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Abstract

Evidence indicates that after-school programs are beneficial to children in the elementary school years, especially when they target more than just problem behaviors, but also focus on a wide range of positive developmental outcomes such as critical thinking, self-awareness and self-confidence (Catalano et al., 2002). The most effective programs (a) target problem prevention and competency promotion simultaneously, (b) are well integrated into the school or community context (Weissberg & O’Brien, 2004), and (c) focus on social and emotional development (Catalano et al., 2002; Elias et al., 1997).

The present study examined the effects of participation in a community-based after-school program for a sample of elementary school-aged African American males. This study was a mixed-method descriptive analysis of a school-centered evidence-based curriculum introduced in the after-school setting. Further, it explored the efficacy and fidelity of the evidence-based curriculum used as a strategy to enhance the development of African American males.

This study employed descriptive and inferential statistics and used qualitative techniques to gather additional data. It used the Teacher-Child Rating Scale, a pre-developed scientifically reliable and valid instrument that assesses a child’s social emotional competence according to four subscales: task orientation, behavior control, assertiveness, and peer social skills. In addition, staff focus group interviews were used as a means to gather other supportive empirical data. Findings of this study suggested a
need for further investigation. Data demonstrated positive gains for youth who were
more frequently exposed to the after-school program (and curriculum) and data supported
the potential future use of this curriculum in the after-school context.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Over the past few decades, the social ecology surrounding children has changed the landscape of the family, school, and community in ways that affect young people (Durlak and Weissberg, 2007). Social ecological factors such as high rates of family mobility, changing patterns in parental employment, larger, more heterogeneous schools, media themes of violence and drug use, and the deterioration and disorganization of neighborhoods and schools have weakened the formal and informal supports once available to youth (National Research Council, 2002). As a result, community networks and safe environments for children have gradually diminished in all sectors of American society. The table below compares data for the primary service area of the agency facilitating this study and national statistics. Table 1.1 examines several socio-economic conditions and illustrates the percentage differential between local and national statistics.

Due to these deteriorating community networks, young people appear to be at increased risk for the development of numerous academic and social problems (Putnam, 1995). Academic failure and dropout in populations of children living in particularly disadvantaged communities (i.e. urban, rural, and minority) continues to be a significant problem (Children's Defense Fund, 2000). Furthermore, when compared to their peers four decades ago, today's children participate in significantly more high-risk activities such as criminal activity, and alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drug use (Weissberg &
Table 1.1

*Local and National Comparisons of Neighborhood Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Census Data</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agency Service Area</th>
<th>National Stats</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$23,078</td>
<td>$50,740</td>
<td>220%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate with Only Labor Force Considered</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>12.97%</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
<td>227%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families on Public Assistance</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>912%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>238%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate for Female-Headed Households</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>44.32%</td>
<td>26.50%</td>
<td>167%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Drop-out Rate</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
<td>151%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greenberg, 1998). The hours immediately following school can be the riskiest of a child’s day, particularly if during those hours children are left unsupervised (Gottfredson, Gottfredson, & Weisman, 2001; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999; Snyder, Sickmund, & Poe-Yamagata, 1996). Unsupervised time has been linked to increases in violence, delinquency, sexual intercourse, smoking, and alcohol and drug abuse (Richardson, 1989; Zill, Nord, & Loomis, 1995). However, the consequences of unsupervised after-school time may dramatically vary depending upon characteristics of the child and the context of the unsupervised time (Gottfredson et al., 2001).

Increased evidence indicates that where and how youth spend their time outside of school has important implications on their development. Unsupervised time puts youth at
risk for negative outcomes such as academic and behavioral problems, drug use and other behaviors such as violence (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001). Reports suggest that more than seven million children in the United States are without adult supervision for various lengths of time after school (National Research Council, 2002), resulting in the increased risk of problem behaviors and the social problems associated with these behaviors such as crime. On the contrary, supervision reduces this risk. One of the goals of after-school programs is to provide supervision to youth who might potentially engage in delinquent activities during the afternoon hours (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001).

Conceptual Framework

After-school programs vary greatly, and incorporate many conceptual and theoretical frames (operating models, i.e., the philosophy that guides the service delivery) that are represented in the social science literature (e.g., prevention, youth development, social and emotional learning programs). For example, prevention approaches emerged three decades ago, with the idea that youth could be supported before problem behaviors occurred. As predictors of problem behaviors began to be identified, the field of prevention science aimed to design interventions to interrupt the developmental processes that lead to problem behaviors (Weissberg & O’Brien, 2004).

Simultaneously, many researchers in the area of positive youth development began to advocate for an examination of the predictors of positive (i.e., competent) behaviors in addition to problem behaviors (Kahne, Nagaoka, Brown, O’Brien, Quinn, & Thiede, 2001; Roth, Brooks-Gunn, Murray & Foster, 1998). The promotion of competent behaviors began to be seen as the major avenue for preventing problem behaviors (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 2002). Currently, the
research reflects an emerging consensus that the same risk and protective factors underlie both competent and problem behaviors (Catalano et al., 2002). Consequently, successful youth development programs focus on providing enrichment activities that are aimed toward the holistic development of youth (Allen, Philliber, Herrling, & Kuperminc, 1997; Lorion & Ross, 1992; Morrison, Storino, Robertson, Weissglass, & Dowdero, 2000; National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2002; Pierce & Shields, 1998; Ross, Saavedra, Shur, Winters, & Felner, 1992).

Recent program evaluations and research, especially those related to positive youth development, have advocated for programs that go beyond the prevention of one specific problem behavior, to a focus on investigating program effects on a range of competent and problem behaviors. Challenges facing researchers and evaluators of youth development programs include a lack of adequate indicators and measures of positive developmental outcomes, poor conceptual clarity and face validity of competent behaviors, and poor psychometric rigor of measures of positive behaviors (Moore, Lippman, & Brown, 2004). Researchers have called for the further development of measures in four broad domains of outcomes: a) educational achievement and cognitive attainment, b) health and safety, c) social and emotional development, and d) self-sufficiency. Studies have noted that measures are especially lacking in the area of social and emotional development (Moore, Lippman, & Brown, 2004; Elias, Zins, Weissberg, Frey, Greenberg, Haynes, Kesler, Schwab-Stone, & Shriver, 1997).

Catalano et al. (2002) identified key program objectives that distinguish positive youth development programs from other youth programs. These researchers suggested that the presence of one or more of fifteen objectives classified a program as belonging to
the category of positive youth development. Several of these fifteen objectives include: a) promotes bonding, b) promotes social competence, c) promotes emotional competence, d) promotes cognitive competence, e) promotes behavioral competence, and f) provides opportunities for prosocial involvement. Successful programs have certain key elements in common; they attend to the physical, social, and emotional growth of young people, and include opportunities for informal educational opportunities and the development of positive relationships with caring and supportive adult staff. Objectives such as these are frequently a critical aspect of the overall goal and structure of successful after-school programs.

Integrated social, emotional, and academic education also provides a useful framework for conceptualizing community-based positive youth development programming during the after-school hours. Advocates of this coordinated approach argue that part of a quality education includes teaching children to relate to other peers and adults in socially skilled and respectful ways. In other words, children must be taught to be knowledgeable, responsible, healthy, caring, connected, and contributing. According to Weissberg and O’Brien (2004), problem behaviors such as youth drug use, violence, bullying, and alienation were closely interrelated, and developed within the broader context of the family, school, and community. The appropriate response, rather than looking for the agent to blame, is for everyone to come together to create a positive and supportive environment that can become a lasting part of the educational landscape in the community. Hence, after-school programs are an emerging context to accomplish this goal.
Social and emotional learning (SEL) programs, such as those developed by Collaborative for Academic Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) provide further scientific and theoretical evidence for the effectiveness of the after-school program movement (Weissberg & O’Brien, 2004). SEL programming is based on two principles: 1) diverse problem behaviors are caused by the same risk factors, and 2) optimal learning emerges from supportive and challenging relationships. Advocates of such approaches believe that coordinated social, emotional, and academic programs, provided by dedicated staff in supportive environments, will result in positive outcomes for children in multiple areas of development (Catalano et al., 2002; Elias, Zins, Weissberg, Frey, Greenberg, Haynes, Kesler, Schwab-Stone, & Shriver, 1997).

Elias et al. (1997) suggested that social and emotional learning is essential to the healthy development and success of children as productive, responsible, and caring members of society, and that failure to provide this learning will result in the failure of children to attain academic and personal success. According to Elias et al., the answer does not lie in fragmented programs offered inside and outside of school addressing various topics of prevention and youth development. On the contrary, the resolution is within a system of coordinated, integrated, and developmentally appropriate programs that address the social, emotional, and academic development of children under a common theoretical framework. The current dilemma facing after-school program providers is the attempt to balance school and community needs for social and emotional learning with a funding emphasis on academic performance (Weiss, 2000).

Catalano et al. (2002) called for the convergence of approaches toward development, based on the common understanding among youth development
practitioners, policy makers, and prevention scientists that programs must be extended beyond a single problem behavior focus to include examinations of a wide range of problem and competent behaviors. Of paramount importance is an understanding of what programs do and what their evaluations measure, rather than what label of program type are attached to them (i.e., prevention, positive youth development).

Significance of the Study

The social conditions (i.e., employment, education, marital status, civic, and family responsibilities) of African Americans, particularly males, have been under review for the past several decades (Simms, Knight & Dawes, 1993). According to Gordon, Gordon and Nembhard (1994), this increased interest of research focusing on African American males is a phenomenon that began in the latter 20th century.

African American males are disproportionately represented in a variety of risk areas. These areas include: (a) homicide, (b) incarceration, (c) unemployment and underemployment, (d) school dropout, (e) unequal earnings of college graduates, (f) drug distribution, (g) military enlistment due to limited options, (h) adolescent pregnancy, (i) single parenting, (j) enrollment in and dependence on government subsidies, and (k) poverty and other forms of economic insufficiency (Gordon, Gordon & Nembhard, 1994; Fashola & Cooper, 1999; Woodland, 2008). Much of the contemporary literature (research, newspaper, and magazine articles) that discusses African American males emphasizes negative statistics related to this population. However, investigations of the accuracy and the interpretation of these data receive far less attention (Gordon, Gordon & Nembhard, 1994; Fashola & Cooper, 1999; Woodland, 2008). Greater accuracy with research and attention to the concerns of African American males is important if they are
to receive equitable representation and treatment, leading to the reduction of African American males represented in risk areas.

Academic achievement is one means that could be leveraged to help African American males succeed (Fashola & Cooper, 1999). Durlak and Weissberg (2007), Halpern (1999) and Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson, Apthorp, Snow and Martin-Glenn, (2006) assert that the development of social emotional competencies increases the likelihood that youth will produce academic gains (i.e., increase in standardized test scores, grade and school completion, etc.). In addition, as academic achievement levels increase, the likelihood that youth, particularly African American males, will be engaged in delinquent activities decreases (Caldwell, Wiebe & Cleveland, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

Poverty, community violence, and family distress are all risk factors for children growing up in inner-city communities (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992). These risk factors contribute to children’s poor academic performance, lack of self-esteem, and lack of social and emotional adjustment, all which are most prevalent among African American males (Fashola, 2005). Inner-city communities are predominately comprised of African American and Latino residents. The overrepresentation of African American and Latino children living in poor inner-city communities suggests that they are at greater risk of academic and social failure than that of their ethnic counterparts (Crane, 1991, and Crowder & South, 2003). Resources such as after-school programs have been created to meet the developmental needs of these children (Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson, Apthorp, Snow, & Martin-Glenn, 2006).
The purpose of this study was to examine how after-school programs contribute to the academic success of African American males. It reviewed social emotional competence as an indicator of academic success. In addition, it placed emphasis on social emotional competence given the primary focus of schools (education) and the secondary focus of after-school programs (supplemental support).

This study was designed to explore effective and useful strategies that enhance and advance the development process of African American males given they are at greater risk for at-risk behaviors and problems. It examined an after-school program intervention that is developed to have a positive impact on elementary school-aged youth. Further, given the correlation of early problem behaviors such as uncontrolled anger and social problems such as violent crimes, the purpose of this study was to identify resolutions in the way of prevention techniques that lead to more positive, social behavior.

Evidence-based Strategies

A meta-analysis conducted by Durlak and Weissberg (2007), that examined 73 after-school programs that attempted to enhance the personal and social development of children and adolescents, indicated that youth who participated in after school programs improved in three general areas: (a) feelings and attitudes, (b) indicators of behavioral adjustment, and (c) school performance. More specifically, significant increases occurred in youths' self-perceptions and bonding to school, their positive social behaviors, and in their school grades and level of academic achievement. At the same time, significant reductions occurred in problem behaviors and drug use. Substantial differences emerged between programs that used evidence-based approaches for social
skill development training and those that did not. Programs that used evidence-based approaches consistently produced significant improvements among participants in all of the above outcome areas; whereas programs that did not use evidence-based approaches did not produce significant results in any outcome category.

Findings of this meta-analysis have two important implications for future research, practice and policy. The first implication is that after-school programs need to contain components that foster the personal and social skills of youth, because participants can benefit in multiple ways such as social interaction and behavioral adjustment if these components are offered. The second is that such components are effective only if they use evidence-based approaches. Durlak and Weissberg (2007) suggested that programs that successfully enhance personal and social skills were sequenced (developmentally and age appropriate), active (interactive, involving movement), focused (contains subject matter), and explicit (direct and provides core information).

The Promoting Alternatives Thinking Strategy (PATHS) evidence-based curriculum is in direct alignment with the conceptual frame of this study and the research literature regarding after-school programs. The PATHS prevention intervention program is based on the ABCD (affective-behavioral-cognitive-dynamic) model of development (Kam, Greenberg, & Kusche, 2004), which places primary importance on the developmental integration of affect, behavior, and cognitive understanding as they relate to social and emotional competence. A basic premise is that a child's coping, as reflected in his or her behavior and internal regulation, is a function of (a) emotional awareness, (b) affective-cognitive control and behavioral skills, (c) and social-cognitive understanding.
The PATHS prevention strategy operates under the following assumptions:

1. Children’s ability to understand and discuss emotions is related to both communicative development and the ability to inhibit behavior and show self-control.

2. Children’s ability to manage, understand, and discuss emotions operates under developmental constraints and is also affected by socialization practices.

3. Children’s ability to understand their own and others’ emotions is a central component of effective problem solving.

4. The school and community environment is a fundamental ecology, and one that can be a central locus of change.

As a result, PATHS was initially designed to be delivered by teachers with support from project staff, to be taught on a regular basis throughout most of the school year, and to provide daily activities for promoting social skill development. Furthermore, it is hypothesized that PATHS would increase protective factors (e.g., emotional understanding, social problem-solving skills) that avert problem behaviors and decrease risk factors related to problem behaviors (Kam, Greenberg, & Kushe, 2004).

The PATHS curriculum has been used in a variety of settings and has demonstrated efficacy in multiple prevention trials (Greenberg, Kusche, Cook, & Quamma, 1995). PATHS was designed to be implemented in the early school years, with an extensive set of activities that can span over several years. Much of the curriculum is classroom based, although there are also some community-level and home-involved components.
The curriculum includes many structured classroom activities that begin with a focus on the most basic aspects of recognizing emotions in self and others, behavioral strategies for managing emotions, and strategies designed to minimize interpersonal conflict in the face of negative emotions. The classroom culture is augmented with standard daily activities (e.g., PATHS kid of the day), and school-wide efforts to include all staff (e.g., lunchroom personnel, bus drivers) in supporting the emotion-promotion activities in the learning environment. The structured curriculum elements are supported by a set of materials that help guide specific didactic activities, as well as provide generalized reminders of behavioral strategies on the one hand, and personalized tools on the other (Kam, Greenberg, & Kushê, 2004).

Research Question

The following research question was used to explore the efficacy (effectiveness) and fidelity (suitability for the population under study) of an evidence-based curriculum used to enhance the development of African American males. In addition, the research question examined the accuracy of findings that suggest after-school programs are protective measures that reduce the negative behaviors of youth (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001; Durlak & Weissberg, 2007).

What is the impact of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum on the social-emotional development of African American males aged 5 - 13 actively participating in a community-based after-school program located in the northeast sector of Rochester, New York as evaluated by Teacher-Child Rating Scale assessment scores and staff focus group interviews?
**Definition of Terms**

Following are key terms and definitions used for the purpose of this study.

**Academic achievement** is defined as grade and school completion, and student's proficiency based on standardized test scores (Woodland, 2008).

**Active participation** is defined as youth who have more than 50% attendance or active involvement in program activities as defined by after-school program staff.

**After-school and out-of-school time programs**, which typically include after-school and summer programs, will be used interchangeably to describe after-school programs only (Durlak and Weissberg, 2007). After-school programs are structured programs that take place during the after school hours that provide an array of services that include: recreation, arts and crafts, computer lessons, homework assistance, tutoring, etc. These programs vary depending on type, location (urban or rural), and setting, i.e., school or community organization (Woodland, 2008).

**At-risk youth** is defined as youth who reside in homes or neighborhoods with high concentrations of social problems such as poverty, crime, illiteracy and parental absence.

**Community-based after-school programs** are defined as after-school programs that are directly located in the neighborhoods of the consumers - which conventionally are housed in community centers, not-for-profit organizations and other human services agencies. These programs are traditionally unlicensed and allow for more flexibility and creativity than other regulated after-school programs such as school-based after-school programs (Woodland, 2008).
Efficacy, for the purpose of this paper, is defined as the effectiveness or usefulness of a program, strategy, or technique.

Fidelity, for the purpose of this paper, is defined as the suitability and practicality of a program, strategy, or technique co-dependent on variables such as culture, age, and setting.

Impact (or effect), for the purpose of this paper, is defined as significant positive or negative change.

Low income is defined as at or below the federal poverty index.

Risky behavior is defined as behavior that could be detrimental to one’s physical, social, emotional, and psychological health and well-being.

Risky environment is defined as a neighborhood with high concentrations of poverty, crime, drugs, illiteracy, parental absence, high school drop out rates, teenage pregnancy and community disengagement such as poor parent school involvement, etc.

Risk factors are defined as causes that contribute to risky behaviors or risky environments.

Social-emotional development (used interchangeably with social-emotional competence) is defined as task orientation, behavior control, assertiveness, and peer social skills (Perkins & Hightower, 2002).

Social condition is defined as the societal state of a geographic region or population of people, such as employment and graduation rates.

Social environment is defined as neighborhood influences such as community, family, and peer networks (Duncan, 1994; Esminger, Lamkin & Jacobson, 1996; Moore, 2003).
Summary

Research indicates that a child's use of time is associated with important child outcomes (Posner & Vandell, 1999). Moreover, children's participation in structured activities during the after school hours is a critical part of their academic and social development (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007). Evidence suggests that during the after school hours, positive, enriching, and supervised activities need to be available to children, especially for children classified as at-risk, i.e., urban African American males, because of their increased risk of engaging in socially inappropriate behavior. After-school programs are one attempt at engaging children and providing the supports necessary to ensure their development. This study was an examination of how after-school program supports can contribute to the academic and social development of African American males.
Chapter II: Review of the Literature

Synthesis of the Research Literature

Although a substantial body of research has examined the impact of neighborhood socioeconomic distress on youth academic attainment, few studies have determined under what conditions, and for what types of youth, neighborhood characteristics matter most (Crowder & Scott, 2003). The following review of literature is a synthesis of research articles related to African American males, social environment, after-school programs (also referred to as out-of-school time programs), and the PATHS curriculum. The following review is designed to garner a better understanding of youth development within the greater context of neighborhood and social constructs. Moreover, the review of literature will help frame strategies for developing or understanding effective resources that will allow for the advancement of African American males.

Social Environment

Research in the areas of social science and education has shown direct correlations between neighborhood conditions and educational outcomes; Crowder and South (2003) researched this relationship. These researchers developed hypotheses regarding the conditional nature of neighborhood effects on a youth’s risk of dropping out of high school. Moreover, they tested these hypotheses using data from the 1968-1998 waves of the Panel Study for Income Dynamics (PSID), a nationally representative longitudinal survey of US families and their individual members (Crowder & South, 2003). The sample included African American and Caucasian PSID family members.
who were between the ages of 14 and 19 between 1968, the first year of PSID data collection, and 1993, the latest year data was available. Because the PSID panel was based on the original sample drawn in 1968, members of other racial groups were too small in number to support a separate analysis. This sample included 3067 African American and 3689 Caucasian individuals for a total of 6756. For these individuals, the researchers used retrospective and annual educational information to measure the timing of the final exit from school without completing high school. Just over 15% of the adolescents in their sample experienced such a dropout before reaching age 20.

Findings of this research study suggested that socioeconomic characteristics of residential neighborhoods had a substantial impact on adolescents’ likelihood of dropping out of school, and that these contextual effects operated largely independent of the influence of family, and other micro-level conditions. In addition, among African Americans, the detrimental impact of neighborhood socioeconomic distress on school dropout has increased significantly over the past quarter-century, a probable repercussion of the increasing geographic concentration of urban poverty.

Ensminger, Lamkin and Jacobson (1996) examined whether neighborhoods influence the likelihood of high school graduation for a cohort of African American children followed from 1966-1993. These researchers tested the possible direct, indirect, and interactive effects of neighborhood indicators on the likelihood of school dropout. They employed a longitudinal study using census tracts and quantitative research instruments such as assessments to examine the following measures: neighborhood income, family background, transience, and school behavior and performance. In 1996-1997, 1,242 children were assessed three times by their first grade teachers and again at
the end of third grade. In 1975-1976, 939 (75%) of the children were re-interviewed and in 1992-1993, 954 (77%) of the 1,242 members of the original cohort were re-interviewed. Using statistical and qualitative analyses, findings of this study suggested there were correlations between neighborhood conditions and educational outcomes such as grade completion.

Duncan (1994) analyzed the effects of neighborhood and family characteristics on school completion. Data from this study was derived from the PSID. Duncan sampled 3,394 teenagers – 738 Caucasian males, 818 Caucasian females, 884 African American males, and 954 African American females – observed in the PSID between the ages 16-22. Measures for this study included (a) years of completed schooling, (b) family income, (c) neighborhood income, and (d) demographics, i.e., race. Using statistical applications such as univariate and regression analyses, the study indicated that the presence of affluent neighbors conferred benefits on Caucasian males and on both Caucasian and African American females, after controlling for family structure. The racial composition of neighborhoods appeared to affect African American but not Caucasian children. Family-level characteristics such as maternal education and family income were consistently important across all race and gender subgroups and were more powerful than any of the neighborhood characteristics. Other neighborhood effects were more specialized but did not, in general, support the hypothesis that economically disadvantaged adolescents were more vulnerable to either the positive or negative influences of neighborhoods.

Crane (1991) studied the relationship between social problems (i.e., crime and violence) and neighborhood quality and hypothesized that as neighborhood quality
decreased, the probability that an individual would develop a social problem directly increased. A geographic tool developed by the United States (U.S.) census bureau was used for the methodology; samples were taken from this data instrument to conduct the study. There were 113,997 16 – 19 year-olds (56,233 females) in the 1970 geographic tool that was developed by the US census bureau. After various exclusions, the study samples consisted of 92,512 teenagers. The statistical analysis and findings of this study strongly support the hypothesis that neighborhood quality and an individual’s likelihood of developing a social problem were inversely correlated.

Neighborhoods consist of many different facets, some of which include schools, churches, community agencies, businesses, etc. Quane and Rankin (2006) studied the relationship between neighborhood-based organizations and the social development of urban adolescents. The researchers randomly sampled African American mothers and their children in minority middle-class and poor neighborhoods and collected data from 546 families. Using statistical applications such as the multivariate analysis, findings of this study suggested that youth participation in locally based organizations was greater in more disadvantaged neighborhoods. Findings also concluded that participation was important and had positive implications for youths’ self-concept, their academic commitment, and educational expectations.

*After-School and Out-of-School Time Programs*

According to Weisman and Gottfredson (2001), one of the goals of after-school and out-of-school time programs is to provide supervision to youth who might potentially engage in delinquent activities during the afternoon hours. After-school programs first emerged in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, in the form of small, idiosyncratic
boys' clubs (Sarampote, Bassett & Winsler, 2004; Halpern, 2002). Settlements, also referred to as settlement houses, began this work upon their inception in the mid-1880s. The first after-school programs were developed by men and women intent on rescuing children from the physical and moral hazards posed by growing up in the immigrant neighborhoods of major cities.

In the period between 1920 and 1950, after-school programs and their sponsoring agencies became part of the solidifying human service system in the United States (Halpern, 2002). According to Sarampote, et al. (2004), sponsorship remained diverse and settlements and boys' clubs expanded steadily throughout the 1920s, leveled off during the 1930s, and began growing again in the post-war years.

By the 1960s, low-income urban neighborhoods were changing in new ways, making them far less supportive and far more toxic settings for child development (Sarampote, Bassett & Winsler, 2004; Halpern, 2002). In previous decades, the streets and other public spaces provided a largely positive developmental context for low-income children due to the increased number of charities and schools that provided after school care. Critical changes at this time included the breakdown of traditional social organization, a decline in informal social control, and a shift from turf-focused gang conflict to drug-related violence. These changes created new rationales and roles for after-school programs, especially in a climate of rapidly growing public funding to address poverty-related problems.

The 1970s and 1980s brought a renewed interest in after-school programs, as a response to growth in maternal employment. By the early 1990s, public funding finally found its way to after-school programs in low-income neighborhoods through the Federal
Child Care and Development Program, a block grant program administered by states. By the mid 1990s, the after-school field was experiencing resurgence. Beyond a handful of foundation initiatives, much of the renewed growth was local and decentralized – a response to locally perceived needs (Sarampote, Bassett & Winsler, 2004). Currently, after-school programs are receiving more attention and support from both national and local sources.

In addition to national and local support, researchers also suggested that children’s after school time has recently emerged as a major social issue (Halpern, 1999). This, in turn, has heightened interest in the field of after-school programs. Halpern provided a profile of after-school programs for low-income children, focusing on supply and demand, program emphases, and program sponsors and support organizations. This research article highlighted the major challenges facing the field of out-of-school time programs in the areas of facilities, staffing, and financing. Details and examples for this study were drawn from the ongoing evaluation of a specific after-school program initiative called MOST (Making the Most of Out-of-School Time), which seeks to strengthen after-school programs in Boston, Chicago, and Seattle. Halpern (1999) stated that it was dangerous to argue that children’s participation in after-school programs could or should provide basic skills, sense of worth, competence, and acceptance for which family and school are primarily responsible. Researchers suggested that although after-school programs lead to positive indicators, these indicators vary according to person, program and emphases.

Schools and districts are adopting out-of-school-time (OST) programs such as after-school programs and summer schools to supplement the education of low-achieving
students. However, research has painted a mixed picture of their effectiveness. Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson, Apthorp, Snow and Martin-Glen (2006) studied the impact of OST programs by synthesizing and examining research on OST programs that assisted at-risk students in reading and/or mathematics.

Lauer et al. (2006) analyzed 35 OST studies that employed control or comparison groups along with other criteria. Criteria for selection of the studies included: (a) studies had to focus on an OST program for K-12 students; (b) studies had to be published or reported during or after 1985 and implemented in the United States; (c) studies had to include some type of direct assessment of students’ academic achievement in reading, mathematics, or both; (d) studies had to examine the effectiveness of an OST program for students who are at risk of school failure; and (e) studies had to include sufficient quantitative information for calculation of effect sizes. Each study was coded for information about the OST program that was implemented, the student sample, the research design, statistical results, and research quality. Separate meta-analyses were conducted for studies with reading and mathematics student outcomes. These meta-analyses indicated small but statistically significant positive effects of OST programs on both reading and mathematics for students in grades K-12. Larger positive effect sizes were found for programs with specific characteristics such as tutoring in reading. Whether the program took place after school or during the summer did not make a difference in effectiveness according to this study.

The meta-analyses conducted by Lauer et al. (2006) of OST research literature demonstrated the significance of OST programs on the academic achievement of participants. Fashola and Cooper (1999), and Fashola (2005) conducted a focused
examination of four academic OST programs that have demonstrated measurable evidence of effectiveness and achievement gains, particularly for African American students. Their research suggested that the criteria for success of these four programs were: (a) evidence of an academic focus; (b) strong research designs and evaluation procedures to determine program effectiveness; (c) wide replicability; and (4) effectiveness with African American children.

These researchers concluded that after-school program research is at a very rudimentary stage. Their article highlighted four model efforts that have demonstrated some success in improving the academic achievement of African American students. Undoubtedly, many programs attempt to develop the talents of African American students during the non-school hours, but face barriers that prevent them from achieving their goals, i.e., lack of cultural sensitivity, socio-ecological factors such as poverty, lack of parental involvement, etc. The programs reviewed in their article have overcome these barriers, and thus have been proven successful. This is not to say that these are the only programs that benefit African American students; rather, their article illuminated some of the specific factors that have made these programs successful.

Weisman and Gottfredson (2001) compared students who remained in an after-school program to students who withdrew prior to the end of the school year. They analyzed data obtained from an ongoing evaluation of the Maryland After School Community Grant Program (MASCGRP) during the 1998-1999 academic year. Weisman and Gottfredson discovered students who stopped attending the programs scored higher on eleven out of twelve indicators of at-risk behaviors and had significantly more drug use and days absent from school than students who stayed in the program. Census data
indicated that students who dropped out came from neighborhoods characterized by higher levels of social disorganization than students who stayed in the programs.

Posner and Vandell (1994) conducted a study examining outcomes for low-income, elementary school children involved in various forms of care (i.e., formal after-school programs, parental care, informal adult supervision and self-care). They found that child ethnicity, parental education, and family income were significantly associated with care choices. For example, mothers using formal after-school programs or informal adult supervision were more educated than mothers whose children returned home after-school, and family incomes were lower for children in formal after-school programs than for children in self-care or informal adult supervision.

After controlling for demographics, children attending formal after-school programs had better grades in reading and math, and better conduct ratings than children receiving parental care or informal adult supervision. Children in after-school programs also had better teacher ratings of work habits, peer relations, and emotional adjustment than children in other care arrangements. Findings suggested that time spent with peers with an adult present, and in planned, supervised activities, can be a positive developmental influence for low-income children. On the other hand, time spent with peers without structure or supervision was associated with negative outcomes.

In a similar study, Sarampote, Bassett and Winsler (2004) reviewed current research on relative care, non-relative care, after-school programs, and self-care for school age children with special attention paid to child outcomes from participation in various after school care arrangements. Research showed mixed findings regarding relationships between type of after-school care and child outcome. The use of self-care
was not associated with negative child outcomes for Caucasian children within rural and suburban populations. Different outcomes for self-care were found, however, within urban and minority communities. For low-income families, positive effects from participation in formal after-school programs were found.

Despite the academic benefits of after-school programs, the personal and social benefits of after-school programs have been somewhat overlooked in terms of formal evaluation. Many researchers and practitioners acknowledge that after-school programs can improve young people’s personal and social development, and findings from individual studies have been positive (Harvard Family Research Project, 2003). Minimal research has been done to evaluate systematically the impact of after-school programs that attempt to enhance youth’s personal and social skills, identify the nature and magnitude of the outcomes of such programs, and describe the features that characterize effective programs (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007).

**PATHS Curriculum**

During the past decade, there has been in increasing interest in the manner in which children understand, discuss, and regulate their emotions. Despite advances, there has been little study of the emotional development in children and little interest in directed interventions that might support or increase emotional competence during childhood. The following review of literature examines the effects of such a preventive intervention program, the PATHS (Promoting Alternative THinking Strategies) curriculum on the emotional development of children.

The PATHS curriculum was designed to provide school-aged children with instruction regarding a variety of issues involved in the expression, understanding, and
regulation of emotions (Greenberg, Kusche, Cook, & Quamma, 1995). This preventive intervention program is based on the ABCD (affective-behavioral-cognitive-dynamic) model of development, a hybrid model that places primary importance on the developmental integration of affect, behavior language, and cognitive understanding as they relate to social and emotional competence. A fundamental concept in the ABCD model is that as youth mature, emotional development precedes most forms of cognitive development (Riggs, Greenberg, Kusche, & Pentz, 2006).

A number of randomized clinical trials have shown the short-term effectiveness of the PATHS curriculum. Greenberg, Kusche, Cook and Quamma (1995) reported that the PATHS intervention led to significant improvements in the understanding of emotions, fluency in discussing emotions, and perceived efficacy in managing emotions. Moreover, in a large randomized trial involving 48 schools in four U.S. communities, PATHS was used as the universal prevention model of the Fast Track Program. Initiated at the beginning of first grade, results after 6 months indicated (a) significant effects on child aggressive and disruptive behavior according to peer socio-metric reports, and (b) improved quality of classroom atmosphere, based on ratings by independent observers. Further findings at the end of the third and fourth grades indicated continued reductions in the numbers of nominations of aggressive behavior by boys according to peer sociometric reports.

**Analysis of Research Literature**

There has been recent interest in the levels of influence outside of individual, family and school dynamics on youth positive and negative behaviors (Lambert, Brown, Phillips & Ialongo, 2004). Much of the earlier research on social environment and
neighborhood influence consisted of methodological instruments or sources such as the
census tract, the census bureau, and other instruments developed from these two sources.
There were some methodological weaknesses that were used in the research field of
social environment; for example, Crane (1991) used the Public Use Microdata Samples
(PUMS) to study long term effects. Since this data set is nonlongitudinal, the
methodology was insufficient. Despite the methodological limitations, there are
consistent data that reflect the relationship between social environment and academic
achievement.

Research on the effectiveness of after-school programs has dramatically increased
over the last few years, in part, as a response to growing popular and fiscal support.
Major policy recommendations are: (1) to increase federal funding available for after-
school programs; (2) to set standards for programs; (3) to involve local communities in
administering after-school programs; and, (4) to make more information regarding after-
school care options available to parents (Sarampote et al., 2004).

Conversely, evidence that after-school programs are related to positive youth
outcomes is inconsistent (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). One quasi-experimental program
evaluation investigated ten after-school programs and found that children who
participated in school-based after-school programs were less likely than those who did
not attend to report initiation of alcohol use and truancy. Further, children who
participated in after-school programs were more likely to report a sense of competence
and pride in school, handle anger in socially appropriate ways, and pay attention in class
(Grossman, Price, Fellerath, Jucovy, & Kotloff, 2002). Some smaller scale studies also
suggest that participation in after-school programs may be associated with positive
social-emotional (Posner & Vandell, 1994) and academic (Posner & Vandell, 1994; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004) outcomes.

A review of the literature indicated that a great need exists for the development of programs to support the academic and socio-emotional development of youth and provide them with opportunities to escape risky environments, and engage in activities that will result in positive and healthy development. Studies have found that when children are involved in unsupervised, unorganized time after school, they are most likely to exhibit negative behaviors (Posner & Vandell, 1994, 1999). Productive use of after-school time has been linked with positive academic (Fuligni & Stevenson, 1995; Mahoney & Carins, 1997; Pettit et al., 1997; Posner & Vandell, 1994, 1999) and social-emotional-behavioral functioning (Posner & Vandell, 1994, 1999). Furthermore, care arrangements during the after-school hours such as after-school programs, are effective when the programs are supervised by adults and are structured (Steinberg, 1986; Vandell & Ramanan, 1991).

Programs of this type tend to impact at-risk and low-income youth the most, especially when participants are engaged for longer periods of time (Huang, Gribbons, Kim, Lee, & Baker, 2000; Steinberg, 1986; Vanell & Corsaniti, 1988).

Evidence indicates that after-school programs are beneficial to children in the elementary school years, especially when they target more than just problem behaviors, and instead focus on a wide range of positive developmental outcomes (Catalano et al., 2002). Programs also are best when they target problem prevention and competency promotion simultaneously, are well-integrated into the school and community settings (Weissmann & O’Brien, 2004), and emphasize social and emotional learning (Catalano et al., 2002; Elias et al., 1997). Several studies highlighted the positive impact that after-
School programs have on the development of children, on social, emotional, behavioral, and academic functioning constructs (Huang et al., 2000; Le & Hamilton, 2001; LoSciuto et al., 1997). Although evidence exists for the effectiveness of these programs, few studies have examined the outcomes for elementary school youth (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

In the area of after-school program research and evaluation, there is still a great need for investigations of the effects of program participation on multiple aspects of youth development, including academic functioning and socio-emotional development. This is especially critical as programs struggle for funding, and attempt to define their role in contemporary society as promoters of child development (Weiss, 2000). Questions remain as to the level of participation required to demonstrate maximum impacts. Few studies have examined multiple sources of academic performance in addition to social-emotional functioning. Most importantly, very little research has examined whether positive changes in social, emotional, and behavioral functioning over time are related to corresponding positive changes in academic functioning.

The present study examined the effects of participation for a sample of elementary school-aged African American males in an after-school program on their social-emotional functioning. The effects of program exposure were examined by measuring variations in outcomes based on the level of program participation within the current year and across multiple years.
Chapter III: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

Although evidence of the effectiveness of after-school programs exists, techniques for gathering empirical evidence such as attendance records, outcome indicators and program impacts are still a critical need in the field. A danger of deriving firm conclusions from after-school program research is the weaknesses in the after-school program design, i.e., service delivery systems, policies and procedures. Because of the voluntary nature of most after-school programs, evaluations rarely utilize randomized designs. Although attempts are often made to ensure statistical rigor, a lack of randomization renders it difficult to control for selection bias, further hampering the generalizability of findings (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). Well-developed quasi-experimental designs using instrumental variable models have not been utilized in many of the studies of after-school programs (Foster & McLanahan, 1996). In addition, most evaluations of after-school programs have not utilized comparison groups, making it difficult to determine whether effects are due to the program itself or the typical and expected development of children. Some evaluations that utilize comparison groups still possess serious flaws in their evaluation design (Durlak and Weisberg, 2007).

Due to the mixture of findings and lack of methodological rigor in after-school program research, overly optimistic expectations regarding the effect that after-school programs can have on youth outcomes may be premature or unreasonable. From a social standpoint, it is clear that there is a great need for safe and healthy after-school contexts.
From a policy standpoint, it is likely that formal after-school programming will continue to receive support despite the lack of consistent evidence on after-school program effectiveness due to the widespread need of after school care. However, research can help guide more effective use of public and private financial investments; therefore, more detailed analyses of after-school programs effectiveness are greatly needed (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004).

**General Perspective**

Evidence is increasing that where and how youth spend their time outside of school has implications on their development. Subsequently, reports suggest that more than seven million children in the United States are without adult supervision for various lengths of time after school (National Research Council, 2002). This unsupervised time puts youth at risk of negative outcomes such as academic and behavioral problems, drug use and risky behavior such as crime (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001). According to Weisman and Gottfredson (2001), one of the goals of after-school programs is to provide supervision to youth who might potentially engage in these delinquent activities during the afternoon hours.

A study conducted by Durlak and Weissberg (2007) of after-school programs that seek to enhance the personal and social development of children and adolescents indicated that youth who participated in after-school programs improved in three general areas: feelings and attitudes, indicators of behavioral adjustment, and school performance. Findings of their study had two important implications for future research, practice and policy. The first is after-school programs should contain components that foster the personal and social skills of youth, because participants can benefit in multiple
ways if these components are offered. The second is such components are effective only if they use evidence-based approaches such as well-researched curriculums and best practices.

The following research question was used to examine the treatment and fidelity of an evidence-based curriculum and test the accuracy of findings that suggest after-school programs are protective supports that reduce delinquent behaviors among youth (Weisman & Gottfredson, 2001; Durlak & Weissberg, 2007):

What is the impact of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum on the social-emotional development of African American males aged 5 - 13 actively participating in a community-based after-school program located in the northeast sector of Rochester, New York as evaluated by Teacher-Child Rating Scale assessment scores and staff focus group interviews?

This research question was designed to produce baseline data for the after-school program. Data and information collected substantiated the utility of the PATHS curriculum in the after-school setting. The PATHS curriculum is a school-based prevention/intervention program designed to improve the social-emotional competencies of students in grades K-6. Though the PATHS program is generalizable and could be modified to suit the after-school program setting, there was no prior significant evidence to support the utility or fidelity of the PATHS curriculum in the after-school setting. In addition, there is a growing need for interventions that support the development of African American males. Accordingly, the research question obtained information needed to advance the after-school field and inform practice.
**PATHS Curriculum**

The PATHS curriculum is comprised of 16 lessons (13 content areas; several content areas are divided into two or more lessons) that focus primarily on teaching emotional understanding, self-control, and issues involved in relating to other people. The curriculum is designed to be taught in a group setting by a trained consultant or provider once each week, with generalization ideas to be used throughout the remainder of the week by the childcare staff. However, the format can be adapted to fit other needs. Following is a brief overview of the areas discussed throughout the PATHS lessons: (a) PATHS Readiness Lesson (Rules & Introductions), (b) Complimenting and the PATHS Kid for Today, (c) Introduction to Feelings, (d) Understanding Anger, (e) Feelings vs. Behaviors, (f) Anger Management and the Control Signals Poster, (g) Understanding Guilt, (h) Friendship, (i) Understanding Rejection, (j) Understanding Maliciousness and Kindness, (k) Teasing, (l) Manners, and (m) PATHS Celebration.

Although the PATHS curriculum contains much in the way of specific content, developers believe that the true power behind PATHS involves the process. In other words, PATHS involves a philosophy about children that providers will impart through their interaction of teaching them. Developers believe that this modeling of PATHS ideas is much more important than teaching them (Greenberg, Kusche, Cook, & Quamna, 1995). The lessons in the PATHS curriculum are designed to meet the following objectives:

1. To establish and reinforce basic group rules
2. To improve self-esteem
3. To increase self-control and encourage reflective thinking
4. To help children understand the differences between feelings and behaviors
5. To help children identify, understand, and discuss different feelings that people experience in their daily lives
6. To teach children important concepts about relationships
7. To increase children's use of the vocabulary of emotions and emotional stages
8. To increase children's ability to recognize and interpret similarities and differences between feelings, reactions, and points of view of self and others
9. To increase children's recognition and understanding of how one's feelings and behaviors can affect others

**Research Context**

This study took place at a private, multi-service, not-for-profit organization located in Rochester, New York. The organization was founded in 2001 as the result of a merger of three local settlement houses. Although the newly merged organization was founded less than a decade ago, the organization's history spans over 100 years with the founding of one of the former settlement houses in 1907.

Settlement houses worked to improve the lives of less-fortunate people since their inception in the mid-1880s. The first settlement houses were developed by men and women intent on rescuing children and families from the physical and moral hazards posed by growing up in the immigrant neighborhoods of major cities (Sarampot, Bassett & Winsler, 2004; Halpern, 2002). However, during the mid-nineteenth century, settlement houses changed in response to the demographic shifts and growing needs of these once immigrant neighborhoods to inner-city regions. As a result, settlement houses
have become neighborhood resource centers whose mission is to strengthen the social conditions of neighborhoods and improve the economic viability of families within these neighborhoods.

This private, multi-service, not-for-profit organization conducts a major part of its outreach to families in surrounding neighborhoods because of its proximity to the center, increasing accessibility and the opportunity of facilitating community youth development and communication with parents. The organization has a target geographic location that covers much of northeast Rochester.

Given its settlement house history, the organization facilitating the study annually serves nearly 9,000 underprivileged people with more than 90% of these individuals at or below the poverty index. Subsequently, many of the families served are in need of basic essentials such as food, shelter and health services. In addition to providing resources and support for individuals and families who are in need, the agency employs preventive strategies and protective supports for families such as enrichment and educational programs to guard against some of the many risk factors associated with the neighborhoods it serves.

The organization employs a diverse staff of over 100 people and works with many community volunteers and a host of college and vocational interns. Since its inception, the organization has established, managed and acquired several other organizations whose mission is to strengthen the social conditions of underprivileged communities. The organization’s service systems consist of five major units: Family and Housing, Youth Development, Aging Services, Early Childhood Services, and Developmental Disabilities Services. In addition, the organization owns 26 residential units: seven single
and multi-family homes and two apartment buildings with 19 apartments. The organization also owns and operates five commercial properties, used for direct service or leased to community partners.

In March 2005, staff (i.e., executive staff, senior management staff, and line staff) started a process of interviewing youth and meeting with staff involved with delivering youth services that would eventually lead to the re-organization of the youth department in this organization. Prior to the reorganization, the youth department served nearly 3,000 youth, but performance was considered marginal according to stakeholders. Major change was required as reported by data and other outcome indicators, i.e., focus group discussions and employee reports. Data indicated that services were not in line with the developmental outcomes of youth, i.e., preparing youth for Regents exams and developing the social competencies that would allow youth to engage in work. The existing format did not offer interventions that produced academic success and social improvement. The program format primarily consisted of open recreation activities (e.g., basketball, socializing), a format that attracted large numbers of youth with sporadic attendance and insignificant, indeterminate results.

Subsequently, in summer 2006, all positions within the youth department were eliminated. Employees received compensation for their participation in the redesign process that defined the target population, needs of the population, intended outcomes, program format and structure, and staff skills and educational levels. These changes included changes to staff and staff positions, organizational structure, and overall service delivery.
The youth department provided a wide range of after-school assistance to school-aged youth because of the re-organization. This assistance included mentoring and academic support, counseling and case management services, civic engagement, college preparation, field trips, and other developmental activities. Several comprehensive after-school programs emerged because of this new design such as YAP (Youth Adult Partnership Program) - a community development and civic engagement focused community-based after-school program, and RASA (The Rochester After School Academy) – a secondary age school-based after-school program designed to improve student performance in English and Math.

The after-school program that employed the PATHS curriculum is the Community After School Academy (CASA) that operates from one of the organization’s commercial properties located in one of the most distressed inner-city communities in the northeast section of Rochester, New York. The community is categorized as the “crescent” (an area surrounding downtown area of Rochester), a label used to identify the area because of its high index of violence, crime, drugs, poverty and other social ailments such as illiteracy and teenage pregnancy. This “crescent” area has the highest rates of teenage pregnancy, poverty, crime, unemployment, public assistance, and infant mortality in the city of Rochester (US Census, 2000). According to the 2000 US Census, northeast Rochester has 69,992 residents; of all households in this area, single women head 75.91%. Of the entire population, only 61.76% finished high school and only 18.56% of these graduates enrolled in college. In addition, the primary service area contains the zip code with the highest rate of adolescents aged 12-17 living in poverty.
CASA, primarily designed to serve youth ages 5-13 who reside in the neighboring community, operates five days a week, Monday – Friday, from 2:30 – 6:30 pm. Daily activities include homework assistance, tutoring, instructional learning, mentoring, one-on-one staff support, arts and crafts, computer lessons, a nutritious meal, workshops, presenters and speakers, field trips, and other activities such as college touring and community service projects. Participants are responsible for their own transportation; transportation is not provided by the program (only for field trips and program related activities). Staff members consist of: (a) division administrator (Associate Vice President), (b) division director (director of department), (c) after-school site manager, (d) life coaches (line staff), (e) youth and family support specialists (support staff) and (f) other staff that provide partial assistance such as manager of training and program development, coordinator of academic enrichment services, and manager of data research and program evaluation. In addition to staff, CASA employs a host of college and vocational interns and sub-contracts with a professional tutoring agency to provide professional tutoring services to youth by certified teachers.

CASA is divided into three age groups for age and developmental stage appropriateness: (a) 5-7 age group (early childhood), (b) 8-10 age group (childhood), and (c) 11-13 age group (pre-adolescent/adolescent). Each age group is assigned a life coach and a youth and family support specialist. The after-school site manager directs program activities, services and lesson planning.

Research Participants

The population represented in this study was African American males in grades K-6, enrolled in and who have actively participated (50% or more attendance from date
of enrollment with a minimum of 10 days of participation) in the CASA after-school program. There is no enrollment cost or participation fee and enrollment is open to all youth who reside in the area (Monroe, Livingston, Olean and Wayne counties); however, priority is provided to youth who reside in the neighboring community (primarily the northeast quadrant of the city of Rochester).

Parents or guardians of participants must come to the organization to complete a registration packet before the participant can engage in services. This registration packet includes the participant’s name, age, race, date of birth, address and phone number, emergency contact and parent consents and releases, i.e., transportation and evaluation. After the registration packet is completed, the information is reviewed by a youth department staff for completeness and legibility. When registration is approved and initialed by the staff person, the registration packet is forwarded to the manager of data, research, and program evaluation and the information therein is transferred into a central database. Subsequently, the participant receives an identification number; the registration packet is placed into a folder with the student’s identification number and the folder is filed in a locked file cabinet. Upon concluding the registration process, the parent or guardian is notified of the participant’s start date and attendance records will reflect this date.

Staff was the key participants involved in this research study. The after-school site manager; the manager of training and program development; the manager of data, research and program evaluation; the coordinator of academic enrichment services; life coach staff; and youth and family support specialist staff provided data for the research analysis and data collection.
General qualifications of staff consists of the following: (a) required to have a minimum of an associate’s degree or two years of college experience, (b) required to have a minimal of one to three years of direct experience working in the field, and (c) must have strong communication skills. Each staff person is provided with ongoing support and training. In addition, all staff has received or will receive training from a local not-for-profit organization to administer the PATHS curriculum.

*Instruments Used for Data Collection*

The Teacher-Child Rating Scale (T-CRS) 2.1 is a brief objective rating scale designed specifically for teachers to use to assess children’s school problem behaviors and competencies (Perkins and Hightower, 2002). Teacher rating scales have been used extensively to assess a variety of children’s behaviors (Edelbrock & Achenbach, 1984; Martin, 1983) in a variety of settings. The teacher, or in this case, child care provider, is an important source of information on children’s school or after-school adjustment because the child care provider is most familiar with a child’s current school or after-school behavior and performance.

Children’s early problem behaviors and competencies are significantly associated with later school and social adjustment. These behaviors can have an influence on later school and social competence across diverse areas such as cognitive achievement, and school dropout (Reynolds, Weissberg, & Kasprow, 1992). They are also predictive of later school performance (Cladwell & Pianta, 1991; Entwisle & Hayduk, 1988). Because children’s early competence and problem behaviors are significantly associated with later school and social adjustment, detection and assessment of problem behaviors and
competencies, and appropriate interventions when necessary, are critical to their future well-being.

The T-CRS version 2.1 (See Appendix A) is the culmination of more than 25 years of development and revision, with roots stemming from the Classroom Adjustment Rating Scale (CARS; Lorion, Cowen, & Caldwell, 1975; Weissberg, Cowen, Lotyczewski, Orara, Stalonas, Boike, Sterling, & Gesten, 1987)), Health Resources Inventory (HRI; Gesten, 1976; Weissberg, et al., 1987), and T-CRS 1.0 (Hightower, Work, Cowen, Lotyczewski, Spinell, Guare, & Rohrbeck, 1986).

The T-CRS 2.1 consists of 32 items assessing four primary and eight secondary domains of a child's socio-emotional adjustment. The four primary empirically derived scales assess four areas salient to a child's socio-emotional adjustment, namely: (a) task orientation, (b) behavior control, (c) assertiveness, and (d) peer social skills. Each primary scale contains eight items; four measure positive competency behaviors and four measure negative problem behaviors. Table 1.0 presents the T-CRS 2.1 items by scale. The four primary scales for the T-CRS 2.1 are described below:

1. Task Orientation: Assesses a child's ability to focus on school related tasks.
2. Behavior Control: Assesses a child's skill in tolerating and adapting to limits imposed by the school of after-school environment or by the child's own limitations.
3. Assertiveness: Measures a child's interpersonal functioning and confidence in dealing with peers.
4. Peer Social Skills: Measures the child's likeability and popularity among peers and how well the child interacts with peers.
Table 3.1

**Primary and Secondary Scales of the T-CRS 2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Scale</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Orientation</strong></td>
<td>1. A self-starter</td>
<td>5. Has difficulty following directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Functions well even with distractions</td>
<td>13. Underachieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Works well even without adult support</td>
<td>21. Poorly motivated to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. Completes schoolwork</td>
<td>29. Has poor concentration, limited attention span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior Control</strong></td>
<td>6. Accepts imposed limits</td>
<td>2. Disturbs others while they are playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Tolerates frustration</td>
<td>10. Overly aggressive to peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. Copes well with failure</td>
<td>18. Defiant, obstinate, stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30. Accepts things not going his/her way</td>
<td>26. Disruptive in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertiveness</strong></td>
<td>3. Participates in class discussions</td>
<td>7. Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Defends own views under group pressure</td>
<td>15. Anxious, worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Expresses ideas willingly</td>
<td>23. Nervous, frightened, tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27. Comfortable as a leader</td>
<td>31. Does not express feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Social Skills</strong></td>
<td>8. Makes friends easily</td>
<td>4. Lacks social skills with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Classmates like to sit near this child</td>
<td>12. Other children shun or avoid this child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. Has many friends</td>
<td>20. Has trouble interacting with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32. Well-liked by classmates</td>
<td>28. Other children dislike this child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each primary scale can be divided into two, four-item secondary scales. Each secondary scale measures either positive competency behaviors or negative problem behaviors. Hence, there are four primary scales and eight secondary scales.

**Psychometrics of the T-CRS**

Reliability of the T-CRS instrument was evaluated using measures of its internal consistency. Alpha scores ranged from .87 to .94 (desirable alpha scores range from .70 to .95) when administered to 700 subjects. The high level of internal consistency means that items are reliable.

Table 3.2

*Alpha Reliabilities for the T-CRS 2.1 Primary Scales (n = 700)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Control</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Social Skills</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content validity for the T-CRS 2.1 was established concurrently with the revision and addition of items to the original T-CRS. The original T-CRS was developed with teachers, since teachers were the primary users. For the current revision (T-CRS 2.1), feedback on old, new, and revised items was obtained from teachers, psychologists, measurement specialists, and other users of this and other social-emotional adjustment instruments, to ensure that items covered the content of interest. The 32 items appearing
on the T-CRS 2.1 were judged to be pertinent to the measurement of social-emotional adjustment.

In addition to the T-CRS 2.1, the other instrument tool that will be used for this study is the staff focus group protocol (see Appendix B). The staff focus group protocol was designed by the researcher to gather more in depth information about the research question. In addition, the researcher consulted with qualitative research experts to ensure the proper utility and efficacy of the instrument. Following are questions of the staff focus group interview:

1. Please tell me about your experience working with the PATHS curriculum.
2. What is your general understanding of the PATHS curriculum?
3. What are your perceived strengths and what are your perceived weaknesses of the PATHS curriculum?
4. Do you believe the PATHS curriculum will improve the social-emotional competencies of African American boys aged 5 – 13?

The T-CRS 2.1 determines rather or not there is an impact; the focus group protocol seeks to determine how, and, if possible, why.

Procedures Used

The T-CRS 2.1 consists of 32 items assessing four primary domains of a child’s socio-emotional adjustment. The four primary empirically derived scales assess four areas salient to a child’s socio-emotional adjustment, namely: (a) task orientation, (b) behavior control, (c) assertiveness, and (d) peer social skills. Each primary scale contains eight items; four measure positive competency behaviors and four measure negative problem behaviors. The T-CRS 2.1 is not restrictive to use of the PATHS curriculum.
however, the T-CRS 2.1 has been extensively used to evaluate the PATHS curriculum in the school setting. The T-CRS has been known to evaluate social-emotional competencies for a variety of program settings.

Evaluators used a pencil to complete a computer scoreable answer sheet for the T-CRS 2.1. Each subject received a unique identification number that was randomly generated using a centralized database. The identifying information on the upper section of the T-CRS instrument was completed prior to evaluators receiving the measure. This information included: (a) child identification number, (b) grade, (c) date, (d) child’s name, (e) name of teacher or child care provider, (f) school, (g) sex, and (h) screening; initial, middle, or final—reflects the time when the form was being completed.

The T-CRS 2.1 took approximately five minutes per child to complete. The T-CRS 2.1 was completed by the child’s teacher or childcare provider who had had four to six weeks of ongoing contact with the child. For children with more than one teacher or childcare provider, any person who had significant contact with the child completed the rating scale. The earliest the T-CRS 2.1 was completed was approximately four to six weeks after the teacher or childcare provider has been introduced to the child. This allowed the teacher to have time to become familiar with the child’s behavior.

Since younger children require more time to adjust to the classroom or after-school program setting (Perkins & Hightower, 2002), children in grades one through eight, had the T-CRS 2.1 completed no earlier than one month after the beginning of program. More time may be needed for children in pre-kindergarten or kindergarten to give sufficient time to observe children and to rate their behavior accurately.
The teacher or childcare provider completed an initial T-CRS 2.1 for all participating children after approximately four weeks of observation, prior to the intervention. Final assessments occurred any time after the intervention ends. Conversely, even with standardized rating scales such as the T-CRS 2.1, people have different rating styles; the same person should be used to assess pre and post observations, whenever possible.

There were three administrations of the T-CRS 2.1. The initial administration took place January 5 – 9, 2009; the intermediate administration took place March 30, 2009 – April 3, 2009; and the final administration took place June 1 – 5, 2009. These dates were pre-determined and scheduled by the organization to allow time for evaluators to accurately assess subjects’ social emotional adjustment. In addition, due to the ongoing enrollment of after-school participants, the dates were staggered to allow each participant to have a minimal of two T-CRS administrations. Furthermore, there were three staff focus group interviews, which ran parallel to the dates of the T-CRS administrations.

An outside facilitator conducted the focus group interviews. The focus group interviews were divided into three tiers of staff: management, support staff, and line staff. Management staff consisted of (a) after-school site manager, (b) manager of training and program development, (c) manager of data, research and program evaluation, and (d) coordinator of academic enrichment coordinator. Support staff consisted of (a) coordinator of youth and family support services, (b) youth and family support specialist, and (c) CASA program support specialist. Line staff consisted of the three life coaches.
that provided direct implementation of the PATHS curriculum to CASA participants, specifically, the population under study.

There were ten focus group interviews; with the exception of two instances, focus groups interviews were not administered to individual staff persons. The first administration of focus group discussions that involved the support staff were conducted as two separate interviews due to a time conflict with one of the staff. The second administration of the focus group discussions that involved support staff only involved one staff person due to the other staff person resigning from employment to attend graduate school.

Each focus group interview asked the same questions or reiterations of the same questions. Each focus group interview was audio recorded and transcribed for data analysis. The purpose of the focus group interviews was to gather in-depth data about the program and the intervention that will inform the researcher of the actual practice and service delivery of the PATHS curriculum that is not quantifiable. In other words, the focus group interviews were aimed to assist the researcher with understanding the quality of the curriculum and nuances associated with its implementation such as the strengths and challenges.

Data Analysis

The T-CRS 2.1 was computer scored by a collaborating organization. Individual profiles were provided to the agency facilitating the study along with a group summary, which included each child's percentile scores for the T-CRS's four domains. In addition, for all analyses, the influence of participation intensity (i.e., total number of sessions
attended) and duration (i.e., multiple years of participation) on the outcomes was examined.

T-CRS data was collected at three times. The researcher analyzed mean score differences among subject groups and examined time effect using a multivariate repeated-measures analysis of variance (MANOVA) for the four T-CRS subscale scores. Additionally, for analyses related to attendance, age, and overall T-CRS change, Pearson product-moment correlations were used to examine any bivariate relationships.

Focus group interviews were transcribed and analyzed. The researcher coded the information and identified major themes and findings. A descriptive analysis followed the actual data collection. Data obtained included (a) strengths and challenges of the curriculum delivery, (b) issues or concerns that influenced the research study, and (c) recommendations for continued use of the curriculum or suggestions for improvement. This information will be used to determine future practicality of the PATHS curriculum and organizational support for the generalized use of the curriculum.

Summary of Methodology

In January 2009, the organization in which the study was conducted began implementation and evaluation of the PATHS curriculum. This curriculum was administered in the CASA after-school program, evaluated using the T-CRS 2.1, and analyzed using data from focus group interviews. The PATHS curriculum was introduced to after-school participants October 2008, at the start of program, to allow for transition and orientation to the new intervention. However, the intervention did not start until January. The T-CRS 2.1 was administered in January, March-April, and June. In addition, an outside facilitator conducted a series of focus group interviews with the
following tiers of staff to acquire feedback and information relative to the PATHS curriculum: management staff (i.e., after-school site manager), ancillary support staff (youth and family support specialist staff), and line staff (life coach staff). Additionally, staff focus group interviews took place in January, March-April, and June.

The study was considered a mixed-methods descriptive analysis. The study was designed to answer the following research question:

What is the impact of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum on the social-emotional development of African American males aged 5 - 13 actively participating in a community-based after-school program located in the northeast sector of Rochester, New York as evaluated by Teacher-Child Rating Scale assessment scores and staff focus group interviews?

It is hypothesized that the information derived from this study will allow for the future investigation of this intervention in the after-school context.
Chapter IV: Results

Introduction

The use and need for Out-of-School-Time (OST) programs has become increasingly popular in the last twenty years. Research literature has found that OST programs have shown promise and importance in precipitating positive developmental outcomes for young people. However, those who research and evaluate OST programs face difficult challenges in the design, implementation and evaluation of their research efforts due to lack of accurate control groups to compare (Posner & Vandell, 1994; 1999); non-treatment comparison groups do not exist because children are always engaged in some level of activity following the school day. Another challenge with research of OST programs is the failure of programs to describe program details (such as attendance and activities) and assess treatment fidelity. It is difficult to make specific recommendations from the research field of OST programs when research and evaluation reports give only vague references to the intervention and provide no measures of the degree to which intervention was implemented. Until research on and evaluation of OST programs become more systematic in measurement and reporting, recommendations for the implementation of specific practices to increase positive student behavior should be used cautiously. Subsequently, this study was designed to receive baseline data and information that will be used for further scientific inquiry.
Research Question

The following chapter reports the research findings of a study that was completed at a community-based after-school program located in Rochester, NY. This study was a mixed-methods descriptive analysis that used both quantitative and qualitative techniques to answer the following research question:

What is the impact of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum on the social-emotional development of African American males aged 5 - 13 actively participating in a community-based after-school program located in the northeast sector of Rochester, New York as evaluated by Teacher-Child Rating Scale assessment scores and staff focus group interviews?

Overview

The study examined Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) - a school-based risk behavior prevention strategy within the after-school context to determine whether the intervention could reduce the risky behaviors of African American males and promote their academic and social achievement. PATHS was initially designed to be used by teachers in the school setting with support from project staff, to be taught on a regular basis throughout most of the school year, and to provide daily activities for promoting social skill development. This study delivered the PATHS curriculum to an after school convenience sample of African American boys aged 5-13 who voluntarily enrolled and participated in the program. It was hypothesized that the PATHS curriculum would increase protective factors (e.g., emotional understanding, social problem-solving skills) that avert problem behaviors and decrease risk factors related to problem behaviors (Kam, Greenberg, & Kushè, 2004).
Data Analysis and Findings

The study employed two instruments to gather empirical evidence: the Teacher-Child Rating Scale and the staff focus group interview questions. The Teacher-Child Rating Scale (T-CRS) 2.1 is a brief objective rating scale designed specifically for teachers or child care providers to use to assess children's school competencies and problem behaviors (Perkins and Hightower, 2002).

The T-CRS 2.1 was administered three times during this study. The initial administration took place between January 5 and 9, 2009 (T1); the second administration took place between March 30 and April 3, 2009 (T2); and the final administration took place between June 1 and 5, 2009 (T3). Since implementation of the PATHS curriculum started in January 2009; the first administration of the T-CRS 2.1 was a pre-test scheduled to assess the subject's behavior before exposure to treatment of the PATHS curriculum. Not all subjects involved in this study completed all administrations of the T-CRS 2.1 for a variety of reasons which included the following: (a) discontinuation of subject participation in the after-school program, (b) date of subject enrollment was subsequent to the first administration of the T-CRS, (c) staff inability to assess the subject due to low and/or infrequent attendance, and (d) challenges due to new staffing, program design, and curriculum. In addition, not all subjects received the full intervention/treatment of the PATHS curriculum. The PATHS curriculum was comprised of 16 lessons that were taught over 22 weeks that focused primarily on teaching emotional understanding, self-control, and issues involved in relating to other people.
Table 4.1 on the following page describes the number of subjects who had completed T-CRS data, the number of weeks subjects were exposed to the PATHS curriculum, and the number of PATHS lessons they received (this number is probable provided subjects didn’t attend 100% of the time).

Table 4.1

**T-CRS & PATHS Data and the Total Number of Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-CRS Data</th>
<th>Weeks of Exposure</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 Only</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 and T2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1, T2, and T3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 and T3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. A complete data set was missing for one subject; therefore, the actual N used in the data analysis for this study is 28.*

T1 = First Administration of the T-CRS (January 5–9, 2009).

T2 = Second Administration of the T-CRS (March 30–April 3, 2009).

**Quantitative Analysis**

There were 28 subjects involved in this study. As noted in table 4.1, one subject was excluded from this study due to incomplete data. Tables 4.2 – 4.4 illustrate demographic information for the sample represented in this study. Intensity/attendance information is the ratio (days attended/days available to attend) of time subjects
participated in the after-school program. Intensity as percent is the actual percentage of time subjects participated in the after-school program. Intensity as a range is the category the subject fell into according to the percentage of time they attended; there were four categories: zero – 25%, 26 – 50%, 51 – 75% and 76 – 100%. In addition, duration is the number of years the subject has participated in the after-school program (the PATHS curriculum was not administered in prior years, but participants attended the same after school program).

Table 4.2 is the demographic information for subjects who had T-CRS data for first two times of testing.

Table 4.2

Demographic Information for Subjects who Completed T-CRS Data for Phases 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Phases 1 and 2</th>
<th>Birth date</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Duration (Multiple Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/10/2003</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31/47</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/08/2002</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52/68</td>
<td>76.47</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/04/2000</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30/94</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03/11/1997</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54/68</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/20/1995</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 is the demographic information for subjects who had T-CRS data for all three times of testing.
Table 4.3

Demographic Information for Subjects who Completed T-CRS Data for Phases 1, 2, and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth date</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Duration (Multiple Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/18/2002</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118/138</td>
<td>85.51</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2001</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>119/147</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/2000</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77/99</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/05/2000</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>132/147</td>
<td>89.80</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/1998</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97/138</td>
<td>70.29</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/1997</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91/138</td>
<td>65.94</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/1998</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90/114</td>
<td>78.95</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/17/1998</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>122/138</td>
<td>88.41</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/1997</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59/114</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/1997</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91/114</td>
<td>79.82</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/24/1996</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120/147</td>
<td>81.63</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/1995</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132/147</td>
<td>89.80</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 is the demographic information for subjects who had T-CRS data for
last two times of testing.

**Table 4.4**

*Demographic Information for Subjects who Completed T-CRS Data for Phases 2 and 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth date</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Duration (Multiple Years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/23/2003</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52/69</td>
<td>75.36</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/2002</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28/39</td>
<td>71.79</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/2001</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31/99</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/2001</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83/106</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>76-100</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/2000</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29/104</td>
<td>27.88</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/29/1999</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23/71</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/1999</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31/48</td>
<td>64.58</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/1998</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35/96</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/1997</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16/61</td>
<td>26.23</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/1996</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05/24</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/1996</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19/61</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve subjects had a complete data set (all three times of testing). Because of the size of the sample and the categories into which they fall, mean comparisons were made between the three groups reflected in Table 4.1, i.e., subjects who had data for T1 and T2; T1, T2, and T3; and T2 and T3. Mean comparisons were used to determine effect change over time and differences, if any, among the three groups. Mean comparisons were made for each primary T-CRS subscale (Task Orientation, Behavior Control, Assertiveness and Peer Social Skills) at each time of testing for each of the three groups. Mean comparisons could not be made where subjects did not have data. Table 4.5 is the mean comparisons of the three groups at the first time of testing. Mean scores that are higher among the three groups indicate a positive difference.

Table 4.5

Mean Comparisons of the Three Groups at Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Task Orientation</th>
<th>Behavior Control</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Peer Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Available (n=17)</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 1, 2, 3 (n=12)</td>
<td>28.17</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 1, 2 only (n=5)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 2, 3 only (n=0)</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XX = no data available

Figure 4.1 is a bar chart that reflects the data in table 4.5. There is no information available for the group that has data from only the second and third time of T-CRS testing.
Bar Chart: Teacher-Child Rating Scale Mean Scores by Data Availability Group Time 1

Table 4.6 is the mean comparisons of the three groups at the second time of testing. Mean scores that are higher among the three groups indicate a positive difference.

Table 4.6

Mean Comparisons of the Three Groups at Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Task Orientation</th>
<th>Behavior Control</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Peer Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Available (n=28)</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 1, 2, 3 (n=12)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 1, 2 only (n=5)</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 2, 3 only (n=11)</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2 is a bar chart that reflects the data in Table 4.6. All three groups had data for the second time of testing.

Figure 4.2

*Bar Chart: Teacher-Child Rating Scale Mean Scores by Data Availability Group Time 2*

Table 4.7 is the mean comparisons of the three groups at the third time of testing.

Mean scores that are higher among the three groups indicate a positive difference.

Table 4.7

*Mean Comparisons of the Three Groups at Time 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Task Orientation</th>
<th>Behavior Control</th>
<th>Assertiveness</th>
<th>Peer Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All available (n=23)</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>24.91</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 1, 2, 3 (n=12)</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 1, 2 only (n=0)</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times 2, 3 only (n=11)</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3 is a bar chart that reflects the data in Table 4.7. There is no information available for the group that has data from only the first and second time of T-CRS testing.

Figure 4.3

Bar Chart: Teacher-Child Rating Scale Mean Scores by Data Availability Group Time 3

Table 4.5 and Figure 4.1 show a notable difference (a difference of at least 2.0 points for mean score totals) between the group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the first two times of testing. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores for task orientation (28.17/21.8), behavior control (26.67/24.6) and assertiveness (33.5/31.2). There were no notable differences between the two groups as it related to peer social skills (33.75/34.2).

Table 4.6 and Figure 4.2 show notable differences among all three groups (groups that had all three times of testing, the group that had only the first two times of testing, and the group that had only the last two times of testing). There were notable differences among the three groups in the area of task orientation. The group that had all three times...
of testing had higher mean scores than the other two groups. Conversely, the group that had only the first two times of testing had higher mean scores than the group that had only the last two times of testing. Additionally, there were notable differences among the three groups in the area of behavior control. The group that had only the first two times of testing had higher mean scores than the other two groups. There wasn’t a notable difference between the groups that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the last two times of testing. In addition, there were notable differences among the three groups in the area of assertiveness. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores than the other two groups. There were no notable differences between the other two groups.

Lastly, there were notable differences among the three groups in the area of peer social skills. The groups that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the first two times of testing had notably higher mean scores than the group that had only the last two times of testing. There was a difference of 8.22 between the group that had all three times of testing and the group that had the last two times of testing and there was a difference of 7.15 between the group that had the first two times of testing and the group that had the last two times of testing. However, there were no notable differences between these two groups (group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the first two times of testing).

Table 4.7 and Figure 4.3 show a notable difference between the group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the last two times of testing. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores. This difference was most noticeable among the following primary subscales: task orientation and peers social
skills. There were no notable differences between the two groups as it related to behavior control and assertiveness.

The T-CRS is traditionally designed to be a pre and post assessment tool; therefore, only two times of testing are required. However, to consider the number of subjects who enrolled in the after-school program at various times throughout the academic year, the program design allowed for three times of T-CRS testing in order to increase the number of participants who had a pre and a post test. Given the aforementioned, further analyses were conducted using more robust, sophisticated statistical techniques to determine change.

To allow for further analyses, the researcher developed two categories to define pre and post. Due to the variance of subjects who had different times of testing, pre was defined as the first time of testing and post was defined as the last time of testing. Conversely, only 12 subjects had the potential to receive the full treatment of the PATHS curriculum (the group that had all three times of T-CRS data). Therefore, subsequent analyses were used simply to determine change amongst subjects. Table 4.8 explains how the researcher defined pre and post for the three groups in this study.
Table 4.8

*Number of Subjects who had T-CRS Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-CRS Data</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1 and T2</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1, T2, and T3</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 and T3</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher examined a time effect using a multivariate repeated-measures analysis of variance (MANOVA) for the four T-CRS subscale scores. If a significant \( p \leq 0.05 \) multivariate effect was detected, the researcher would conduct parallel univariate ANOVA tests. For any of those that were statistically significant, the researcher would then use an appropriate posteriori test to determine where the differences among the three time points occurred.
Table 4.9

**Multivariate Analysis of Variables for the T-CRS Sub-Scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-CRS Sub Scales</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANOVA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Social Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post</td>
<td>31.39</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=28

ns = not significant

Conversely, since no significant change was detected using the MANOVA test, no further inferential statistical analyses were required to determine effect or change over time. However, analyses were conducted to determine correlations among age, number of years in the after-school program, and attendance percentage for the 2008-2009 academic year.
Table 4.10

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Years in After-School Program</th>
<th>Attendance Percentage for the 2008/2009 Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Control</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Social Skills</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Control</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Social Skills</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change (Post-Pre)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Control</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Social Skills</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n=28

*p = <.05  **p = <.01  ***p = <.001

Table 4.10 shows a significant correlation at the first time of testing (pre-test) between peer social skills and the number of years the subject participated in the after-
school program. In addition, peer social skills and attendance percentage were positively correlated at the first time of testing. Additionally, there was a significant correlation between assertiveness and the number of years the subject participated in the after-school program; there was also a significant correlation between assertiveness and the percentage of time the subject participated in the after-school program.

Subsequently, there was a positive significant correlation between peer social skills and the number of years the subject attended the after-school program, and peer social skills and the percentage of time the subject attended at the final time of testing (post-test). Conversely, age was adversely correlated with the change of assertiveness from the first time of testing to the last time of testing.

In addition to quantitative techniques, the researcher employed qualitative methods to further explore the research question, i.e., focus group interviews. Focus group interviews were used as a means for the researcher to acquire in-depth information regarding the curriculum, its effect, or the lack thereof. There were three administrations of the focus group discussions, which paralleled the administration of the T-CRS. The focus group discussions followed a tier typology, i.e., line staff, support staff, and management staff. The following are brief descriptions for each level of staffing:

**Line Staff/Direct Staff:** The line staff implements the PATHS curriculum and is the direct holders of the information, i.e., curriculum manual, lessons, and activities.

**Support Staff/Ancillary Staff:** The support/ancillary staff supports the implementation of the curriculum and aids the line staff with the delivery. The support staff is also responsible for the individual case information (i.e., case notes, terminations.
registration, etc.) for the youth and provides skill development workshops related to the curriculum and offers other assistance as needed.

Management Staff: The management staff has little to no direct involvement with the PATHS curriculum; however, in some respects, influence the implementation and or support of the curriculum by providing the proper training to line staff and offering adequate supervision of activities.

Ten staff persons in total participated in the focus group discussions. Table 4.11 is a demographic breakdown for the participants of the focus group discussions.

Table 4.11 provides some demographic information for the staff that participated in the focus group interviews. There were six females and four males; of these 10 participants, seven were African American, one was Hispanic and two were Caucasian. Eighty percent of the staff interviewed had a bachelor's degree at minimum. Sixty percent of the staff had at least three years of experience in the field; however, only three staff worked with the agency three years or longer. Seventy percent of the staff had participated in all three focus group discussions; one staff person participated in two and the two staff persons only participated in one focus group interview.

The first administration of focus group discussions that involved the support staff was conducted as two separate interviews due to a time conflict with one of the staff. The second administration of the focus group discussions that involved support staff only involved one staff person due to the other staff person resigning from employment to attend graduate school. The third administration of the focus group discussions involving support staff consisted of a new staff person who did not participate in the prior two administrations. In addition, one line staff person was unable to conduct the second
administration of the focus group interviews due to maternity leave. The researcher 
triangulated (received information from three levels of staffing) the data to receive 
multiple viewpoints of the curriculum to make for an objective analysis.

Table 4.11

Demographics of Staff who Participated in the Focus Group Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Related Experience</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Focus Group Participation (1, 2, and 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2, and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Analysis

The researcher transcribed and analyzed 10 audio-recorded focus group interviews. The focus of the analysis was to determine strengths and weaknesses of the PATHS curriculum, and, if possible, determine recommendations for improvement. The
The researcher used Atlas.ti software packaging to code and analyze the data for the focus group discussions. The researcher uploaded the 10 focus group transcripts into the software package and was able to organize the documents, quotes and develop codes for the central themes that emerged. As a result, 28 central codes/themes emerged after careful review and analysis of the focus group transcripts. These central themes included: (a) age appropriateness (b) applicability, (c) communication, (d) continuity/consistency/linkage, (e) cultural appropriateness, (f) curriculum adaptation, (g) curriculum dosage, (h) cultural philosophy, (i) home/parent involvement, (j) impact/effect, (k) instruction, (l) media influence, (m) peer influence, (n) resistance, (o) social emotional learning, (p) strengths/weakness/recommendations, and (q) training.

Following is a brief definition for each of these themes as defined for the purpose of this analysis:

**Age Appropriateness:** the relatedness of the program/curriculum and its suitability with the chronological and developmental needs of the population being served

**Applicability:** ability or the lack of ability to make application

**Communication:** communication or lack of communication among the parent, the school and the after-school program staff

**Continuity/Consistency/Linkage:** the linkage between home, school and the after-school program. The consistency of messages, values and expectations

**Cultural Appropriateness:** relativity and alignment of the curriculum, staff, theories, concepts and examples with the student population being served

**Curriculum Adaptation:** modifying the curriculum to meet the demographics, social setting/context, needs and interest, and learning styles of the youth
Curriculum Dosage: the frequency and use of the curriculum

Cultural Philosophy: the underlying values, language, central understanding of the curriculum

Home/Parent Involvement: the parents' (home) participation in the child's life, the after-school program, and their level of support towards their development, i.e., reinforcement of skills and learning values, communication with the program, providing feedback, etc.

Impact/Effect: significant positive or negative change

Instruction: the direct delivery of lessons and activities

Media Influence: the influence of media on the attitude, behavior and social culture(s) surrounding youth

Peer Influence: the influence of peers on the attitude, behavior and social culture(s) surrounding youth

Resistance: Push back from students and/or the rejection of the curriculum, theories, ideologics, etc.

Social Emotional Learning: the social and emotional skills required to live and successfully navigate throughout society

Strengths/Weakness/Recommendations: strengths and weakness of the PATHS curriculum and recommendations for improvement

Training: the professional development of staff

There were several additional themes; the researcher analyzed the qualitative data through the lens/perspective of the four subscales of the quantitative instrument used for this study to measure social emotional competence, i.e., assertiveness, task orientation,
peer social skills and behavior control (T-CRS 2.1). This resulted in the direct linkage of measures between both the qualitative and quantitative instruments.

The qualitative data provided rich information regarding the PATHS curriculum. The central theme that occurred most (most number of quotes) during the data analysis was behavior control. Behavior control was defined as a child's skill in tolerating and adapting to limits imposed by the school or after-school environment or by the child's own limitations.

Staff members expressed many concerns, challenges of and strengths for delivering the PATHS curriculum related to this area. Following are several direct quotes taken from the qualitative data:

...it was interesting in the way its set up to compliment individual social and emotional development regarding our youth because they lack that...

...they lack that (social skills), especially complimenting one another or telling somebody that they're good instead of always something negative.

...it's set up to compliment individual social and emotional development regarding our youth because they lack that, especially complimenting one another or telling somebody that they're good instead of always something negative. So I definitely see the change in working with the kids and how they're not so negative. They're more toward a positive mindset.

In addition to behavior control, the second theme that recurred most was curriculum adaptation. Because the PATHS curriculum is primarily used in the classroom setting, many times the after-school program staff had challenges delivering the curriculum. Additionally, because of the varied learning styles of participants and the
contrast differences between the after-school program and school day settings, the curriculum had to be modified and needs further modification to meet the needs of the program and ultimately the participants. Following are several direct quotes taken from the qualitative data:

...cause a lot of it is sit down and reading, you know, and me personally I learn better hands on, or just doing something with one another, or getting up out of my chair or something. So a lot of it is just pretty much just sit down and, you know, let’s look at the board, and let’s talk about this lesson. You know, I would do something to incorporate a little bit of movement, a little bit of engagement with one another better. So let’s do an activity, we stand up and we got to talk to each other and things like that communication-wise where we’re just not sitting at a table.

...we have three different age groups, 5 to 7, 8 to 10, 11 to 13, and the lessons increase by age group, so you have to modify it for the 5 to 7’s and then increase it a little for the 8 to 10’s, and then its extreme for the 11 to 13’s, so we try and expand it out into the whole after school program...

...a lot of times emotionally it’s not, like they need to hear exactly what the curriculum is saying, but they need to say it in a different way to reach this population. I don’t know if they’ve found that way yet because there’s so many different attitudes and emotions and things at that age that it’s hard to narrow them down under one curriculum.

But I think if you’re the individual that’s delivering it and you have a good understanding of the curriculum, there are ways that you can look at what
they're saying and say okay, this is what they're saying, now let me say it in these terms for this individual. It just takes, you know what I mean, it depends on the work you want to put into it to making it work for that age group.

I would like to see the PATHS Curriculum implemented more into physical activities as far as like playing a kickball game or something like that, but like eliminating like saying somebody sucks or eliminating different things like that and implementing it in a way where its like if you put another person down and make them feel bad for the way they kicked this ball, or the way they play or the way they run, you know what I mean, that's another out batter to your team, something like that. So that it eliminates all of that and it creates an environment, the same environment, the same good social emotional environment you want for learning, I think that translates to athletics as well, because something that happens to you as far as playing ball or something when you're a little kid can affect you forever. You might never play basketball again, or you might never feel confident doing it and then that affects you, you don't want to exercise, you don't want to do anything like that, and I feel that that's just as important as learning academically, and I feel that if the PATHS Curriculum was implemented more in physical exercises I think that would even help and they would be able to relate to that a lot more than in a classroom.

Although there were many overlapping themes (parent/home involvement, curriculum adaptation, training, etc.) amongst the three tiers of staffing that were interviewed, there was much variation amongst staff. The management staff did not have much direct involvement in the PATHS curriculum with the exception of the one staff
person who managed the line/direct staff. The ancillary staff provided support for the curriculum, but much of their time was spent aside from the delivery of the actual curriculum; whereas the line/direct staff was 100% responsible for the implementation of the curriculum.

Conversely, during the first administration of the focus group interviews, staff did not have much or no experience with the PATHS curriculum. Moreover, their responses to the focus group interview questions were their ideas and interpretations of the actual curriculum versus the practical application and implementation of the curriculum. During the second administration of the focus group interviews, staff spoke to their knowledge of the potential gains of participants and how they were using the curriculum at that time and the promise the PATHS curriculum exhibited. During the third administration, the staff reflected on the curriculum and spoke to the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum and offered recommendations for improvement. Following are several direct quotes from staff that speaks to the strengths of the curriculum and recommended changes:

...the most important thing in my opinion is consistency, and without that I think that's a disadvantage that we are at serving the population we serve, is that's a disadvantage. You'll go to certain schools and you'll have like the parent involvement starting from home and that parent may show up some time during the day to help out in class if they have the day off or come in to bring cupcakes, they have the birthday party, do something like that. And the parents have an organization where they get together or they have sports teams that allow a lot of the football parents to invite the family over, invite the football team over, and
they make dinner for each other or you’ll have like a lot of the events where they’re trying to fund raise. So it’s like a family, a school/home community and that doesn’t exist in the City School District a lot of times because we have so many schools and you might have kids from 10 different schools in the after school program, where you go to a certain district where you might have like you have one school, one middle school, everybody in that age group goes to the same school, parents know each other, they play on the same soccer team together, the same football team, and us being in that environment I think it puts us at a disadvantage too because we don’t have that consistency.

I just think it’s the social emotional piece that’s really good, especially dealing with inner city youth.

I think that kind of being the pioneers of something that I think is exciting and being able to have something on board that can truly evaluate what it is that we’re doing, for me that’s what’s exciting for me. The other thing that I like about the program is just the fact that I’ve worked with youth for so many years and I know a lot of the issues that they go through are because they don’t know how to deal with their emotions, so being able to really kind of meet a kid where they are and work with them to come up with alternatives to deal with emotions I think is hopefully we’ll see some differences and some changes with the behaviors in our youth.

For me I think that the major strength of PATHS is its giving the tools to the students that they’ve never been given before. They didn’t even know that they didn’t have them. When you look through the PATHS Curriculum it seems
pretty, you know, common sense, it all makes sense, you know, like James said its rather easy to teach, but it makes sense when you read it, but on a day-to-day basis you don’t necessarily use those skills and this is finally giving those skills to the students who you know might not come from the best homes, or they might not have the supervision at home that they need to be able to, you know, have this one-on-one interaction. When they come here they have that one-on-one interaction and they’re learning this is how I can deal with all the stresses in my life and by being able to deal with these stresses, that kind of gives them a relief so they’re more open to be able to learn at school, and it can improve the overall life of each of the youth.

What I like about the PATHS Curriculum is that it’s packaged very well, it’s also supported in research. So they put a lot of time in creating this whole curriculum and one of the things that I love about it is that it’s teaching them something different from what they’re learning in school. Like they’re starting to implement the PATHS program now, but in school usually they only learn math, science, social studies, but they’re learning so much more than just those academic courses in class. So having this PATHS Curriculum is teaching them, you know, how to relate with others, how to communicate well with others, you know. In college you have all these communication classes and you learn how to communicate through those classes, so having them learn those types of skills early I just think that it’s going to benefit them so much.

Conversely, one area of concern about which staff expressed was training. This staff training issue emerged from the data as something that warranted future
investigation. Staff offered many suggestions and recommendations regarding training.

Following are several quotes taken directly from the qualitative data:

I do feel like the life coaches do get enough support. Only thing I would just say with the training was about one or two days, I would extend the training myself personally, especially that it’s a long curriculum and you really got to understand and read it through and carefully. the training was about, I think we did it for 1 ½ days or even a day. I would just extend it a little bit more to just become a little bit more familiar with the curriculum in itself. It’s not something you just look at and be like okay, we’re going to do this, but just definitely extend it.

...train us a little more, and go for and refresh them in ways. I know I work better with some type of refresher, like okay, this is what we’ve done so far and just kind of regroup with one another and see what works and what didn’t work, especially at the age level of my class cause once they leave the 5 to 7 they go to 8 to 10, you know, we can kind of talk about what happened in the 5 to 7 and how should I go ahead and teach them on the same similar curriculum or similar lesson only moving forward so they understand and they can feed off of what they learned in that age group moving to the next age group. so that’s one recommendation I would just add.

The staff focus group interviews offered the researcher rich information about the PATHS curriculum and areas for further inquiry. The following areas were summarized as major areas influencing the overall curriculum delivery and implementation: (1) curriculum adaptation to the after-school setting, (2) parental/home involvement, (3)
continuity between school day and after school learning, (4) cultural appropriateness of activities and lessons, and (5) staff training.

Summary of Results

The following study demonstrated promise for further research. Research findings within this study suggested that there are correlations between several areas (subscales) of the intervention and the number of years attended and the percentage attendance of subjects. However, age was adversely correlated with assertiveness. The assumption the researcher was able to draw from this conclusion was the older the subject, the least likely the youth will be impacted by the intervention in the area of assertiveness. The curriculum, in this area, was most effective with younger populations. Conversely, the researcher was unable to draw firm conclusions regarding the effect change of the curriculum over time. Inferential statistics (MANOVA) did not detect significant effect change. However, these statistical findings were assumed to be accredited to the sample size and the statistical power of the test. Moreover, because the size of the sample (N=28) was relatively low (minimum number for inferential statistics is generally 30), it was very improbable for the researcher to detect or make assertive claims regarding the accuracy and validity of the findings for this study.

Additionally, the qualitative review of this study supports the need to further explore the research question as evident by the responses of the staff. The overall response and perception of staff was positive regarding use of the PATHS curriculum. Please see quote below:

Is there anything else you’d like to say about that curriculum at this point in time?
Nope, I really think it's a great curriculum and I think it will be beneficial moving on pretty much we're trying it this year, so I think once we learn the kinks and everything, and once we grow with it, I think it will become more beneficial and just how we use it with our kids and the youth we serve.

However, in order for the curriculum to be more effective, additional modification to the curriculum is required to make the curriculum more suitable for the after-school setting. Staff identified curriculum adaptation as a major challenge in the qualitative review. The classroom-based learning approach was not effective in the after-school setting. Findings suggested that the curriculum should be more integrated into other activities. Findings also supported the PATHS literature that suggested the curriculum is most effective if used as an overarching culture to apply a shared language and shared concepts, i.e., PATHS kid of the day. In addition, staff training served as a critical element for ensuring the curriculum was implemented with fidelity. In other words, staff should receive more training before implementation of the curriculum and there should be periodical trainings throughout the program year to ensure staff fully understands how to deliver the curriculum contents.
Chapter V: Discussion

Introduction

A review of the literature indicated that a great need exists for the development of programs that support the academic and social-emotional development of youth. Additionally, there is a growing demand for the research of behaviors and competencies that will allow youth to escape risky environments, and engage in activities that will result in their positive, healthy development. Studies have found that when children are involved in unsupervised, unorganized time after school, they are more likely to exhibit negative behaviors (Posner & Vandell, 1994). Productive use of after-school time has been linked to better academic and social-emotional behavioral functioning (Posner & Vandell, 1999). Furthermore, care arrangements during the after-school hours are effective when programs are supervised by adults, structured, and employ evidence-based techniques such as research findings and curriculums (Steinberg, 1986; Vandell & Ramanan, 1991; Durlak & Weissberg, 2007). Programs of this type tend to impact primarily at-risk and low-income youth, especially when participants are engaged for longer periods of time.

Many researchers in the area of positive youth development are beginning to advocate for an examination of the predictors of positive (i.e., competent) behaviors in addition to problem behaviors (Kahne, Nagaoka, Brown, O'Brien, Quinn, & Thiede, 2001; Roth, Brooks-Gunn, Murray & Foster, 1998). The promotion of competent behaviors is beginning to be viewed as the major avenue for preventing problem
behaviors (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 2002). Currently, the research reflects an emerging consensus that the same risk and protective factors underlie both competent and problem behaviors (Catalano et al., 2002).

This study was designed to explore effective and useful strategies that enhance and advance the development process of African American males given they are at greater risk of social and academic problems. To that end, this study examined an after-school program intervention that is designed to have a positive impact on elementary school-aged youth. In addition, given the correlation of early problem behaviors such as uncontrolled anger and social problems such as violent crimes, the purpose of this study is to identify resolutions in the way of prevention techniques that will lead to a better, more socially viable society.

This study took place at a community-based after-school program located in Rochester, New York. A mixed-methods descriptive analysis with both quantitative and qualitative research techniques was utilized to answer the following research question:

What is the impact of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) curriculum on the social-emotional development of African American males aged 5 - 13 actively participating in a community-based after-school program located in the northeast sector of Rochester, New York as evaluated by Teacher-Child Rating Scale assessment scores and staff focus group interviews?

The study employed two instruments to gather empirical evidence: the Teacher-Child Rating Scale (T-CRS) and the staff focus group interview questions. There were three time periods at which the T-CRS 2.1 was administered. The initial administration took place January 5 - 9, 2009 (T1); the second administration took place March 30 -
April 3, 2009 (T2); and the final administration took place June 1 – 5, 2009 (T3). There were three administrations of the focus group discussions, which paralleled the administration of the T-CRS.

Implications of Findings

Evidence indicates that after-school programs are beneficial to children in the elementary school years, especially when they target more than just problem behaviors, and instead focus on a wide range of positive developmental outcomes (Catalano et al., 2002). Programs also are best when they target problem prevention and competency promotion simultaneously, are well integrated into the school or community setting (Weissberg & O’Brien), and focus on social and emotional learning (Catalano et al., 2002; Elias et al., 1997).

Results from this study yielded encouraging, but certainly not conclusive findings and therefore demonstrated promise and a need to conduct further research. The study employed an analysis of mean differences to examine differences among the three groups who had completed the first two administrations of the T-CRS, all three administrations of the T-CRS, and those who completed the last two administrations of the T-CRS. The group with a complete data set (all three T-CRS administrations) had greater mean scores (greater mean scores is positive) than the other two groups.

During the first T-CRS administration there was a notable difference (a difference of at least 2.0 points for mean score totals) between the group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the first two times of testing. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores for task orientation (28.17/21.8), behavior
control (26.67/24.6) and assertiveness (33.5/31.2). There were no notable differences between the two groups as it related to peer social skills (33.75/34.2).

During the second T-CRS administration there were notable differences among all three groups (the group that had all three times of testing, the group that had only the first two times of testing, and the group that had only the last two times of testing). There were notable differences among each of the three groups in the area of task orientation. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores than the other two groups. Conversely, the group that had only the first two times of testing had higher mean scores than the group that had only the last two times of testing.

In addition, there were notable differences among each of the three groups in the area of behavior control. The group that had only the first two times of testing had higher mean scores than the other two groups. There wasn't a notable difference between the groups that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the last two times of testing. Further, there were notable differences among each of the three groups in the area of assertiveness. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores than the other two groups. There were no notable differences between the other two groups.

Lastly, for the second T-CRS administration, there were notable differences among each of the three groups in the area of peer social skills. The group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the first two times of testing had notably higher mean scores than the group that had only the last two times of testing. There was a difference of 8.22 between the group that had all three times of testing and the group that had the last two times of testing and there was a difference of 7.15 between
the group that had the first two times of testing and the group that had the last two times of testing. However, there were no notable differences between these two groups (group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the first two times of testing).

During the third T-CRS administration there were notable differences between the group that had all three times of testing and the group that had only the last two times of testing. The group that had all three times of testing had higher mean scores. This difference was most noticeable among the following primary subscales: task orientation and peers social skills. There were no notable differences between the two groups as it related to behavior control and assertiveness.

To allow for further analyses, the researcher developed two categories to define pre and post. Due to the variance of subjects who had different times of testing, pre was defined as the first time of testing and post was defined as the last time of testing. Analyses were used simply to determine change amongst subjects.

No significant change was detected using a multi repeated analysis of variance test. However, analyses were conducted to determine correlations among age, number of years in the after-school program, and attendance percentage for the 2008-2009 academic year.

This study showed a significant correlation at the first time of testing (pre-test) between peer social skills and the number of years the subject participated in the after-school program. In addition, peer social skills and attendance percentage were positively correlated at the first time of testing. Further, there was a significant correlation between assertiveness and the number of years the subject participated in the after-school program.
program; there was also a significant correlation between assertiveness and the percentage of time the subject participated in the after school program.

Subsequently, there was a positive significant correlation between peer social skills and the number of years the subject attended the after-school program, and peer social skills and the percentage of time the subject attended at the final time of testing (post-test). Conversely, age was adversely correlated with the change of assertiveness from the first time of testing to the last time of testing. The assumption the researcher was able to draw from this conclusion was: the older the subject, the least likely the youth will be impacted by the intervention in the area of assertiveness. The curriculum, in this area, is most effective with younger populations.

This study demonstrated potential and provided merit for further investigation. The researcher concluded, based on the study findings, that the PATHS curriculum may have had some level of positive impact on the social emotional development of African American males. In addition, participants who attended the program more frequently were more likely to see positive behavioral gains related to social emotional functioning.

Limitations

This study has a number of limitations to consider. The sample size of this study is low, so firm conclusions and significant findings are difficult, if not, impossible to determine. The study did not include a matched control group, so conclusions about what effects are related solely to active participation in the after-school program cannot be made. The amount of program services delivered to participants cannot be controlled for; as a result, some individuals participated more than others. Whether this participation differential is related to any other variable (e.g., program site, sex, age, and ethnicity) is
unknown. Program attrition is not controlled for, and the delivery of curriculum contents varied by grouping and time of testing. Therefore, firm conclusions as to what content areas were correlated to positive gains cannot be made. In addition, to make the curriculum more suitable for the after-school setting, it was modified throughout the program year; resulting in the inability to determine the exact weeks the curriculum contents were provided to subjects.

Recommendations

It is common for a study on a rapidly emerging research area such as after-school programs (ASPs) to generate a series of questions that merit attention for future research. The following are a list of research questions that warrants examining (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007):

Which participants benefit the most from ASPs, and in what areas?

How can attendance and participation be improved for more youth?

How can programs be created that appeal to and benefit youth based on differences in gender, race/ethnicity, age, income status and academic or behavioral problems?

What are the long-term benefits of ASPs?

What aspects of program quality are empirically related to youth outcomes and should be emphasized in future programming?

How can researchers and practitioners best assess the constructs and variables considered by many in the field to be important to the success of ASPs, such as participation, engagement, program quality, staff composition and competence, and program implementation?
From an ecological perspective, how do child, family, school and neighborhood characteristics lead to consistent and active participation in ASPs, and then interact with various program processes and structures to influence youth outcomes?

Research literature suggests that after-school programs are one way to reduce some of the risk factors social environment has on children and are one way to improve their academic achievement. After-school programs provide children with experiences and activities that enhance their personal and social development. In addition, programs located directly in children's communities have great potential to protect (physically, socially, and emotionally) children living in high-risk environments (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992).

After-school programs are increasingly seen as one potential strategy for reducing the risks children face immediately following the school hours. However, according to Riggs and Greenberg (2004), there is a scarcity of methodologically rigorous research confirming that after-school programs can positively affect children's developmental trajectories. During the next decade, substantial attention will be paid to the effectiveness of after-school programming and the quality and depth of this research will have broad implications for both the funding of programs and the well-being and development of our nation's youth.

Methodologically rigorous evaluations based on research models that consider individual and contextual factors contain great promise in determining the characteristics of after-school programs most beneficial to children's development, as well as the families and communities most likely to be impacted by the implementation of after-school programs (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). In addition, research that focuses on
African American males' involvement in after-school programs is scarce and filling this gap could add substantial gain to this body of knowledge.

Conclusion

Research suggests that after-school programs have significant influences on children's development and that children who are at most risk for poor developmental outcomes are those who benefit the most from after-school program participation (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). This indicates that it may behoove those responsible for disseminating after-school funds to increase funding for after-school programs in communities with large portions of children considered to be at-risk for developmental maladjustment. Because funding for after-school programs is often limited, funding priority for high-risk communities is warranted if those communities are most likely to be impacted by after-school services.

Similarly, at the program level, enrollment is often limited. Therefore, program providers often have to make difficult decisions regarding which youth receive services. In many instances, enrollment decisions are made on a first-come first-serve basis. However, if children demonstrating early academic and behavioral problems are also the children who can make the greatest strides in these developmental spheres, then perhaps priority of enrollment for these children may be warranted.

After-school programs are viewed as a protective factor for youth most at-risk for academic and behavioral problems, i.e., African American males. Because of the challenges associated with distressed communities, i.e., illiteracy, poverty, and crime, after-school programs are used as protective measures to guard against some of the risk factors and poor social conditions of these neighborhoods. As a result, after-school
programs are needed in the community context; there is a great need for after-school programs located directly where children and families reside.

Because the PATHS curriculum was never employed or researched in the after-school setting, this study was designed to acquire baseline data and information that may be used for further research. Findings of this study showed promise for use of the PATHS curriculum during the after school hours. Although firm conclusions cannot be drawn regarding the effectiveness of the PATHS curriculum, a more rigorous evaluation and research design would allow such an assertion to be made. The researcher intends to work with the developer of the PATHS curriculum to conduct a more rigorous evaluation of PATHS in the after-school context involving a larger sample size and a comparison group. Findings of this study will be shared with the local community and will be used as benchmark to aid other service providers. Moreover, the school district for which this study took place has intentions to employ the PATHS curriculum in every elementary school during the school day. After-school research and after-school reports encourage after-school programs to offer holistic supports that are supplemental to the school day learning that also support the reinforcement of learning standards. Adhering to this philosophical view of after-school programs, the organization for which this study was conducted is planning to meet with the superintendent of the school district to partner and offer extended school day support. The goal of the organization is to offer the PATHS curriculum during the after-school context for every elementary school that uses the curriculum during the regular school day. This study provided a basis for scientific inquiry and practical implication of PATHS to be conducted in the future.
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### Teacher-Child Rating Scale (T-CRS) 2.1

**ID Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Today's Date</th>
<th>For Office Use Only</th>
<th>Child's Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Last) (First)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher:**

**School:**

**Screening Initial (Middle) Final**

*Please rate how much you agree each item describes the child. Fill in the oval corresponding to your response.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A self-starter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disturbs others while they are working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Participates in class discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lacks social skills with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Has difficulty following directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accepts imposed limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Makes friends easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Functions well even with distractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Overly aggressive to peers (fights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Defends own views under group pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other children shun or avoid this child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Underachieving (not working to ability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tolerates frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anxious, worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Classmates like to sit near this child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Works well without adult support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Defiant, obstinate, stubborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Expresses ideas willingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Has trouble interacting with peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Poorly motivated to achieve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Copes well with failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Nervous, frightened, tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Has many friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Completes schoolwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Disruptive in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Comfortable as a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Other children dislike this child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Has poor concentration, limited attention span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Accepts things not going his/her way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Does not express feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Well liked by classmates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please do not write in this area.*

**Please rate how much you agree each item describes the child. Fill in the oval corresponding to your response.**

**Strongly Disagree**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

**Strongly Agree**

- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
Appendix B

Focus Group Interview Questions

Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) – a curriculum of social emotional development

1. Please tell me about your experience working with the PATHS curriculum.
   - What has been your experience with the PATHS curriculum?

2. What is your general understanding of the PATHS curriculum?
   - Please explain what you know about the PATHS curriculum.

3. What are your perceived strengths, if any, of the PATHS curriculum?
   - What is going right with the PATHS curriculum?

4. What are your perceived weaknesses, if any, of the PATHS curriculum?
   - What is going wrong with the PATHS curriculum?

5. Do you believe the PATHS curriculum will improve the social emotional competencies of African American males aged 5 – 13? If so, why or why not?
   - Do you believe the PATHS curriculum is effective among African American males aged 5-13?
   - Do you believe the PATHS curriculum is suitable for the population of African American males aged 5-13?

6. What changes, if any, need to be made to the PATHS curriculum?
   - Are there any changes needed to the instruction? If so, what changes?
   - Are there any changes needed to the support provided? If so, what changes?
   - Are there any changes needed to management? If so, what changes?

7. Is there anything else you would like to share in reference to the PATHS curriculum?
   - Is there anything else you would like to add that has not been discussed?
   - What else you would like to discuss about the PATHS Curriculum?
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September 16, 2008

To the Institutional Review Board

I am the acting President and Chief Executive Officer of The Community Place of Greater Rochester, Inc. I have reviewed the research proposal of Leonard Brock and have found it to present no harm to The Community Place of Greater Rochester, Inc., or to any of its employees or clients.

Mr. Brock’s research will address the question: What is the impact of the PATHS curriculum on the social-emotional development of African American males in grades K-6 actively participating in a community-based after-school program located in northeast Rochester as measured by T-CRS evaluations, staff focus groups, and parent interviews? The results will benefit The Community Place and further the body of research available to guide practitioners in this field.

We therefore support the research of Leonard Brock and grant permission for him to conduct his study at The Community Place of Greater Rochester, Inc. If you have any questions, please contact me at (585) 327-7200 or susanne@communityplace.org.

Sincerely,

Susanne E. Davin
Interim President/Chief Executive Officer