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This study investigated the effectiveness of a videotape training program to teach self-protective skills to preschool children. Children were taught to say, "I have to ask my teacher/parent," and to run to their teacher/parent when presented with one of two lures commonly used by child molesters. The videotape incorporated the direct instructional techniques of active pupil responding; the model, lead, and test format; and use of minimally different stimuli to teach children to discriminate between correct and incorrect responses. The results showed that although none of the subjects showed any improvement in responding after only one viewing, five of the seven subjects showed improved responding following the second viewing. Following the third viewing, two subjects showed complete acquisition of the target responses, one showed further improvement, and two subjects reverted to baseline response levels.
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INTRODUCTION

Although the problem of the sexual molestation of children is not a new one, it has generated more attention in recent years. In spite of the fact that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at an accurate estimate of the extent of the problem, a number of authors conclude that it is indeed a major problem (Finkelor, 1979; Geiser, 1979; Helfer & Kempe, 1976; Walters, 1975).

In one Michigan county alone, seven children were molested and killed in one year. Seemingly all were related in that, in each case, the child was lured into going with the killer (Arnold, 1978). As a result of these deaths, an extensive survey was conducted in the surrounding school districts to obtain information about the number and types of lures that had actually been presented to children (Tobias & Gordon, 1977). The authors conclude that the number of potentially dangerous incidents is much higher than generally believed. One significant finding was that coercion, as a tactic, was used in only a small minority of the reported cases. This finding suggests that children who exhibit appropriate verbal and motor skills can greatly reduce their chances of becoming the victim of a child molester.

To date, very few programs are available to teach children appropriate responses to the lures of potential child molesters. Two such projects were conducted recently at the Child Development Center in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Poche and Brouwer (1980) used modeling, prompting,
and social reinforcement to teach preschool children appropriate verbal and motor responses to several common lures. While the training procedure proved to be highly effective, training was conducted in the natural environment (i.e., outdoors) and a large number of persons were required to conduct the training. Both of these aspects may preclude widespread adoption of the procedure for normal classroom use. In an attempt to reduce the number of persons required for training while at the same time adapting the above procedure for use with small groups, Kies (1980) conducted training sessions indoors in a role-play situation. Following acquisition of the target responses in this setting, outdoor probes were conducted to test for generalization to the natural environment. While this procedure was effective in teaching the appropriate responses in the role-play situation in the classroom and can be used with small groups, the responses of a number of children did not show generality to the natural environment, and only one of the five subjects emitted the target responses at follow-up.

A number of films are also available which seek to address this problem (Arnold, 1978; B.F.A., 1977; Davis, 1972; 1975; 1977). Films share an advantage over the above programs in that they are more easily utilized in classroom settings. However, several shortcomings of currently available films are readily apparent. First, no data exist to show that any of these films effectively change the behavior of children who view them. Secondly, all employ the use of the word "stranger," when, in fact, the large majority of child molesters are known at least casually by their victims (Finkelor, 1979; Geiser, 1979; Roberts, 1980; Walters, 1975). In addition, these films are largely
directed toward upper elementary and junior-high school children. While children from ten to fourteen do represent the highest risk group (Tobias & Gordon, 1977), it would seem desirable to teach children self-protective responses prior to their becoming likely targets. Additionally, there is no lower age limit below which children are automatically safe (EDCOM, 1964; Geiser, 1979).

An extensive literature supports the conclusion that children learn from television and films (Bogatz & Ball, 1971; Bryan & Schwartz, 1971; Chu & Schramm, 1967; Gropper, 1966; Henderson & Swanson, 1978; Lesser, 1974) and from both live and filmed models (Adelson, Liebert, Poulos, & Herskovitz, 1972; Bandura, 1965; Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963; Cantor, 1978; Stein & Bryan, 1972; Walters & Park, 1964; Yussen, 1974). In addition, direct instructional techniques, which have been widely tested, promote rapid acquisition of learning tasks by preschool children (Becker & Engelmann, 1977; Carnine & Silbert, 1979; Monteiro, 1980).

The purpose of the current study was to extend the work of Poche and Brouwer (1980) and Kies (1980) by developing and evaluating a videotape training program designed to teach self-protective skills to preschool children. To the extent that children effectively learn and exhibit the skills taught by this program, it enjoys several advantages over the previous procedures. It could be readily adopted for classroom use with minimal effort on the part of the teacher, and secondly, it should be equally effective with both large and small groups.
METHOD

Subjects and Setting

Four girls and three boys from three to six years of age were recruited from the Kalamazoo Learning Village, a preschool located in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and administered by the Behavior Research and Development Corporation. Children were selected for training based on the nonoccurrence of the target responses during the baseline condition.

Training was conducted in a classroom at the Learning Village. Children were tested for the presence of the target skills in two locations in the natural environment: 1) outdoors near the Learning Village (school probe), and 2) outdoors near their home (home probe).

Experimental Design

The effectiveness of the videotape was evaluated via a multiple baseline design across subjects. One child was selected as a pilot subject and trained individually. The remainder were divided into two small groups of three children each. However, individual data were retained for all children regardless of whether they were trained individually or in a group.

Procedure

Baseline

Baseline consisted of a minimum of three probes in the natural

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
environment, at least one of which was conducted near the child's home. All subjects initially received a school probe. The order of the remaining probes was largely dependent upon when the home probe could be arranged with the child's parent(s). In order to preserve the multiple baseline design without significantly increasing the number of obtrusive probes to which subjects were exposed, children in the second and third baselines had their probes spaced accordingly. However, at least two baseline probes were conducted following implementation of the training phase for the immediately preceding subject or group.

Training

Following baseline, training was sequentially introduced across a single subject and two small groups. During each training session, subjects first viewed the videotape (see Appendix A for script). Immediately following viewing, subjects were questioned to determine if they could verbally describe the correct responses. Correct responses were praised and incorrect responses were simply corrected and the question repeated. Finally, each subject role-played the correct responses with the experimenter presenting the lure. Again, correct responses were praised and incorrect responses were corrected and the sequence repeated. Sessions lasted approximately 30 minutes with the videotape occupying roughly two-thirds of that time, i.e., 20 minutes.

A number of features of direct instruction were incorporated into the videotape program to enhance the program's effectiveness.
The first and most important, was that of active pupil responding. This technique allows every pupil to respond overtly to every trial and to receive immediate feedback regarding the correct response. The every-pupil-response technique utilized was choral responding. An audible signal presented by the experimenter was used to coordinate responding.

A second feature of direct instruction, designed to minimize errors and maximize initial correct responding, is the model (prime), lead (prompt), and test (probe) format. This format was employed in two ways. First, the experimenter provided a verbal lead in the early portions of the videotape. Secondly, the program itself followed a similar format: correct responses were modeled, trials were presented which provided practice in identification of correct and incorrect responses, and, finally, test lures were presented which required production of the target verbal response and a verbal description of the target motor response.

One final feature adapted from direct instruction was that of initially presenting minimally different stimuli when teaching a discrimination task. The program required subjects to discriminate between examples (correct responses) and non-examples (incorrect responses) which differed only slightly, e.g., walking away from the "suspect" rather than running.

A number of additional features were included in an attempt to increase attending and to enhance modeling effects. Research from Sesame Street (Anderson & Levin, 1976; Bogatz & Ball, 1971; Lesser, 1974) suggests a number of features which contribute to increased
attending on the part of preschool children. In this regard, the videotape utilized relatively short scenes and the reintroduction of familiar characters. Music and rapid pacing, two other attention enhancing features identified by the above authors, were not used due to production limitations.

Additionally, it has been shown that informed instructions, i.e., telling the child to remember what s/he sees, can be used to enhance both attending and recall (Yussen, 1974). Thus immediately prior to each scene, the narrator instructed the subjects to watch closely and to get ready to say whether or not the next boy or girl said and did the right things.

A number of researchers have demonstrated that children are more likely to imitate the behavior of models that are rewarded or reinforced than that of non-reinforced or punished models (Cantor, 1978; Walters & Park, 1964). Therefore, the narrator praised the models' correct responses and labeled incorrect responses "wrong."

One final feature which has been shown to increase imitation of filmed models by preschool children is that of first person narration (Jakibchuck & Smeriglio, 1976). This feature was incorporated in two scenes in which the model verbalized the key features of the lure and the correct response in an aside before modeling the target behaviors.

**Target Behaviors**

Two responses were chosen as appropriate self-protective behaviors for preschool children, one verbal and one motor (Kies, 1980; Poche & Brouwer, 1980). The target verbal response was defined as the
verbalization, "I have to ask my teacher/parent," immediately following presentation of the lure. Any parental noun could be used when appropriate, e.g., mother, father, mom, dad, etc. Teacher/parent usage was required to correspond with the appropriate setting, i.e., home or school, to be considered correct. The target motor response was defined as any movement by the subject which placed him or herself a minimum of 25 ft. away from the suspect within five seconds following termination of the target verbal response. The subject's movement was required to be in the direction of the home/parent or school/teacher to be considered correct. In the event that no verbal response was made, timing began upon completion of the lure.

The target behaviors selected were designed to provide a maximum of safety to the child, given a potentially dangerous situation, while at the same time not eliciting undue anxiety on the part of the child or making the child appear rude to benevolent individuals. The target verbal response avoided the use of the word "stranger" for several reasons. Interviews with parents indicated that they did not want their children to become indiscriminately fearful or suspicious of all strangers. Secondly, as previously mentioned, the majority of child molesters are not total strangers to their victims. Finally, it has been suggested that most child molesters avoid children who appear to have good relationships with, and receive attention from, their parents (Roberts, 1979). Since the target verbalization carries the implication of a good relationship with a trusted adult, it should serve as a deterrent to potential child molesters. The motor response is also included for several reasons: 1) it immediately removes the
child from a potentially dangerous situation, 2) it removes any opportunity for the molester to escalate the lure, and 3) it greatly lessens the probability of the child being physically abducted after failure of the noncoercive lure.

**Measurement System**

Measurement probes were conducted in the natural environment in two distinct settings, home and school. The following procedures were used to conduct each probe. For school probes, a confederate (either the experimenter or one of the child's teachers) took the subject for a walk near the school. The confederate would then use one of several pretexts for momentarily returning to the school, e.g., "I forgot to...," "I need to get...," "I think I heard someone call me," etc. (An effort was made to use novel pretexts as much as possible and subjects were frequently taken for walks in which no probes were conducted.) As soon as the confederate left the area, the "suspect" (a second confederate) approached the subject and presented one of two standard lures. Both lures used have frequently been cited as common lures (Arnold, 1978; B.F.A., 1977; Tobias and Gordon, 1977) and had previously been shown effective with preschool children (Kies, 1980; Poche & Brouwer, 1980). Lures were preceded by the suspect approaching the subject, saying, "Hi," "Hello," etc., and engaging in a sentence or two of small talk related to the weather or something that the child was doing. The first, or "authority" lure, consisted of the verbalization, "I just talked to your teacher/parent and they said you could go for a walk/ride with me. Would you like
to come with me?" The second, or "incentive" lure, consisted of the
verbalization, "I've got a really neat surprise for you in my car.
Would you like to come with me and see it?" In the meantime, the
first confederate would retreat to a vantage point from which s/he
could observe the interaction unobtrusively. If the subject started
to go with the suspect, the confederate immediately terminated the
probe by quickly returning and calling the subject to come with them.
The suspect then faded into the background by simply continuing to
walk away. If the subject did not go with the suspect but remained
in the area, the suspect escalated the lure by adding the second lure.
If the subject still did not go with the suspect or leave the area,
the confederate returned and terminated the probe as described above.
If the subject moved away from the suspect, the confederate returned
and terminated the probe when the subject had reached a distance of
more than 25 ft. away from the suspect.

Home probes were similarly conducted with the exception that
the subject's mother or father, rather than the first confederate,
was responsible for initiating and terminating the probe.

Subjects' verbal and motor responses were independently coded
into one of four categories. Only the initial verbal response fol­
lowing the presentation of the lure was scored. Verbal response cat­
egories were defined as follows: Incorrect--any verbalization not
falling in one of the remaining categories; None--no verbalization;
No--any verbal refusal other than the target response, e.g., "I
can't," "I don't want to," "No," etc.; and Correct--the verbaliza­
tion, "I have to ask my teacher/parent."
Motor response categories were defined as follows: Go—subject starts to leave the area with the suspect; Stay—subject remains within a 25 ft. radius of the suspect; Walk—subject moves a minimum of 25 ft. away from the suspect but fails to meet the time criterion or moves in a direction other than toward the school or home; and Correct—the subject moves a minimum of 25 ft. away from the suspect within five seconds following the termination of the subject's initial verbal response.

In order to derive a composite score based on both the verbal and motor responses, a safety index score from zero to six was assigned to each possible response combination (See Table 1). While

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the scores are admittedly somewhat arbitrary, they represent an attempt to evaluate the combined responses on the basis of the degree
of protection afforded a child using that response combination.

**Interobserver Agreement**

"Suspect" confederates served as the primary observers for both the verbal and motor responses. In order to obtain interobserver agreement scores for verbal responses, suspects carried a hidden tape recorder with the tape subsequently being scored by the experimenter. For motor responses, the other confederate served as the "reliability" observer, with the exception of home probes where the experimenter did so. Slightly more than 97% of the probes were independently scored by two observers. Agreement scores were calculated separately for verbal and motor responses using the formula: agreements / agreements + disagreements. Interobserver agreement was 90% for verbal responses, and 98% for motor responses.
RESULTS

Figure 1 shows the safety index scores for each subject across baseline and training conditions. The results reveal that the videotape was only partially effective in teaching self-protective responses to preschool children. The only consistent finding across all subjects was that one viewing of the videotape alone was insufficient to produce any change in behavior. However, given a number of complications, the results are nonetheless encouraging. If you exclude the subjects whose parents intervened, the remaining subjects all improved greatly except for subject 7 who was less than 3 years old. Subjects 1 and 4 showed complete acquisition of the target responses over three viewings. All but one of the remaining subjects showed some improvement during the training condition. Subject 2 made an almost perfect response after viewing the videotape twice, as did subject 1, but both failed to meet the five second criterion for leaving the area. However, on the third probe, subject 2's responses reverted to baseline levels. Subject 5 showed a similar pattern of some improvement following the second viewing but also reverted to baseline levels following the third viewing. Subject 6 showed no improvement in responding following any viewings of the videotape. Subject 7 showed slight improvement following the third viewing, but failed to exhibit either of the target responses. Subject 3's improvements following each of the second and third viewings, resulted from a correct verbal and a correct motor response respectively. However, both target responses were never exhibited together during any
Figure 1. Safety index scores for self-protective responses based on verbal and motor response combinations during baseline, videotape training and follow-up conditions. (Note: training always preceded probes when both occurred on the same day.)
one probe.

A number of subjects showed some improvements in responding during baseline. However, since none of these subjects exhibited the target responses, it was decided to retain them in the study. In each case, these gains occurred during or immediately following the first home probe. Questioning of parents revealed that at least three of the four such improvements could be directly attributed to parental instructions not to go with strangers or punishment for going with the suspect, in spite of the fact that parents had previously been instructed not to discuss the project with their children prior to its completion. On all such occasions which could be directly attributed to parental instructions, the responses shown by subjects were a verbal refusal accompanied by staying in the area. It is especially instructive to note the responses of subject 6, which never varied following physical punishment for going with the suspect, even when more appropriate responses were modeled and taught by the videotape. Subject 7's only improvement followed the second home probe and perhaps should be attributed to parental instructions as well.

Follow-up probes for subjects 1 to 4 were conducted one week following termination of training. All four subjects' responses were higher than baseline, but only subject 1 exhibited either of the target responses. However, none of the subjects went with the suspect. Subject 3 did show maintenance of the partial gains made during training. No follow-up probes were conducted for the subjects in the second group since all failed to acquire the target responses during training.
DISCUSSION

In spite of the somewhat equivocal nature of the data, the present findings suggest that the videotape training program was effective in producing at least some improvement in responding for five of the seven subjects. This finding is consistent with previous research with instructional television and/or films which suggests that films can be but are not necessarily effective in changing behavior (Cantor, 1978; Chu & Schramm, 1967).

It is possible that, given additional opportunities to view the videotape, more of the subjects might have acquired the target responses. However, additional viewings were not conducted for several reasons. First, when questioned immediately after viewing the videotape, all subjects were able to state the correct verbal response and verbally describe the correct motor response. In addition, all subjects, with the exception of the youngest, correctly role-played the appropriate behaviors when presented with a lure by the experimenter. It should be noted that, while the verbal response required no further training, the motor response typically required one or two prompted role-play trials before being emitted independently. However, following the third viewing, both verbal and motor responses were appropriately emitted by all but the youngest subject, although no data were collected on performance during the brief role-plays. The fact that subjects responded correctly in the role-plays was taken as evidence that the appropriate responses were indeed incorporated into their repertoires. Failure to respond appropriately during the probes might
then be viewed as a failure to show generality to the natural environment.

A second reason for not extending the number of training sessions was the observation that attending to the videotape decreased with each successive viewing across almost all subjects. Attending, especially during the third viewing, was markedly less than that during prior viewings. Decreased attending was accompanied by a parallel increase in off-task behaviors. The data of subjects 2 and 5 probably reflect these changes. A final reason for not extending the number of training sessions was the fact that, even if further viewings would have produced further increments in responding, it is not likely that classroom teachers would adopt a program which required numerous repetitious showings of the same film or videotape.

The present findings are also interesting in light of the studies preceding it. Poche and Brouwer's (1980) procedure was more effective but was more costly in terms of staff and training time. However, since training occurred in the natural environment, responding did not need to occur in nontraining environments. Kies' (1980) procedure again showed somewhat more success than the current study, but her subjects' responses did not readily show generality to the natural environment. In addition, the number of training sessions was two to three times greater than in the present study. Having subjects view the target behaviors occurring in the natural environment might promote transfer, however, the present results do not substantiate such a conclusion.

The present training program would seem to enjoy some advantages
over other films currently available (Arnold, 1978; B.F.A., 1977; Davis, 1972, 1975, 1977). Data are provided to show that the current program can be used to successfully teach self-protective skills to at least some children. Further, the program provides simple, appropriate skills which are useful in a wide variety of potentially dangerous situations as opposed to long lists of "do's and don't's" which are not likely to control much behavior (Arnold, 1978; Davis, 1972, 1975, 1977).

The current results suggest that further research is required. A number of problems encountered with the current videotape, if corrected, may lead to increased success. For example, a number of the pauses on the videotape during which subjects were to respond overtly to questions or lures were not quite long enough, so that occasionally the narrator would be asking another question while the children were responding to a previous one. A second problem was coordinating responses for children who were not familiar with the DISTAR format. Perhaps training with this format would have increased responding somewhat. However, the major problem with the program seemed to be its length. Twenty minutes is a fairly long time to maintain attending for a preschool child. The videotape could be shortened by increasing the pace and dropping several repetitious scenes. Further research might also attempt to incorporate short segments of the videotape with a training program similar to that of Kies (1980) in an attempt to reduce the number of training sessions required in the role-play format, while also enhancing generality of the target responses. Additional research might also focus on the age parameters
for which the videotape program is most effective.
APPENDIX A

Script for Training Videotape

Characters: Narrator; suspects (white, male, 20-35 years of age, average height and build); and children (4-6 years of age).

Setting: Outdoors - school, playground, and community.

SCENE I

(From subjective perspective: Camera pans school and playground (Children playing in background), continuing around toward street. Stops on suspect leaning on car parked at edge of playground. As camera nears suspect, he straightens up and comes toward camera.)

Suspect: Hi there! Nice day isn't it? (pause) Guess what, I've got a really neat surprise in my car. Would you like to come with me and see it? (freeze action)

Narrator: This program will teach you what to say and what to do (narrator should emphasize each underlined word) whenever someone asks you to get in their car or to go someplace with them.

SCENE II

(Scene I repeats with addition of objective perspective and child (female) playing near edge of playground. When child gets close enough suspect approaches.)

Suspect: Hi there! Nice day isn't it?
Child: Uh-huh.
Suspect: Guess what, I've got a really neat surprise in my car. Would you like to come with me and see it? (freeze action)

Narrator: If someone asks you to get in their car or to go someplace with them, you should say...(resume action)

Child: I have to ask my teacher. (freeze action)

Narrator: What should you say if someone asks you to go someplace with them? (pause; I have to ask my teacher--pause will be long enough for children to make indicated response.)
If you said, "I have to ask my teacher," you're right! Good listening! Next you should run to your teacher.

(Action resumes; girl runs toward teacher on far side of playground. Narration continues immediately with action frozen when girl reaches teacher.)

Narrator: What should you do after you say, "I have to ask my teacher"? (pause: run to my teacher) If you said, "Run to my teacher," you're right!

Remember, if someone asks you to get in their car or to go someplace with them, you should say... (flash back to child's response above)...and then you should run to your teacher. (freeze action as child runs toward teacher)

Should you get in their car? (pause: no) Should you go with them? (pause: no) Should you say, "I have to ask my teacher"? (pause: yes) Should you run to your teacher? (pause: yes)

We're going to watch and see what some other boys and girls do when someone asks them to go someplace with him. Afterwards I'm going to ask you to tell me if the boy or girl said the right thing and did the right thing, so watch very closely. This next little girl is at home so she should say, "I have to ask my mother," or "I have to ask my father," instead of, "I have to ask my teacher." Let's see if she does. Watch closely!

SCENE III

(Child, female, riding tricycle on sidewalk in front of her home. Suspect approaches from across the street.)

Suspect: Hi Sally! Having fun?
Child: Yeah.
Suspect: It's really nice out here today, isn't it?
Child: Sure is.
Suspect: I just talked to your mother and she said you could go for a walk with me. Would you like to come with me?
Child: I have to ask my mother. (Gets off tricycle and runs toward house)
Suspect: But I already ask... (Voice trails off, turns and quickly walks away. Cut back to child, freeze action as she opens door to house)

Narrator: Did she say the right thing? (pause: yes) What did she say? (pause: I have to ask my mother) If you said, "Yes," and, "I have to ask my mother," you're right! You were
really watching closely, good job! Did she also do the right thing? (pause: yes) What did she do? (pause: ran to her mother) Did you say, "Yes," and "Ran to her mother"? If you did, you're right! You're pretty hard to fool. She said and did the right things. Good girl! Remember, it's very important to both say and do the right things. This next one is going to be a really hard one. I bet I can fool some of you this time. Watch very closely and don't let me fool you!

SCENE IV

(Child, male, comes out of school as if to leave. Suspect stops him in parking lot.)

Suspect: Hi there, Billy. How's it going?
Child: O.K., Mr. Johnson.
Suspect: Your mother asked me to pick you up this afternoon. We're going to meet her at the mall. Come with me. (Holds out his hand)
Child: I have to ask my teacher. (Runs down sidewalk away from school building) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did he say the right thing? (pause: yes) If you said, "Yes," you're right! Good listening! Now don't let me fool you. Did he do the right thing? (pause: no) If you said, "Yes," I fooled you! He ran, but he didn't run to his teacher. What should he have done? (pause: ran to his teacher) If you said, "Ran to his teacher," you're right! Good job! Let's give him another chance to say and do the right things. Get ready to tell me if he says and does the right things this time. Watch.

SCENE V

(Scene IV repeats through lure. First-person aside and correct motor responses are added.)

Child: (Aside) Gee, he said, "Come with me." I'd better ask my teacher first.
(Aloud) I have to ask my teacher. (Turns and runs back toward school building) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did he say the right thing this time? (pause: yes) Did he do the right thing this time? (pause: yes) If you said, "Yes," both times, you're absolutely right! I didn't fool you that time. He said and did the right things. Good boy!

Here's another one. See if you can tell me if this next
girl says and does the right things. Don't let me fool you!

SCENE VI

(Edge of playground near woods. School to right of playground. Child, female, playing on swing.)

Suspect: Hi! How's it going?
Child: Fine.
Suspect: Nice day, isn't it?
Child: Yes.
Suspect: How would you like to go for a walk with me? I'll show you a really neat surprise if you do. Come with me. (Holds out his hand)
Child: I have to ask my teacher. (Jumps off swing and walks towards the school) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did she say and do the right things this time? (pause: no) If you said, "No," you're right! If you said, "Yes," I fooled you this time. She said the right thing, but she didn't do the right thing. What should she have done? (pause: ran to her teacher) If you said, "Ran to her teacher," you're right! You're getting pretty good at this. Let's see if she says and does the right things this time. Watch closely and don't let me fool you.

SCENE VII

(Scene VI repeats through lure.)

Child: (Abruptly) No. (Jumps off swing and runs towards the school) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did she say and do the right things this time? (pause: no) If you said, "Yes," I fooled you. She did the right thing, but she didn't say the right thing. What should she have said? (pause: I have to ask my teacher) If you said, "I have to ask my teacher," you're right! You're pretty hard to fool. The first time she did the wrong thing and this time she said the wrong thing. Let's see if she remembers to both say and do the right things this time. Watch.

SCENE VIII

(Scene VI repeats again through lure. First-person aside and correct responses are added.)
Child: (Aside) Oh-oh, he said, "Come with me." I'd better run and ask my teacher.  
(Aloud) I have to ask my teacher. (Jumps off swing and runs toward the school) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did she say the right thing this time? (pause: yes) Did she do the right thing this time? (pause: yes) If you said, "yes," both times, you're right! She remembered to say and do the right things. Good girl! Do you think you could? (pause)

Let's see if you can tell me if this next boy both says and does the right things. Watch closely and don't let me fool you.

SCENE IX

(Child, male, playing with toys, e.g., trucks, cars, etc., on lawn in front of home. Suspect approaches on sidewalk.)

Suspect: Hi! How are you?
Child: Fine.
Suspect: That's a pretty nifty truck you have there.
Child: (Proudly) I got it for my birthday!
Suspect: Wow! That's really nice. Say, I've got something in my car I bet you'd like. Want to come with me and take a look at it?
Child: What is it? (freeze action)

Narrator: Is that what he should say? (pause: no) He said the wrong thing! What should he have said? (pause: I have to ask my mother, or I have to ask my father) If you said, "I have to ask my mother," or "I have to ask my father," you're right! I bet I fooled some of you that time! Watch closely and don't let me fool you this time.

(Action resumes at point of lure)

Suspect: Say, I've got something in my car I bet you'd like. Want to come with me and take a look at it?
Child: I have to ask my father. (Resumes "driving" truck and making appropriate "truck" sounds) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did he say the right thing this time? (pause: yes) You are right if you said "yes." Did he do the right thing? (pause: no) No, he did not do the right thing. What should he have done? (pause: ran to his father) If you said, "Ran to his father," you're right! You're getting harder to fool all the time. Let's see if he can remember to say and do the right things this time. Watch closely.
SCENE X

(Scene IX repeats with correct verbal response and incorrect motor response. Action continues as child resumes playing with truck.)

Suspect: I already asked your father and he said it was O.K. for you to go with me.

Child: Oh, O.K. (Gets up, takes suspect's hand, and they start down sidewalk) (freeze action)

Narrator: He said the right thing again, but did he do the right thing this time? (pause: no) No, he sure didn't! What should he have done? (pause: ran to his father) If you said, "Ran to his father," you're right! Good remembering! He did the wrong thing because he didn't run to his father. Let's see if he can finally get it right. Do you think he'll remember to say and do the right things this time? (pause) Let's see if you're right. Watch closely.

SCENE XI

(Scene IX repeats through lure. First-person aside and correct responses added.)

Child: (Aside) Gee, he said, "Come with me." I'd better ask my father first.
(Aloud) I have to ask my father. (Gets up and runs toward the house) (freeze action)

Narrator: Did he say and do the right things this time? (pause: yes) I hope you all said, "Yes," because I fooled you if you didn't! He was a good boy, he remembered to say and do the right things! Will you? (pause)

It's very important that you remember to say the right thing and to do the right thing if someone asks you to get in their car or to go someplace with them. Let's review. What should you say if you're at school and someone asks you to go someplace with them? (pause: I have to ask my teacher) If you said, "I have to ask my teacher," you're right! Good job of listening and remembering! What should you do next? (pause: run to my teacher) If you said, "Run to my teacher," you're right! Good remembering. Did you remember both what to say and what to do? Let's see. Watch closely.

SCENE XII

(Scene IV repeated from subjective perspective through lure. Freeze
action.)

Narrator: What should you say now? (pause: I have to ask my teacher) And then what should you do? (pause: run to my teacher)

(Camera turns and zooms in on school to give appearance of running to the teacher.)

Narrator: Did you remember to say, "I have to ask my teacher," and "Run to my teacher"? If you did, great! If not, I fooled you that time. Watch closely, and don't let me fool you this time.

SCENE XIII

(Scene VI repeated from subjective perspective through lure. Freeze action.)

Narrator: What should you say now? (pause: I have to ask my teacher) And then what should you do? (pause: run to my teacher)

(Camera turns and zooms in on school)

Narrator: I bet I didn't fool anybody that time. You guys are just too smart! Now listen. What should you say if you are at home and someone asks you to get in their car or to go someplace with them? (pause: I have to ask my mother, or I have to ask my father) If you said, "I have to ask my mother," or "I have to ask my father," you're right! What should you do next? (pause: run to my mother, or run to my father) If you said, "Run to my mother," or "Run to my father," you're absolutely right! Good remembering! Let's see if you really remember what to say and what to do if someone asks you to go with them. Watch closely.

SCENE XIV

(Scene III repeated from subjective perspective through lure. Freeze action.)

Narrator: What should you say now? (pause: I have to ask my mother, or I have to ask my father) And then what should you do? (pause: run to my mother, or run to my father)

(Camera turns and zooms in on house.)

Narrator: Did I fool you that time? I did if you didn't say, "I have to ask my mother," or "I have to ask my father," and "Run to my mother," or "Run to my father." If I fooled you that
time, watch closely so I don't fool you again.

SCENE XV

(Scene IX repeated from subjective perspective through lure. Freeze action.)

Narrator: What should you say now? (pause: I have to ask my mother, or I have to ask my father) And then what should you do? (pause: run to my mother, or run to my father) If you said, "I have to ask my mother," or "I have to ask my father," and "Run to my mother," or "Run to my father," great job! Now you know what to say and what to do if someone asks you to get in their car or to go someplace with them.

Let's practice just a few more times. This time I'm not going to ask you what to say. Go right ahead and say the right thing when you're asked to go with someone. Ready?

(Repeat scenes XII through XV rapidly without question prompts from Narrator. Present scenes in following order to alternate setting and lure: XII, XV, XIII, XIV.)

Narrator: Did you remember to say, "I have to ask my teacher," or "I have to ask my mother," or "I have to ask my father," each time someone asked you to go someplace with them? I hope so! And don't forget what to do next!

THE END
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