Everybody line up by birth date without talking

3. Charades

Members pair up. They have 5 minutes to communicate to their partner nonverbally (without speaking or writing) 3 behaviors that get them into trouble and 3 things they can do to make their life better. Reinforce that these are things that they can do or have control over as opposed to random events (i.e. win the lottery). i.e. instead of saying "good grades," state "work on study habits so my grades improve". Reconvene group and see who got the messages correctly. Can be made into a competitive game where each pair gets one point for each correct communication.

Debrief:

- Was it easier to give the nonverbal communications or to receive?
- What percent of communication do you think is nonverbal?
- How aware are you of what you are communicating nonverbally?

4. Decide on a Face

Ask everyone to decide on a gesture or idiosyncrasy that they think represents one of the participants, such as a typical facial expression, habitual movement of the hands, characteristic body language: something that might be recognized as associated with a specific person or persons. Emphasize before starting that you are not trying to embarrass anyone, so the choice of a gesture should be compassionately chosen.

Standing in a circle, one person initiates a gesture and it is then copied (mimed) by everyone else in sequence around the circle. After all this posturing and gesticulation, everyone should attempt a guess as to who the gesture is associated with. Then someone else volunteers a gesture, etc. Note: As in all potentially embarrassing "volunteer attempt" situations, do not require a gesture from everyone, and if you think that a particular gesture could be character threatening, kill it.

A less threatening and more spontaneous approach is asking each person to volunteer a gesture or facial expression that "...just comes to mind." It does not have to be associated with anyone or any particular situation. The chosen gesture is then passed around the circle quickly, then it’s on to the next person. Try to keep the activity low-key and fun, remembering that passing must always remain an option.

5. Trust Wave

This activity is best done outside
Divide the group equally in two and form two straight lines with each player standing opposite someone from the other line. The lines should be just far enough apart so that when the player's arms are fully extended, at shoulder height and in front of them, their hands reach to approximately the wrist of the person opposite. These players are called "spotters".

The goal is for one player, the "runner," to start ten yards from the group and walk, jog, or run between the two lines of people. The players in the lines raise their arms just before the runner reaches them and lower them as soon as the runner has passed by.

Ask runners to attempt to maintain the same speed throughout their runs. Slowing down is not a problem, but speeding up can be.

*Safety factors:* The spotting lines need to be extremely careful or the runner will get smacked in the face/head. Spotters need to carefully watch the runners and judge their speed. Spotters should lift their arms with sufficient time to insure that the runner is not hit. If you have doubts about your group's ability to perform the spotting role, either don't try the activity, or allow walking only for the first round or until everyone seems comfortable with the task.

Allowing for a ten-yard space before the runner enters the line helps people gauge the speed and judge when to lift their arms. Don't allow players to start only 2-3 feet away, especially if they are running. The faster that runners intend to go through the lines, the farther away they should start their approach to maximize safety.

It would be appropriate to set a series of commands to indicate a runner is starting, much like with a "Trust Fall". The runner should ask the spotting line, "Ready?" and wait for a reply before starting toward the lines.

If there are more than 10 people in the spotting lines, be sure that the spotters are all focused on the front of the line and the runner before starting. When runners have been hit, it has often been because people in the middle/end of the line did not see them coming or did not react quickly enough.

6. **Commonalties**

Playing commonalties is a good chance to experiment with diversity.

Ask the group to arrange themselves into clusters of twos or threes. Give each group a piece of paper and a pen.

The task is to generate a list of things that are common to all the people in the cluster but are not physically obvious (you can not identify by looking at them). Ask participants to come up with a specific number of commonalties or as many as they can in a couple of minutes.
Some examples:
• Speak a foreign language
• Have the same number of brothers and/or sisters
• Traveled to a certain country
• Have the same letter starting their last names
• Are/are not vegetarians
• Ride motorcycles
• Wear contact lenses, etc

Some examples that you can see, and hence don't count: Wear glasses, have brown hair, have blue eyes, etc.

7. Stereotyping

Hand out headbands to equal half the group. Make the bands from paper, then just slap on a piece of adhesive tape near the back of the head where the ends join together.

Before you tape on the bands, use a felt-tipped pen to print a stereotype on the front of the headband. Examples: Teacher, nerd, class clown, hoodlum, sexy female, blind, deaf, jock, etc…) Don’t let the wearers know what has been printed on their headband.

After the headbands are in place, ask the remainder of the group to mingle with the banded group and treat them as their stereotype indicates. Encourage role-playing and some creative histrionics. It gives the group a feeling of walking a mile in another person's shoes.

Don't forget to switch roles and allow the stereotyped group to be the minglers. Make up different stereotypes for the next round.

Debriefing questions:
• How did it feel to represent a different stereotype?
• How did it feel to treat the others as a stereotype?

8. Imaginary Toss

Think about throwing something really bizarre to another person in your circled or randomly diffused group. Imagine that you have that bizarre thing in your hands (don't worry about whether you can realistically hold it). Now, in an exaggerated way, mime how you would throw/pass it to someone else (i.e. actually do it). As you make the pass, announce what it is that you are passing and say the person's name that you designate to receive your gift. The receiving person should also enter into this fantasy role-play by miming how he would physically receive your most generous mass of mind matter, and also, how he would probably emotionally react.
9. **Freeze Frame**

Ask the group to relax and perhaps close their eyes if the trust level is high.

Ask them to imagine that they are putting a videotape from the day into the VCR, pressing the REWIND button, and then PLAY. Encourage them to "see" the day as it plays by, acknowledging that they can press FF or REWIND at any time.

As the day's events stream past, ask the players to mentally press PAUSE at pictures or moments that seem significant or important to them. Ask them to remember those pictures as they continue watching the day play by.

After they are finished with the "tape," ask them to mentally enlarge (at least 11"x14") one of the pictures, and encourage them to share with the group:

- A verbal representation of the mental picture; include colors, perspective, people, etc.
- With whom would they most easily share this picture?
- If the picture were developed and framed, where would they hang it?

10. **Picture Postcard**

Ask participants to mentally choose a picture of themselves from one of the significant experiences that occurred during the day and to transfer that picture onto a regulation size postcard.

Turn the postcard over and, recognizing how little space is available for a message on a postcard, ask what players would write in the limited space and to whom they would send it.

11. **Nonverbal Communication**

Ask people to randomly pick a partner. Give them 5-10 minutes together to introduce themselves. They may not speak to one another during this time. Writing is also not allowed.

Players need to communicate whatever they feel is important about themselves to their partners. At the end, players report out to the group what they learned about their partners. What adds a little fun to the descriptions is to have each partner verbalize what they learned, and then allow a little time for rebuttal and/or corrections from the person just described, to insure accuracy of the introduction.

12. **Truth is Stranger Than Fiction**

Players share three stories about themselves. Two stories are true, one is a lie. The group then tries to determine which story is which.
Short version:
If you want the game to move quickly, allow a short period (30 seconds) for questions and then everyone votes for which story they think is true. After the vote, the storyteller reveals the truth. As soon as the truth is told (amidst the comments of "you did that? You gotta be kidding!") a new person can share two stories.

Long version:
Once the stories are related, time is allowed for questioning the storyteller. The intent is to verify the stories by asking pertinent questions as to whether or not the tellers have enough information to back up their stories. People normally enjoy this questioning, and beleaguered tellers sometimes feel as though they are involved in the inquisition. After a specified time, (2-3 minutes) or when no more questions remain, the group votes on the stories and the teller tells all.

13. Who are You?

Ask the group to brainstorm a list of ten or so questions that people would like to ask each other. The questions should be appropriate for the setting, so monitor your group's choices.

Narrow the list down to two or three questions that people like best, then allow whatever length of time you want for mingling and conversing. Encourage people to try and meet everyone (if the size of the group allows).

Provide pens and paper in order to record the most interesting questions. If people want to ask more than two or three questions, have as many rounds as you have time for.

Sample Questions:
- What is the funniest situation that you have encountered during the last 2 months?
- What famous person, alive or dead, would you most want to have dinner with?
- Who do you consider to be a personal hero/ine?
- What is your favorite film of all time?
- Who is one of your favorite fictional characters?
- What is your most recent embarrassing moment?

14. Mirage

One participant is chosen from the group and is given a piece of paper with a design on it. That person must communicate the image to the rest of the group so that players can duplicate it on their own paper. You may ask that people concentrate on their own work, or you may say nothing and allow the group to collaborate if they think that it will help. However, for the first couple times, I suggest that people operate solo. Invent your own variations that highlight any specific issue that you want to address with your group.
This exercise should be done more than once, with each variation allowing different forms of communication between "leader" and the "drawers". A new leader should lead each version.

**15. Boundary Breaking**

Objectives: Boundary breaking is a group interaction encounter experience which works toward the end of creating a sense of community by bringing people together in groups which might not come together otherwise. A further objective is the creation of awareness of others by the use of questions that tend to go beyond superficial depth.

Instructions: Leader
1. Do not tell the participants about the Synthesis set beforehand.
2. Switch to the Synthesis Set while the interest is still strong.
3. Always do all of the Synthesis Set.
4. Sit in a circle as tight as possible. (Don't let the therapy out!)
5. The leader is always a participant.
6. Responses are repeated by the leader because of the possibility that someone was not heard.

Instructions: Participants
1. Each person is to answer according to the way in which he interprets the question. No discussion or debate. Do not worry about making identical responses if the response is honest for you.
2. Each person is to answer all questions.
3. No one is to be allowed not to answer.
4. Participants may pass while they think, but the leader always comes back to them.
5. While each person is answering, watch him closely; you can learn a great deal by the facial expressions, hand movements, i.e. non verbal communications.
6. We are concerned with getting to know each other.
7. We are here to listen
8. We are here to look for the person that is each of us. Too often in life we have been so busy defending our own little world that we never listened to all the hearts beating around us.
9. As each person answers, collect those answers in your head to develop an idea of each person
10. If we all do this, maybe a few of the walls will come down.

1. What is your name and how can I remember it?
2. Who is the person most relevant to our times?
3. What is the title of the last book you read?
4. What is the best movie you've ever seen?
5. When you think of reality, what comes to your mind first?
6. What is the most sacred thing you know?
7. What is the ugliest thing you know?
8. On what basis do you select your friends?
9. What is your favorite TV show?
10. If you could smash one thing and only one thing, what would it be?
11. If you could be any animal other than human, what would you be?
12. What is the greatest crime one person can do to another?
13. For what do you think you would lay down your life?
14. If the atomic bomb were going to fall in ten minutes, what would you do in those last ten minutes?
15. What is your favorite sport?
16. What emotion is strongest in you?
17. What would you like to have written on your gravestone?
18. What is the most beautiful thing you have ever seen?
19. What do you think people like in you the least?
20. What do you think people like in you the most?
21. What person has had the most influence on your life?
22. What institution is in the most need of changing?
23. When do you feel the loneliest?
24. What embarrasses you the most?
25. What is your greatest fear?
26. What do you love the most?
27. What color is love?
28. One day in your life, what would you like to live over again?

17. Synthesis Set

[Answer these questions in light of the answers given by the group]

1. Which person did you learn most about today?
2. Which person do you want to learn more about?
3. Which person do you think hid him/herself the most?
4. Which person do you think was the most honest?
5. Which person had the deepest insights?
6. Which person surprised you the most?
7. Which person is the most sensitive to life?
8. Which person do you think you could get along with best over a long period of time?
9. Which person enjoys life the most?
10. Tell the image you do not want to project?
11. Tell the image you do would like to project to the group.
12. If you could meet any person living in the world today, whom would you like to meet?
13. What decisions are hardest for you to make?
14. What is the best thing about your home?
15. What is the last thing that you would give up?
16. What is the greatest sound in the world?
17. When do you feel the freest?
18. When do you feel the most joy?
19. Which answer, from another person, has pleased you the most?
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X. Closing Activities

1. **Verbal Gift Giving:**
   State a positive characteristic, attribute or trait about that person.

2. **Two Strokes and A Wish**
   State two positives about yourself and a wish based on something that happened during the group.

3. **Web of Appreciation**
   Construct a "web of appreciation" with a ball of string. Start by holding onto the end of the string and toss the ball to someone else in the group. Then state everything you appreciate about that person. The receiving person does the same until the web connects everyone in the group. The web symbolizes the connectedness of the group. End by cutting the strings, symbolizing that we all must return to our own lives, but can remember the experiences here.

4. **Back Writer**
   Break into partners: each partner attaches a piece of paper to his partner's back. Then everyone walks around and writes a positive message on the backs of those people who have impacted them in a positive way.

5. **Filling Up**
   Need: one full (clear) water pitcher and one empty water pitcher, paper cups. Each participant takes a turn pouring water into the empty pitcher, while stating one ingredient that they added to the group and would like the others to take away. After everyone has poured, stir the water and pour a small drink of water for everyone. Make an appropriate toast.
XI. Relaxation Exercises

1. **The Countdown**

   This is a very simple and effective technique. Simply say to yourself, "I am calm and relaxed at the number 10." After your next breath, say "I am even more calm and relaxed at the number 9 than I was at the number 10." After another breath, say, "I am even more relaxed at the number 8 than I was at the number 9" and so on, until you reach the number 1.

2. **Ten Candles**

   Close your eyes and imagine a row of ten lit candles in front of you, any style or color. As you exhale, imagine yourself blowing out one of the candles. With each successive breath, blow out each candle and let yourself become more deeply relaxed with each one. When all the candles are out, let yourself enjoy the peace and quiet of the room.

3. **Visualization: The Sandbag Technique**

   Close your eyes and sit quietly. Visualize yourself standing in a hot-air balloon that has not yet left the ground. In the basket of the balloon along with you are several bags of sand. Each of these bags represents different anxieties and worries. Pick up one of the bags and toss it out. The balloon begins to lift off. Now take another bag and toss it out. The balloon becomes lighter and drifts further. Continue tossing bags out until you are floating freely, free of worry. You can land, if you wish, in your special place. Return whenever you are ready, noticing the different attitude you have about your worries when you return.

4. **Visualization: Arm Levitation**

   Close your eyes and rest your hands on your knees. Imagine lightness in one of your hands, as if being pulled into the air by balloons attached to your wrists. Let your hand slowly lift and float, as if pulled by the balloons, or imagine a powerful magnet pulling your hand higher. Let your hand drift higher and higher towards your face. When your hand touches a particular spot on your face, know that you are deeply relaxed.

5. **Visualization: Quieting Reflex**

   1. Become aware of worry or stress - this is the cue to start
   2. Smile inwardly with your mouth and eyes, and say to yourself, "alert mind, calm body."
   3. Inhale and easy, natural breath, while mentally counting "1,2,3"; then exhale, counting "1,2,3."
   4. While exhaling, let your jaw, tongue and shoulders go loose. Feel aware of heaviness and warmth flowing to your toes as you let your breath out.
6. Falling Leaf

Stare at a point on the wall across from you. Visualize a leaf at that spot. With each breadth, count backwards from 20 to 1 as you watch the leaf very slowly drift to the ground. At 1, the leaf reaches the ground and you are very deeply relaxed.

7. The Three Allies

Think for a moment about people who have helped you as an ally in the past. Now sit quietly and take several deep, relaxing breaths.

Now recall a childhood experience when you felt particularly sad. Imagine the ally figure that we have been talking about. Picture exactly how your ally could have been the most help to you at that moment. Now focus inward and just notice the effects of the ally in your scene.

Repeat the same visualization, except this time recall a time when you felt particularly proud or excited. Imagine your ally responding to you.

Finally, repeat this scene with a memory of a situation when you felt angry or frustrated. Imagine your ally helping you through this.

8. Visualization: Bubble Technique

Close your eyes and sit quietly. Imagine yourself floating underwater with a full air supply, with no tensions, and no need to support yourself. Whenever you notice a thought, picture it as an air bubble in the water and watch as it just floats away and disappears. Continue with each thought until the water and your thoughts become very peaceful. This same technique can be used with the imagery of sitting on a riverbank watching logs roll by, or sitting in front of a campfire and watching puffs of smoke disappear into the air.

9. Visualization: Vibrating Symbol

Focus on the area in your body where you notice discomfort when you feel upset, hurt, or anxious. Now imagine a symbol or image that almost always has a soothing calming effect on you (a special person, place, or object with special meaning to you, etc). Close your eyes and sit quietly. Picture your special symbol somewhere in the room and imagine that it is very slightly vibrating and alive. With each breath, imagine it moving steadily closer to you, drawn directly to the spot you have chosen where you feel discomfort and tension. Then the symbol reaches the surface of your body, imagine it passing right through your skin and into the tense area that needs soothing. Feel the soothing, strengthening quality of this vibrating symbol. Take a few moments to enjoy the effects.
XII.  Handouts

Handout 1

Definitions

Prejudice
An unfavorable attitude toward any group of people which is formed in disregard of facts. Making a judgement about someone before knowing him or her on the basis of such aspects as the person's race, religion, ethnicity, gender, class, sexual orientation, or ability.

Stereotyping
Preconceived or oversimplified generalization involving negative beliefs about a particular group. Negative stereotypes are frequently at the base of prejudice. The danger of stereotyping is that people are not considered as individuals, but rather as members of a group who all think and behave in the same way.

Discrimination
Unequal treatment of individuals or groups based on categorical attributes, such as racial, ethnic, religious, or social-class membership. When we act on our prejudices, it becomes discrimination. (employment, housing, educational, social exclusion)

Epithet
A derogatory word based on a negative image of a race, culture, ethnicity, etc. Examples are: "honky," "nigger," "wetback," "faggot".

Scapegoating
Blaming an individual or group when the fault lies elsewhere. Prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory acts lead to scapegoating. Scapegoating can lead to verbal and physical violence, including death.

Racism
The false assumption that race determines psychological and cultural traits with the belief that one race is superior to another. Based on their belief in the inferiority of certain groups, racists justify discrimination, segregation, and/or scapegoating against these groups.

Genocide
The deliberate, systematic extermination of an entire people.
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“Self in Society” Worksheet

In order to rise above hatred and intolerance in society, it is necessary to be honest with yourself about what (if any) prejudices you are holding, as a result of upbringing or personal experiences. And, in order to be truly honest about what prejudices you do hold, it is necessary to know where you stand in society – how others see you. This may not be as obvious as you think – so answering the following questions may take some thought.

1. Do you think all races and ethnic groups are equal in American society?

2. The following categories are all aspects of your social identity:
   - Ethnic or racial group
   - Ethnic or racial group which others associate you with
   - Nationality
   - Gender
   - Religion
   - Sexual Orientation
   - Economic Class
   - Age
   - Physical Condition

3. What legal privileges or advantages do you think you have because of your social identity? [If you can’t think of any, ask someone from another group to tell you about your advantages]

4. What legal disadvantages do you think you have because of your social identity?

5. What financial problems do you have that you feel are connected to your lack of social privilege? Explain.

6. What are your psychological privileges? (Things that you take for granted)

7. What are your spiritual privileges? (Can you worship without being harassed?)

8. How are you using your most powerful privilege?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>one whose primary or exclusive emotional and sexual attraction is to the same sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>one whose primary or exclusive emotional and sexual attraction is to the opposite sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>one who has the capacity to be emotionally and sexually attracted to either sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>the term used for both males and females who have a self-affirmed homosexual orientation; more commonly applied to males.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>preferred term for women who are homosexual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>an enduring affectionate, erotic or romantic attraction to individuals of a particular sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sex</td>
<td>the physiological and anatomical characteristics of maleness or femaleness with which a person is born.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>a person’s psychological sense of being make or female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role</td>
<td>how you see yourself socially; socially-constructed behavior expectations associated with being male or female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homophobia</td>
<td>a personal and irrational fear or hatred of people who are gay, lesbian or bisexual. True homophobia is pathological, but the term is commonly used for people who are strongly prejudiced against people who are same-sex oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism</td>
<td>the societal/cultural, institutional, and individual beliefs and practices that privilege men, subordinate women, and denigrate women-identified values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexism</td>
<td>a system of attitudes, behaviors, cultural norms, and institutional practices that denies, stigmatizes, and denigrates people who are gay, lesbian, or bisexual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Like other “isms” it represents prejudice plus power. Heterosexuals have advantages simply because they are heterosexual in U.S. society.

**Heterosexual Privilege**
the benefits and advantages heterosexuals receive in a heterosexist culture. Also, the benefits lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals receive as a result of claiming heterosexual identity or denying homosexual or bisexual identity.

**Pedophile**
An adult person who is attracted to and seeks sexual gratification with children. 95% of pedophiles are males whose sexual relationships with adults are heterosexual.

**Transgender**
someone whose gender display at least sometimes runs contrary to what other people in the same culture expect.

**Transsexual**
a person whose biological sex does not match their gender identity and who, through gender reassignment surgery and hormone treatments, seeks to change their physical body to match their gender identity. Transsexuals are not automatically homosexual; their sexual orientation can be heterosexual, homosexual, or bisexual.

**Transvestite**
a person who enjoys dressing in clothes typically associated with the other gender. Most are heterosexual.

**Straight**
a term used to describe people who are heterosexual. Although commonly used, this term is not preferred because it implies that people who are gay are “bent”, and old fashioned derogatory label similar to the term “faggot”.

**PFLAG**
Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays: a support, education, and advocacy organization founded in 1981 by parents and friends of homosexuals.

**Civil Rights**
right to fair employment, public accommodations, and fair housing: these are the rights of every citizen but are not protected for people who are gay except in a few states and cities.

**Coming Out**
a process, usually occurring over time, in which individuals identify and acknowledge their sexual orientation as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Being open and out in one situation does not automatically mean the person is “out” everywhere.
1. Legal Marriage which entitles one to:
   - Recognition and support for an intimate relationship
   - Joint child custody
   - Tax benefits
   - Automatic inheritance from your spouse under probate laws
   - Sharing health, auto and homeowners’ insurance polices at reduced rates
   - Paid bereavement leave if your spouse dies
   - Emotional support from your family

2. Being seen as “normal” which includes:
   - Having multiple positive role models of your gender and sexual orientation
   - Learning about relationships from the media
   - Having positive media images of people with whom you can identify

3. Cultural validation which includes:
   - Talking in public about your relationship without fear
   - Living with your partner without fear
   - Expressing pain if your relationship ends, and having your pain acknowledged
   - Receiving social acceptance by neighbors, colleagues, and friends

4. Institutional Acceptance
   - Better employment opportunities
   - Able to be a religious leader
   - Receive validation from religious community
   - Able to be a teacher without fear of being fired out of public fear you will “corrupt” children
   - Able to be a day care worker without being vilified as a potential child sexual abuser
   - Able to be a boy scout leader without fear
   - Able to serve in the military without hiding your sexuality
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Fair Fighting

Step 1
Describe the person’s behavior that is disturbing you without judging. This is a lot more difficult than it sounds. “You’re making me mad,” is judging, is blaming, and it does not describe the behavior. What did they do exactly that resulted in your getting angry? If they called you a name – say it. Be as specific as possible.

“When you called me a _________”

Step 2
Describe what you felt like when they did whatever they did. To continue with our example, they called you a ______________. How did that make you feel?

“I felt pissed”

Step 3
Identify the need behind the feeling. In this case, perhaps you need to feel respect.

“I’m really needing some respect”

Step 4
Ask for the concrete action that you would like taken, but don’t demand! Demanding dies not usually get a positive result.

“I would really like it if you didn’t call me a __________”
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NEEDS INVENTORY

**Autonomy**
- Choose one’s dreams/goals/values
- Choose one’s plan for fulfilling one’s dreams/goals/values

**Celebration**
- Celebrate the creation of life
- Celebrate the loss of life (mourning)

**Integrity**
- Authenticity
- Meaning
- Creativity

**Interdependence**
- Acceptance
- Closeness
- Consideration
- Contribute to the enrichment of life (exercise one’s power by giving that which contributes to life)
- Empathy
- Honesty
  - Empowering honesty (that which enables us to learn from our limitations)
- Appreciation
- Love
- Reassurance
- Respect
- Trust
- Warmth

**Physical Nurturing**
- Air
- Food
- Movement/exercise
- Protection from: life threatening forms of life: viruses, bacteria, insects, predatory animals (especially human beings)
- Rest
- Sexual expression
- Shelter
- Touch
- Water
Play

Spiritual Communion
- Beauty
- Harmony
- Inspiration
- Order
- Peace
# FEELING INVENTORY

FEELINGS EXPERIENCED WHEN OUR NEEDS AREN’T BEING FULFILLED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afraid</th>
<th>cross</th>
<th>exhausted</th>
<th>insensitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated</td>
<td>credulous</td>
<td>fatigued</td>
<td>intense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agitation</td>
<td>dejected</td>
<td>fear/ful</td>
<td>irate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm</td>
<td>depressed</td>
<td>fidgety</td>
<td>irked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloof</td>
<td>despair</td>
<td>forlorn</td>
<td>irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>despondent</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>jealous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguish</td>
<td>detached</td>
<td>frustrated</td>
<td>jittery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animosity</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
<td>furious</td>
<td>keyed-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoyance</td>
<td>discouraged</td>
<td>gloomy</td>
<td>lassitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>disgruntled</td>
<td>grief</td>
<td>lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathetic</td>
<td>disgusted</td>
<td>guilty</td>
<td>let-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td>disheartened</td>
<td>hate</td>
<td>lethargy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused</td>
<td>disinterested</td>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>listless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversion</td>
<td>dislike</td>
<td>helpless</td>
<td>lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>dismayed</td>
<td>hesitant</td>
<td>mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat</td>
<td>displeased</td>
<td>horrified</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter</td>
<td>disquieted</td>
<td>horrible</td>
<td>melancholy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blah</td>
<td>distressed</td>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>miserable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>disturbed</td>
<td>hot</td>
<td>mopey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bored</td>
<td>downcast</td>
<td>humdrum</td>
<td>nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breathless</td>
<td>downhearted</td>
<td>hurt</td>
<td>nettled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brokenhearted</td>
<td>dread</td>
<td>impatient</td>
<td>overwhelm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagrined</td>
<td>dull</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>edgy</td>
<td>inert</td>
<td>perplexed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>embarrassed</td>
<td>infuriated</td>
<td>pessimism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>embittered</td>
<td>inquisitive</td>
<td>provoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td>exasperated</td>
<td>insecure</td>
<td>puzzled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancorous</td>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>terrified</td>
<td>unsteady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant/ance</td>
<td>sleepy</td>
<td>thwarted</td>
<td>upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repelled</td>
<td>sorrowful</td>
<td>tired</td>
<td>uptight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentful</td>
<td>sorry</td>
<td>troubled</td>
<td>vexed/ation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restless</td>
<td>sour</td>
<td>uncomfortable</td>
<td>weary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>spiritless</td>
<td>unconcerned</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>startled</td>
<td>uneasy</td>
<td>woeful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive</td>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>unglued</td>
<td>worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaky</td>
<td>suspicion</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>wretched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shocked</td>
<td>tepid</td>
<td>unnerved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Pathways to Tolerance**  
**Handout 8**

**FEELING INVENTORY**

**FEELINGS EXPERIENCED WHEN OUR NEEDS ARE BEING FULFILLED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absorbed</td>
<td>aroused</td>
<td>complacent</td>
<td>eager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous</td>
<td>astonished</td>
<td>composed</td>
<td>ecstatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>blissful</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>effervescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>breathless</td>
<td>confident</td>
<td>elated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alive</td>
<td>buoyant</td>
<td>contented</td>
<td>electrified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazed</td>
<td>calm</td>
<td>cool</td>
<td>encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amused</td>
<td>carefree</td>
<td>curious</td>
<td>energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animated</td>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>dazzled</td>
<td>engrossed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>comfortable</td>
<td>delighted</td>
<td>enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlivened</td>
<td>good-humored</td>
<td>loving</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>mellow</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exalted</td>
<td>gratification</td>
<td>merry</td>
<td>spellbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>groovy</td>
<td>mirthful</td>
<td>splendid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhilarated</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>moved</td>
<td>stimulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansive</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectant</td>
<td>hopeful</td>
<td>overwhelmed</td>
<td>tender/ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exuberant</td>
<td>inquisitive</td>
<td>overjoyed</td>
<td>thankful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascinated</td>
<td>inspired</td>
<td>peaceful</td>
<td>thrilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>intense</td>
<td>pleasant/ure</td>
<td>touched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>interested</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>tranquil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilled</td>
<td>intrigued</td>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>tut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>invigorated</td>
<td>radiant</td>
<td>warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad</td>
<td>involved</td>
<td>rapturous</td>
<td>wide-awake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleeful</td>
<td>joy/ful/ous</td>
<td>refreshed</td>
<td>wonderful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorious</td>
<td>jubilant</td>
<td>relief/ved</td>
<td>zestful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glowing</td>
<td>keyed-up</td>
<td>satisfied/faction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS
PATHWAYS to Tolerance
Intake Screening Interview

1. Describe your family.

2. What are your strengths?

3. What are your weaknesses?

4. Describe one thing you have done for someone else that you feel proud of.

5. Do you have any tattoos? If yes, what do they mean to you?

6. What person (living or dead) has had the greatest influence on your life? Why?

7. What kinds of things make you angry? How do you usually express your anger?

8. Describe your friends.
9. What are they into?

10. Do you have a best friend?

11. What is he/she like?

12. Have you or anyone you know ever had a bad experience with someone of another race, religion, sexual orientation or group? Tell me about it.

13. Is anyone you know involved with groups that don’t like, hate or try to avoid being with people of other races/religions/sexual orientations/groups? Tell me about it.

14. What about you?

15. What do your friends or family members say about people of certain races/religions/homosexuals, etc.?

16. What about you?
17. Have you ever done something to someone or his/her property because of disliking the group he/she belongs to? Tell me about it.
18. Describe yourself in 4 words.

19. What do you think you can gain from this group? What would you like to contribute?

20. What are your plans/goals for yourself?

21. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about yourself?
Bias Screening Tool

Instructions: The following questions are provided as a guideline to help you elicit pertinent self-disclosures about biases. Use the information obtained to complete page 2. Optimally, these questions should be incorporated into the overall intake process and should occur toward the end of an interview. Look for “red flags” about the client’s appearance which may be bias indicators.

1. Do you have any tattoos?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   If yes, What do they mean to you?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. Have you or anyone you know ever had a bad experience with someone of another race, religion or group? Tell me about it.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

3. Is anyone you know involved with groups that don’t like, hate or try to avoid being with people of other races/groups/religions? Tell me about it.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   What about you?
   __________________________________________________________________________

4. What do your friends or family members say about people of certain races (e.g. Hispanics, Asians, Caucasians, African-Americans, Native Americans)? Religions? Homosexuals?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   What about You?
   __________________________________________________________________________

5. Have you ever done something to someone or their property because of disliking the race or group they belong to? Tell me about it.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   Current Offense:
   __________________________________________________________________________
Race/Ethnicity:
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- African-American
- Asian-American
- Native-American

Group Affiliation:
- No
- Yes

Check all that apply:
- White
- Supremacists
- Neo-Nazi
- Gang
- Other

Self-Reported
- Suspected
- Known

Physical Characteristics
- Physical description and observation
- Hate/Bias tattoos (for non-hate/bias tattoos mark “0”)

Friends/Family Racial/Ethnic Attitudes
- Use of racial/ethnic stereotypes
- Lack of tolerance towards other racial/ethnic groups
- Acceptability of violence towards other racial/ethnic group

Friends/Family Religious Attitudes
- Use of religious stereotypes
- Lack of tolerance towards other religious groups
- Acceptability of violence towards other religious groups

Friends/Family Other Group
- (sexual orientation/gender/physical disability) Attitudes
- Use of other group stereotypes
- Lack of tolerance towards other groups
- Acceptability of violence towards other group

Personal Beliefs
- Agrees w/friends/family negative attitude towards other race/ethnicity
- Agrees w/friends/family negative attitude towards other religious groups
- Agrees w/friends/family negative attitude towards other groups

Peer Group Affiliation
- Personal group affiliation (Hate/Bias groups)
- Friends/Family group affiliation (Hate/Bias groups)
- Personal/peer group affiliation (street gang)

Personal Experiences
- Negative past experience (property)
- Negative past experience (verbal)
- Negative past experience (physical)
- Negative past experience (weapon)

Behavior
- Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (property)
- Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (verbal)
- Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (physical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Characteristics</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical description and observation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate/Bias tattoos (for non-hate/bias tattoos mark “0”)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friends/Family Racial/Ethnic Attitudes</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of racial/ethnic stereotypes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tolerance towards other racial/ethnic groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability of violence towards other racial/ethnic group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friends/Family Religious Attitudes</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of religious stereotypes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tolerance towards other religious groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability of violence towards other religious groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friends/Family Other Group</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(sexual orientation/gender/physical disability) Attitudes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of other group stereotypes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tolerance towards other groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability of violence towards other group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Beliefs</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agrees w/friends/family negative attitude towards other race/ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees w/friends/family negative attitude towards other religious groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrees w/friends/family negative attitude towards other groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group Affiliation</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal group affiliation (Hate/Bias groups)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/Family group affiliation (Hate/Bias groups)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/peer group affiliation (street gang)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Experiences</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative past experience (property)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative past experience (verbal)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative past experience (physical)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative past experience (weapon)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Self-Reported</th>
<th>Suspected</th>
<th>Known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (property)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (verbal)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (physical)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Individual Hate/Bias motivated behavior (weapon) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3
---|---|---|---|---
Group Hate/Bias motivated behavior (property) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3
Group Hate/Bias motivated behavior (verbal) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3
Group Hate/Bias motivated behavior (physical) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3
Group Hate/Bias motivated behavior (weapon) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3

Column Totals | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Total Score (sum of Columns): ________

The checklist located on page 2 is designed to be used in conjunction with the open-ended interview questions listed on page 3. This form was designed so that you may help quantify the attitudes and behaviors gleaned from youth during the course of the interview.

Please read each question in the interview and note the responses given. If necessary, you may need to prompt the youth for further details (such as a belief in violence as an acceptable way of treating people of different races, religious, etc. and whether a weapon was used in a particular incident). Once the interview is complete (or during the interview, if convenient) please complete the rating scale on page 3, based on the respondent’s answers to interview questions and your own observations, where necessary and appropriate.

For each item on page 3, use a 0-3 scale to rank the severity of the characteristic, belief or behavior of the youth.

“0” indicates no presence of the characteristic, belief, or behavior.

“1” indicates “Mild” or some presence of the characteristic, belief or behavior, but not enough to warrant a serious concern. For example, a youth expressed opinions of another culture derived from ignorance rather than an active hate or bias.

“2” indicates “Moderate” or consistent presence of the characteristic, belief or behavior, indicating an active intolerance which warrants a slight degree of concern.

“3” indicates “Significant” or severe occurrence of the characteristic, belief or behavior, enough to warrant serious concern.

Please mark the box indicating none (0), mild (1), moderate (2) or significant (3). Add the columns, where a mark in the “mild” column has the value of 1, a mark of “moderate” has the value of 2 and a mark of “significant” has the value of 3. Then add the columns together for a total score.
Detailed Scoring Instructions

Physical Characteristics
Use this section to indicate the degree to which you feel the youth’s physical characteristics warrants concern regarding possible hate or bias-motivated behavior.

Physical Description and Observation: please indicate whether the youth's haircut, clothing, etc. indicate to you (from none to significant) the possibility of hate or bias towards other groups.

Tattoos: please rank the presence and severity of any hate or bias-related tattoos (swastika, hate messages, confederate flag, etc.) It is preferable to ask the respondent about the significance of his/her tattoos rather than assuming meaning. Often, youth have tattoos done and later regret them or don't understand their meaning. Below are the scoring guidelines –

0 = no tattoos present, or tattoos do not have any bias/bias related meaning (please note, a youth may have tattoos that do not have any hate or bias meaning – in this case, a “0” score should be given.

1 = respondent acknowledges meaning, but no longer believes in, regrets tattoo, is unsure of meaning, etc.

2 = respondent acknowledges one or two tattoos which have hate/bias-related significance

3 = respondent has many tattoos, particularly in very visible areas (head, neck, face, lower arms, hands) which have hate/bias meaning to respondent. The respondent is proud of the tattoos and feels strongly about their meaning.
Friends or Family Racial Attitudes
This section should be used to rate the degree to which the respondent describes friends and family member bias regarding specific groups. These 3 questions are cumulative, that is, is the respondent indicates an acceptability of violence towards members of different races, then a subscription to racial stereotypes and lack of tolerance can be assumed. Below are specific scoring instructions:

Use of Racial Stereotypes (Friends and Family):
0 = respondent indicates no use of stereotypes on the part of friends or family members
1 = mild use of racial stereotypes, not harmful or conflict generating (i.e. all Mexicans are migrant farmers, middle Eastern people run convenience stores, Jews are all lawyers and doctors, etc.)
2 = use of racial stereotypes which are negative, invoke fear or hostile reactions, or that may be source of conflict between racial groups (i.e. Asians are smart, Blacks use drugs, Jews have all the money and are rich and stingy, etc.)
3 = use of racial stereotypes which not only invoke fear but influence their actions against others – use or purposefully inflammatory language (terms such as “nigger” or “spic” or statements which make value judgments (“they are sick,” “They are unnatural”) – statements which tend to dehumanize members of other groups

Lack of Tolerance for Other Racial Groups (Friends and Family):
NOTE: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then previous item should also be scored at the same level or higher level. A lack of tolerance implies a belief in certain stereotypes (but the stereotypes may be stronger than the lack of tolerance, so previous item may be scored higher).

0 = respondent indicates no lack of tolerance on part of friends/family
1 = respondent indicates a dislike of other races (“I don’t like them” – does not choose them as friends, etc.) but no open hostility indicated
2 = respondent indicates active, hostile dislike (“we hate them,” “they hate us”)
3 = respondent indicates hostility to the point of violence (“they all deserve to die,” “they should all go back to where they came from”)

Acceptability of Violence Toward Other Racial Groups (Friends and Family):
May need to probe for this, as it is not specifically asked in the interview...
NOTE: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then items on the previous 2 items should be scored at the same or higher level because acceptability of violence indicates that a lack of tolerance and use of stereotypes are both also present (the stereotypes and lack of tolerance may be strong, where the respondent indicates only a minimal acceptability of violence, therefore items above may be scored higher, but not scored lower)

0 = respondent may indicate negative attitudes, but does not indicate a belief that violence against other groups is justified because of their race (religion, or other status)
1 = violence acceptable under cases of serious provocation (negative name-calling or inflammatory remarks), or in the case of threats or retaliation for previous violent acts
2 = respondent indicates that violence is acceptable where the intent is not to cause death or serious bodily injury, but to invoke fear or intimidate
3 = respondent indicates that violence is acceptable, for the express purpose of causing serious bodily injury or death, particularly to achieve or maintain beliefs of superiority or racial “purity”
Friends or Family Religious Attitudes
For this section, follow the same guidelines as those established for “Friends and Family Racial Attitudes”
Above items, the same “if scored...then score” also apply.

Use of Religious Stereotypes (Friends and Family):
0 = respondent indicates no use of stereotypes on the part of friends or family members
1 = mild use of religious stereotypes, not harmful or conflict generating (i.e. all Mexicans are migrant farmers, middle Eastern people run convenience stores, Jews are all lawyers and doctors, etc.)
2 = use of religious stereotypes which are negative, invoke fear or hostile reactions, or that may be source of conflict between religious groups (i.e. Asians are smart, Blacks use drugs, Jews have all the money and are rich and stingy, etc.)
3 = use of religious stereotypes which not only invoke fear but influence their actions against others – use or purposefully inflammatory language (terms such as “nigger” or “kyke” or statements which make value judgments (“they are sick,” “They are unnatural”) – statements which tend to dehumanize members of other groups

Lack of Tolerance for Other Religious Groups (Friends and Family):
NOTE: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then previous item should also be scored at the same level or higher level. A lack of tolerance implies a belief in certain stereotypes (but the stereotypes may be stronger than the lack of tolerance, so previous item may be scored higher).
0 = respondent indicates no lack of tolerance on part of friends/family
1 = respondent indicates a dislike of other religions (“I don’t like them” – does not choose them as friends, etc.) but no open hostility indicated
2 = respondent indicates active, hostile dislike (“we hate them,” “they hate us”)
3 = respondent indicates hostility to the point of violence (“they all deserve to die,” “they should all go back to where they came from”)

Acceptability of Violence Toward Other Religious Groups (Friends and Family):
May need to probe for this, as it is not specifically asked in the interview...
NOTE: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then items on the previous 2 items should be scored at the same or higher level because acceptability of violence indicates that a lack of tolerance and use of stereotypes are both also present (the stereotypes and lack of tolerance may be strong, where the respondent indicates only a minimal acceptability of violence, therefore items above may be scored higher, but not scored lower)
0 = respondent may indicate negative attitudes, but does not indicate a belief that violence against other groups is justified because of their religion (or other status)
1 = violence acceptable under cases of serious provocation (negative name-calling or inflammatory remarks), or in the case of threats or retaliation for previous violent acts
2 = respondent indicates that violence is acceptable where the intent is not to cause death or serious bodily injury, but to invoke fear or intimidate
3 = respondent indicates that violence is acceptable, for the express purpose of causing serious bodily injury or death, particularly to achieve or maintain beliefs of superiority or religious “purity”
Friends or Family Other Group (sexual orientation, physical disability, gender, etc.) Attitudes
For this section, follow the same guidelines as those established for “Friends and Family Racial Attitudes”
Above items, the same “if scored...then score” also apply.

Use of Other Group Stereotypes (Friends and Family):
0 = respondent indicates no use of stereotypes on the part of friends or family members
1 = mild use of other group stereotypes, not harmful or conflict generating (i.e. all Mexicans are migrant farmers, middle Eastern people run convenience stores, Jews are all lawyers and doctors, etc.)
2 = use of other group stereotypes which are negative, invoke fear or hostile reactions, or that may be source of conflict between religious groups (i.e. Asians are smart, Blacks use drugs, Jews have all the money and are rich and stingy, etc.)
3 = use of other group stereotypes which not only invoke fear but influence their actions against others - use or purposefully inflammatory language (terms such as “nigger” or “kyke” or statements which make value judgments (“they are sick,” “They are unnatural”) - statements which tend to dehumanize members of other groups

Lack of Tolerance for Other Groups (Friends and Family):
NOTE: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then previous item should also be scored at the same level or higher level. A lack of tolerance implies a belief in certain stereotypes (but the stereotypes may be stronger than the lack of tolerance, so previous item may be scored higher).
0 = respondent indicates no lack of tolerance on part of friends/family
1 = respondent indicates a dislike of other groups (“I don’t like them” – does not choose them as friends, etc.) but no open hostility indicated
2 = respondent indicates active, hostile dislike (“we hate them,” “they hate us”)
3 = respondent indicates hostility to the point of violence (“they all deserve to die,” “they should all go back to where they came from”)

Acceptability of Violence Toward Other Groups (Friends and Family):
May need to probe for this, as it is not specifically asked in the interview...
NOTE: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then items on the previous 2 items should be scored at the same or higher level because acceptability of violence indicates that a lack of tolerance and use of stereotypes are both also present (the stereotypes and lack of tolerance may be strong, where the respondent indicates only a minimal acceptability of violence, therefore items above may be scored higher, but not scored lower)
0 = respondent may indicate negative attitudes, but does not indicate a belief that violence against other groups is justified because of their religion (or other status)
1 = violence acceptable under cases of serious provocation (negative name-calling or inflammatory remarks), or in the case of threats or retaliation for previous violent acts
2 = respondent indicates that violence is acceptable where the intent is not to cause death or serious bodily injury, but to invoke fear or intimidate
3 = respondent indicates that violence is acceptable, for the express purpose of causing serious bodily injury or death, particularly to achieve or maintain beliefs of superiority or “purity”
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Personal Beliefs
This section should be used to indicate whether respondent indicated an agreement with friends or family beliefs stated earlier

Agrees with Friends/Family...Race
0 = if respondent does not agree
1 = if qualified or unsure agreement is indicated “I’m not sure” or “I guess so”
If agreement is indicated, go to items above and score this item using the highest score on above items

Agrees with Friends/Family...Religion
0 = if respondent does not agree
1 = if qualified or unsure agreement is indicated “I’m not sure” or “I guess so”
If agreement is indicated, go to items above and score this item using the highest score on above items

Agrees with Friends/Family...Other Groups
0 = if respondent does not agree
1 = if qualified or unsure agreement is indicated “I’m not sure” or “I guess so”
If agreement is indicated, go to items above and score this item using the highest score on above items
Peer Group Affiliation
Use these items to record the respondents' reports of affiliation with either a hate/bias group or with a street gang/negative peer group

**Personal Group Affiliation (Hate/Bias Group)**
0 = no affiliation with hate/bias group
1 = respondent indicates knowledge about group, some interest in joining, some acquaintances/friends belong to group
2 = respondent indicates that many friends belong to group and admits membership
3 = respondent expresses pride in membership and refers to frequently; most friends in group

**Friend or Family Group Affiliation (Hate/Bias Group)**
0 = no friend/family affiliation with hate/bias group
1 = respondent indicates knowledge about group, and knows some members, doesn't consider them close friends
2 = friends or family (not immediate family; cousin, etc.) are members of the group
3 = the majority of respondents' friends, and/or close family member (i.e. immediate family) is member of the group

**Personal Group Affiliation (Gang - non-hate/bias, i.e. street gang)**
0 = no affiliation with gang
1 = respondent indicates knowledge about gang, some interest in joining; some friends and acquaintances belong to gang
2 = respondent indicates that many friends belong to gang and admits membership
3 = the respondent expresses pride in membership and refers to frequently; most friends involved in gang
Personal Experiences (Victimization)
This section should be used to record the level of seriousness associated with past victimization related by the respondent involving a perpetrator of a different race, religion, sexual orientation etc.

Negative Past Experience (Property)
This item relates to victimization relating to property crimes (theft, vandalism)

0 = no past victimization
1 = past offense resulting in no permanent property damage (i.e. vandalism that is easily washable; egging, etc.), no threat of physical harm
2 = past victimization resulting in property damage or loss, but less than $50 (need to paint over vandalism, minor theft)
3 = past victimization resulting in severe property damage or loss greater than $50 (theft greater than $50, sig. monetary damage) or vandalism containing hate messages and/or implication/threat of violence. In the case of vandalism involving hate messages and/or threats of violence, no permanent loss of damage exceeding $50 is needed to score a “3”

Negative Past Experience (Verbal)
This item relates to victimization relating to verbal incidents

0 = no past victimization
1 = past verbal victimization involving put downs, insults based on race/religion, but not particularly inflammatory (no use of racial/religious slurs, such as “nigger,” “kyke,” or “faggot,” etc.)
2 = past verbal victimization involving use of racial slurs (see above) or designed to incite conflict
3 = past verbal victimization involving threats of violence

Negative Past Experience (Physical)
Note: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then the “verbal” (above) should probably be scored at least as high, if not higher than this item, unless it can be assumed that no verbal exchange occurred during the incident (i.e. a drive-by shooting)
This item relates to victimization relating to violent crimes

0 = no past victimization
1 = past victimization: pushing and shoving
2 = past victimization resulting in injury: being “jumped,” punching, kicking, etc.
3 = past victimization resulting in serious injury: aggravated assault, rape, broken bones, in condition requiring hospital visit

Negative Past Experience (Weapon)
This item relates to victimization relating to violent crimes in which a weapon was involved
Note: If this item is scored a 1, 2, or 3, then the “physical” experience (above) should be scored at least as high, if not higher than this item

0 = no past victimization
1 = past victimization in which a weapon was “flashed” or its use was threatened
2 = past victimization in which a weapon was used, but resulted in no serious injury (i.e. minor cuts, gun discharged, but victim not harmed)
3 = past victimization with a weapon, resulting in injury (shot, stabbed, etc.)
Respondent Past Behavior
This section should be used to record the level of seriousness associated with past offenses related by the respondent involving a victim of a different race, religion, sexual orientation, etc. and motivated by that difference, at least in part

Hate/Bias motivated Behavior (Property)
This item relates to offense relating to property crimes (theft, vandalism)
0 = no past offense
1 = past offense resulting in no permanent property damage (i.e. vandalism that is easily washable; egging, etc.), no threat of physical harm
2 = past offense resulting in property damage or loss, but less than $50 (need to paint over vandalism, minor theft)
3 = past offense resulting in severe property damage or loss greater than $50 (theft greater than $50, sig. monetary damage) or vandalism containing hate messages and/or implication/threat of violence. In the case of vandalism involving hate messages and/or threats of violence, no permanent loss of damage exceeding $50 is needed to score a “3”

Hate/Bias Motivated Behavior (Verbal)
This item relates to offense relating to verbal incidents
0 = no past offense
1 = past verbal offense involving put downs, insults based on race/religion, but not particularly inflammatory (no use of racial/religious slurs, such as “nigger,” “kyke,” or “faggot,” etc.)
2 = past verbal offense involving use of racial slurs (see above) or designed to incite conflict
3 = past verbal offense involving threats of violence

Hate/Bias Motivated Behavior (Physical)
Note: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then the “verbal” (above) should probably be scored at least as high, if not higher than this item, unless it can be assumed that no verbal exchange occurred during the incident (i.e. a drive-by shooting)
This item relates to offense relating to violent crimes
0 = no past offense
1 = past offense: pushing and shoving
2 = past offense resulting in injury: being “jumped,” punching, kicking, etc.
3 = past offense resulting in serious injury: aggravated assault, rape, broken bones, in condition requiring hospital visit

Hate/Bias Motivated Behavior (Weapon)
This item relates to offense relating to violent crimes in which a weapon was involved
Note: If this item is scored a 1, 2, or 3, then the “physical” experience (above) should be scored at least as high, if not higher than this item
0 = no past offense
1 = past offense in which a weapon was “flashed” or its use was threatened
2 = past offense in which a weapon was used, but resulted in no serious injury (i.e. minor cuts, gun discharged, but victim not harmed)
3 = past offense with a weapon, resulting in injury (shot, stabbed, etc.)
**Group (respondent + 1) Hate/Bias motivated Behavior (Property)**
This item relates to offense relating to property crimes (theft, vandalism)

0 = no past offense

1 = past offense resulting in no permanent property damage (i.e. vandalism that is easily washable; egging, etc.), no threat of physical harm

2 = past offense resulting in property damage or loss, but less than $50 (need to paint over vandalism, minor theft)

3 = past offense resulting in severe property damage or loss greater than $50 (theft greater than $50, sig. monetary damage) or vandalism containing hate messages and/or implication/threat of violence. In the case of vandalism involving hate messages and/or threats of violence, no permanent loss of damage exceeding $50 is needed to score a “3”

**Group (respondent + 1) Hate/Bias Motivated Behavior (Verbal)**
This item relates to offense relating to verbal incidents

0 = no past offense

1 = past verbal offense involving put downs, insults based on race/religion, but not particularly inflammatory (no use of racial/religious slurs, such as “nigger,” “kyke,” or “faggot,” etc.)

2 = past verbal offense involving use of racial slurs (see above) or designed to incite conflict

3 = past verbal offense involving threats of violence

**Group (respondent + 1) Hate/Bias Motivated Behavior (Physical)**
Note: If this item is scored a 1, 2 or 3 then the “verbal” (above) should probably be scored at least as high, if not higher than this item, unless it can be assumed that no verbal exchange occurred during the incident (i.e. a drive-by shooting)
This item relates to offense relating to violent crimes

0 = no past offense

1 = past offense: pushing and shoving

2 = past offense resulting in injury: being “jumped,” punching, kicking, etc.

3 = past offense resulting in serious injury: aggravated assault, rape, broken bones, in condition requiring hospital visit

**Group (respondent + 1) Hate/Bias Motivated Behavior (Weapon)**
This item relates to offense relating to violent crimes in which a weapon was involved
Note: If this item is scored a 1, 2, or 3, then the “physical” experience (above) should be scored at least as high, if not higher than this item

0 = no past offense

1 = past offense in which a weapon was “flashed” or its use was threatened

2 = past offense in which a weapon was used, but resulted in no serious injury (i.e. minor cuts, gun discharged, but victim not harmed)

3 = past offense with a weapon, resulting in injury (shot, stabbed, etc.)
PATHWAYS to Tolerance
A Juvenile Intervention Program

 Minor name:       Date Ordered:  
 Regis #:          Date Enrolled:  
 Probation Officer name: Date of Planned Completion:  

 Date:  6 week report  12 week report  
 Minor has attended all groups?  yes  no  group missed___________  
 Minor has arrived on time?  yes  no  late for group___________  
 Minor has participated: actively  passively  
 Minor has taken responsibility for actions leading to group referral:  yes  no  
 Minor has admitted to personal biases:  yes  no  
 Minor has committed to addressing biases:  yes  no  
 Minor has contributed constructively to group process:  yes  no  
 Minor has refrained from threatening behavior/violence:  yes  no  

 Minor may benefit from referrals to address:  

 Summary/Other comments:  

 Signed

 Sarah Brysk, MSW
 PATHWAYS to Tolerance, Program Director
 619-293-377
The San Diego Anti-Defamation League (ADL) has implemented a program called PATHWAYS to Tolerance, which was designed to confront biased attitudes and hate-motivated behaviors in youth, as well as teach them to resolve inter-group conflicts without violence. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is conducting an evaluation of the program and we are seeking your cooperation in completing this survey. This survey will help us measure how successfully the program was implemented and its value to the San Diego region. Your participation and responses are confidential and anonymous. Neither respondents nor agencies will be identified by name.

Please complete this survey by Friday, January 30, 2004. If you have any questions, please contact Gina Misch at (619) 595-5310 or gmi@sandag.org. We appreciate your taking the time to complete the survey.

1. What type of organization do you work for? (Check only one response.)
   1 School
   2 Court
   3 Faith community
   4 Community-based agency
   5 Health and Human Services Agency
   6 Law enforcement
   7 Probation
   8 Other (Specify) ________________________________

2. How did you hear about PATHWAYS to Tolerance? (Check all that apply.)
   1 Member of the steering committee
   2 Attended a presentation by an ADL staff member
   3 Had personal communication with PATHWAYS to Tolerance staff
   4 Other (Specify) ________________________________

3. What kind of contact have you had with PATHWAYS to Tolerance? (Check all that apply.)
   1 Member of the steering committee
   2 Made referral to the program
   3 Co-facilitator of a group
   4 Other (Specify) ________________________________

4. In your opinion, what are the primary goals of PATHWAYS to Tolerance?
5. How successful was PATHWAYS to Tolerance in implementing these goals?
   1  Implemented all of the goals
   2  Implemented most of the goals
   3  Implemented some of the goals
   4  None of the goals were implemented

6. Do you think there were challenges to implementing PATHWAYS to Tolerance?
   1  Yes
   2  No (Skip to question 8)

7. What were challenges to implementing PATHWAYS to Tolerance?

8. Are you satisfied with the PATHWAYS to Tolerance referral process?
   1  Yes (Skip to question 10)
   2  No
   3  Not applicable, no knowledge of the referral process (Skip to question 12)

9. How could the referral process be improved?

10. Are you satisfied with the feedback received by PATHWAYS to Tolerance program staff about the referrals you made to the program?
    1  Yes (Skip to question 12)
    2  No

11. How could the feedback be improved?
12. Do you think youth with a referral to Probation, were the appropriate target population for PATHWAYS to Tolerance?
   1. Yes (Skip to question 14)
   2. Somewhat
   3. No

13. How should the target population for the program be modified or changed?

14. Overall, how would you rate the usefulness PATHWAYS to Tolerance in addressing prejudice and bias? (Check only one response.)
   Very useful (Skip to question 16)
   Somewhat useful
   Neither
   Not very useful
   Not useful at all

15. How could the program be more useful in addressing prejudice and bias?

16. In your opinion, how effective was PATHWAYS to Tolerance in reducing youth risk for committing hate or bias-motivated crimes? (Check only one response.)
   1. Very effective (Skip to question 18)
   2. Somewhat effective
   3. Neither
   4. Not very effective
   5. Not effective at all

17. How could PATHWAYS to Tolerance more effectively reduce youth risk for committing hate or bias motivated crime?

18. What is the most effective component of PATHWAYS to Tolerance?
19. Overall, how would you rate your experience with PATHWAYS to Tolerance?
   1. Very positive (Answer 20 and skip 21)
   2. Positive (Answer 20 and skip 21)
   3. Neither positive or negative (Skip to question 22)
   4. Negative (Skip to question 21)
   5. Very negative (Skip to question 21)

20. What has made your experience with the program positive?

21. What has made your experience with the program negative?

22. Please provide any other comments you would like to make about PATHWAYS to Tolerance.

This completes the survey. Thank you again for assistance in this process.
PATHWAYS to Tolerance
Pre/Post Test

Please circle the best answer for each question. No one in the group will see your answers.

1. One of the reasons you are in this program is to help you take --------- for your own behavior.
   a. blame
   b. responsibility
   c. time
   d. risks

2. Hate crimes are on the rise and 80% are committed by people under the age of ------.
   a. 40
   b. 30
   c. 21
   d. 15

3. It is possible to change your ----------- even though your attitudes may stay the same.
   a. behavior
   b. advice
   c. clothes
   d. story

4. Bias is a ----------- belief about a person or group who has an identity that is different than your own.
   a. negative
   b. positive
   c. beautiful
   d. negative or positive

5. What comes to mind when you hear the word “Jewish”?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

6. The danger of stereotyping is that people are not considered as -----------, but rather as members of a group.
   a. individuals
   b. nice
   c. important
   d. the same

7. During the Holocaust, -----------, Jewish people were killed.
   a. 6,000
   b. 600
   c. 6,000,000
   d. 60
8. People who fear and dislike homosexuals are called -----------.
   a. stupid
   b. homophobic
   c. heterosexual
   d. criminals

9. Prejudices are unfavorable attitudes toward any person or group of people and these attitudes are not based on -----------.
   a. equations
   b. songs
   c. facts
   d. trouble

10. What comes to mind when you hear the words “People of color”?

11. The word “scapegoat” refers to...
   a. an individual or group that is blamed, when the blame really lies elsewhere.
   b. an animal that lives in the mountains.
   c. talking about people using racial words.
   d. saying what is on your mind.

12. 95% of pedophiles are males whose sexual orientation is -----------.
   a. homosexual
   b. bisexual
   c. not important
   d. heterosexual

13. What is the KKK and what are some of their beliefs?

14. Some feelings related to prejudice are...
   a. fear
   b. anger
   c. frustration
   d. all of the above
   e. a & b only

15. What is the swastika symbol and what does it mean?

16. In your opinion, what is the court’s reason for having you participate in this program?
PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE DATA COLLECTION FORM
INTERVENTION COMPONENT
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
(To be completed at the time of program entry)

REJIS NO. __________________________ Entry Date __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __
DOB __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __ Sex ____ (1=Male, 2=Female)
Wardship Date: __ __ / __ __ / __ __ __ __ City __________________ Zip Code ______

Primary Ethnicity ______ (1) White (100) (2) Hispanic (200) (3) Black (300) (4) American Indian (400) (5) Asian/Pac. Islander (500-800)
(8) Other Specify ________________________________

Primary Care Provider (at time of instant offense) ______ Other specify ________________________________
(1) Mother (2) Father (3) Step Parent (4) Foster Parent (5) Relative (6) Friend (7) Other (8) NA (9) Unknown

Secondary Care Provider (at time of instant offense) ______ Other specify ________________________________
(1) Mother (2) Father (3) Step Parent (4) Foster Parent (5) Relative (6) Friend (7) Other (8) NA (9) Unknown

Living Arrangement at Time of Instant Offense____ (check all that apply)
[ ] Living w/mother [ ] Living w/father [ ] Living w/stepmother
[ ] Living w/stepfather [ ] Living w/siblings [ ] Living w/other family members
[ ] Living w/friends [ ] Living w/girlfriend-boyfriend [ ] Living alone stable
[ ] Living alone transient [ ] Other _______
[ ] Unknown [ ] Living in substitute care: [ ] foster home; [ ] RTF; [ ] custody

Name of school attending ________________________________

Self-Reported or Documented Child Abuse or Neglect ____
(1) Yes (2) No (3) Unknown

History of drug use ____ Frequency of drug use____
(1) Yes (2) No (1) Never (2) Occasional (3) Frequent (multiple substances or 1 substance
multiple times)
History of alcohol use ____ Frequency of alcohol use____
(1) Yes (2) No (1) Never (2) Occasional (3) Frequent
Gang Identification ____ (1) Yes (2) No (3) Non-inclusive group (9) Unknown
 Specify non-inclusive group identification ________________________________

Referring agency ____ (1) court (2) law enforcement/probation (3) school (4) other (9) unknown
 Referred to Pathways for (circle all that apply)
1 Hate crime 2 bias motivated incident 3 gang/non-inclusive group
4 tattoos/other signs/symbols 5 Other, specify __________________________

(Complete for intervention only)

Exit Date __ __ - __ __ - __ __ __ __ Reason for Exit ____ (1=successful, 2=unsuccessful,
3=moved, 4=death, 5=CYA, 6=Other, 7=unsuccessful reinstated) Specify other __________

Group attendance (for during intervention only):
Attended how many modules during 12 weeks ____ Number of tardies ____
PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE DATA COLLECTION FORM
Criminal History (complete at program entry)

REJIS ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

Referral History Information (prior to instant offense):
# of Total Referrals: ______ 
# of 602 Referrals ______ 
# of Status Referrals: ______ 
Highest Referral Charge ________ (999 na/unk)
BCS Most Serious: ________ (999 na/unk)
Level Most Serious: _____ (see below)
Type Most Serious: _____ (see below)

Level Codes
1 = Felony
2 = Misdemeanor
3 = Status
4 = Prob. Viol.
5 = NA
9 = Unknown

Type Codes
1 = Violent
2 = Property
3 = Drug
4 = Other Felony
5 = Other Misd
6 = Status
7 = Probation Violation
8 = NA
9 = Unknown

Filed Petition Information:
# of Petitions: ______

Sustained Petition Information:
# of Petitions: ______
Highest Sustained Charge PC ________ (999 na/unk)
BCS Most Serious: ________ (999 na/unk)
Level Most Serious: _____ (see above)
Type Most Serious: _____ (see above)

Sentence Information:
Prior Institutional Commitments:
(1) Yes  (2) No  (3) Assigned but stayed  (9) Unknown

Sentence length ______ longest if more than 1
(1=less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months, 3=6 (+1 day) to 12 months, 4=12+ months, 5 =assigned but stayed, 7 = NA, 9=unknown)

Prior Bias Motivated Crimes (prior to instant offense)
Prior referral for bias motivated crime? ___
(1) Yes  (2) No  (9) Unknown

Number of referrals ______ 99 Unknown
Number of filed petitions ______ 99 Unknown
Number of sustained petitions ______ 99 Unknown

Motivating bias for sustained petition was...
(circle all that apply)
1 Race/ethnicity
2 Gender
3 Age
4 Sexual Preference
5 Religion
6 Other, specify ______________
7 NA
8 Unknown
Instant Offense Information:
Offense date ___/___/___

Current offense bias motivated? ____
(1) Yes (2) No (9) Unknown

Motivating bias was towards victim’s
1 Race/ethnicity
2 Gender
3 Age
4 Sexual Preference
5 Religion
6 Other, specify ___________________
7 NA
8 Unknown

Referral Information:
Highest Referral Charge (PC) _________(999 na/unk)
(i.e., 245AB)
BCS highest referral _______ __ __
Level highest referral ______
Type highest referral ______

Sustained Petition Information:
Highest Sustained Charge (PC) _________(999 na/unk)
BCS highest sustained: _______ __ __
Level highest sustained: ______
Type highest sustained: ______

Sentence Information:
Institutional Commitment: _____
1 Yes 2 No 3 Assigned but stayed

Sentence length ______
(1=less than 3 months, 2 = 3 to 6 months, 3 = 6 (+1 day) to 12 months, 4 =12+months, 5 =assigned but stayed, 7 =NA
9=unknown)

601 Ward (circle one):
1 Now 2 In the past, not currently 3 Never
602 Ward (circle one):
1 Now 2 In the past, not currently 3 Never

Informal Probation:
1 Now 2 In the past, not currently 3 Never

Court Ordered Community Service for instant offense:
1 Yes 2 No 9 Unknown

Fine Ordered for instant offense:
1 Yes 2 No 9 Unknown

Restitution Ordered for instant offense:
1 Yes 2 No 9 Unknown
PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE DATA COLLECTION FORM
Crime Data (During Intervention)

REJIS ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ 
Time Period: From _/__/__ to ___/___/____ 

Referral Information:
# of Total Referrals: ___ ___ 
# of 602 Referrals ___ ___ 
# of Status Referrals: ___ ___ 
Highest charge___________________ (i.e. 245A1) (999 na/unk) 
BCS highest referral: ___ ___ ___(999 na/unk) 
Level highest referral: ___ 
Type highest referral: ___ Number of probation violations 

Referral includes enhancement for a hate crime? 

Filed Petition Information:
# of Petitions: ___ ___ 

Sustained Petition Information:
# of Petitions: ___ ___ 
Highest Sustained Charge(PC)___________________ (i.e. 245A1) 
(999 na/unk) 
BCS highest sustained: ___ ___ ___(999 na/unk) 
Level highest sustained: ___ 
Type highest sustained: ___ 
Petition includes enhancement for a hate crime? 

Sentence Information:

Institutional Commitments: 
1 Yes 2 No 3 Assigned but stayed 9 Unknown 
Sentence length ___ (longest if more than 1) 
(1=less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months, 
3=6 (+1 day) to 12 months, 4=12+months, 
5=assigned but stayed, 7=NA, 9=unknown) 
Bias motivated/hate crimes: 
(any PC 422 or enhancement 422.6 through 422.7pc) 
Number of referrals _____ 99 Unknown 
Number of filed petitions _____ 99 Unknown 
Number of sustained petitions _____ 99 Unknown 
Motivating bias was towards victim’s (circle all that apply) 
1 Race/Ethnicity 
2 Gender 
3 Age 
4 Sexual Preference 
5 Religion 
6 Other, specify ________________________________ 
7 NA 
9 Unknown 
Completed Probation in Time Period (circle one): _____ 
1 2 3 9 
Yes No N/A Unknown 

Level Codes 
1 = Felony 
2 = Misdemeanor 
3 = Status 
4 = Probation Violation 
5 = N/A 
9 = Unknown 

Type Codes 
1 = Violent 
2 = Property 
3 = Drug 
4 = Other Felony 
5 = Other Misdemeanor 
6 = Status 
7 = Probation Violation 
8 = N/A 
9 = Unknown
PATHWAYS TO TOLERANCE DATA COLLECTION FORM
Crime Data (6-Month Follow-up)

REJIS ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

Time Period: From __ __/__ __/__ __ __ __ to __ __/ __ __/ __ __ __

Referral Information:
# of Total Referrals: _________
# of 602 Referrals: _________
# of Status Referrals: _________

Highest Charge _________ (i.e. 245A1) (999 na/unk)

BCS highest referral: _________ (999 na/unk)

Level highest referral: ___(see below)  Number of probation violations ______

Type highest referral: ___(see below)

Referral includes enhancement for a hate crime?

Filed Petition Information:
# of Petitions: ________

Sustained Petition Information:
# of Petitions: ________

Highest Sustained Charge _________ (i.e. 245A1) (999 na/unk)

BCS highest sustained: _________ (999 na/unk)

Level highest sustained: ___(see above)

Type highest sustained: ___(see above)

Sustained petition includes enhancement for a hate crime?

Sentence Information:

Institutional Commitments:  _____
1  Yes  2  No  3  Assigned but stayed  9  Unknown

Sentence length ______ (longest if more than 1)
(1=less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months,
3=6 (+1 day) to 12 months 4 = 12+months,
5=assigned but stayed, 7 =NA, 9=unknown)

Bias motivated/hate crimes:
(any PC 422 or enhancement 422.6 through 422.7 pc)
Number of referrals ______ 99 Unknown
Number of filed petitions ______ 99 Unknown
Number of sustained petitions ______ 99 Unknown

Motivating bias was towards victim’s (circle all that apply)
1 Race/Ethnicity
2 Gender
3 Age
4 Sexual Preference
5 Religion
6 Other, specify ________________________________
7 NA
9 Unknown

Completed Probation in Time Period (circle one):_______
1  Yes  2  No  3  N/A  4  Completed during intervention  9  Unknown

---

Level Codes
1 = Felony
2 = Misdemeanor
3 = Status
4 = Probation Violation
5 = N/A
9 = Unknown

Type Codes
1 = Violent
2 = Property
3 = Drug
4 = Other Felony
5 = Other Misdemeanor
6 = Status
7 = Probation Violation
8 = N/A
9 = Unknown

---

203