Summer 2009

Design Development and Implementation of a Resiliency-Based After-School Program for Sixth Grade Students Through Recreational Activities

Takeyra Collins
Old Dominion University

DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A RESILIENCY-BASED AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS THROUGH RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

by

Takeyra Collins

B.S. May 2008, Virginia Wesleyan College

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of

Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the

Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

August 2009

Approved by:

Edwin Gómez
(Head Committee Chair)

Stephen Shapiro (Member)

Tammi Milliken (Member)

ABSTRACT

DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A RESILIENCY-BASED AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR SIXTH GRADE STUDENTS THROUGH RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Takeyra Collins
Old Dominion University, 2009
Head Committee Chair: Dr. Edwin Gómez

Fostering youth development is the responsibility of caring adults who have the opportunity to provide support, opportunities, and services in a safe and enlightening environment. The purpose of the current study was to determine the benefits of a resiliency-based after-school program and to examine the design, development and implementation of recreational activities that were developed to instill resiliency traits in at-risk youth. The after-school program has resiliency-based activities for sixth graders that were facilitated by undergraduate college students at a public middle school in Norfolk, VA. A 40-item questionnaire, the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP), was used to gather information from the sixth grade students. A pre and post test was administered by the directors and graduate assistants of the in-school and after-school portions. Internal and external validity analyses and reliability analyses provide support for the RASP as an accurate measure of the resiliency traits. Results did not find evidence for differences between gender, nor did it find evidence for those sixth graders who participated in both the in-school and after-school portions versus those who only participated in the in-school portion. Furthermore, the results did not find significant difference in one resiliency trait in comparison to the other six. The discussion relays findings back to the literature and investigates implications as to why evidence was not found.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development and completion of my thesis was a very rewarding experience. There are a number of people that have helped me in this process that I would like to thank. First, my professor and head committee chair, Dr. Edwin Gómez. He was very diligent, honest, and accommodating throughout the entire process and with his continuous support and dedication to research, I was able to present an in-depth study of something that is truly important to me. Secondly, I would like to thank Bobbie Freidt for working so hard to make sure that the after-school portion of the CARE NOW program ran so well and for giving me the strength and opportunity to grow as a Graduate Assistant within the program. Next, I would like to thank my thesis committee members, Dr. Stephen Shapiro and Dr. Tammi Milliken for their input and expertise. Additionally, I could have never completed my thesis without the support and love of my husband, Sandy Collins Jr., my mother and father, Angela and Glenn Talbot, my siblings, Trevon and Tahjiana, and other family, friends and colleagues who witnessed the time and effort needed to complete my thesis. Last, but not least, none of this could have been accomplished without the love of my Lord and Savior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Children who have a warm, supportive relationship with parents or other adults have been shown to exhibit less antisocial behavior (Werner & Smith, 1982). The presence of individuals who work to challenge, assist, and care for youth in a positive setting (e.g. school, church, and community recreation centers) is extraordinary due to the fact that these individuals often serve as mentors and proxies for absent parents. A relationship is a bond that is made between individuals who have a connection to one another. The relationships that can be formed between mentors and youth can be undoubtedly significant. Furthermore, when mentors use recreation as a tool to enhance, empower, and challenge youth, they bring in a number of other options (e.g., community ties, beliefs, and security) to teach and present new opportunities (e.g., positive adult relationships, improve personal skills, and develop social skills). Recreation plays a significant role in the development of adolescents and recreational activities are important and useful methods for establishing mentor relationships with children. Developmental recreation and the positive benefits of recreation have been shown to enhance efforts to develop resiliency and positive youth behavior (Cooper, Estes, & Allen, 2004). Developmental recreation involves the process of exposing youth to different aspects of life, experiences, and beliefs, via activities that help to shape and prepare them for the future. The use of developmental recreation can help youth in various ways by providing opportunities comprised of supportive relationships with adults and mentors that allow youth to feel a common bond and a sense of cohesiveness (Robertson, 2000).

However, developmental recreational opportunities are often not available or not provided to certain populations of youth, although it has been found to be particularly positive for those in underprivileged environments.

Youth Programs

A solid academic foundation is not always provided for poor and nonwhite youth by public schools (Hoschschild & Scovronick, 2004). Budget cuts and a lack of resources have influenced such circumstances. A decrease in funds often results in the elimination of courses or programs involving physical and health education, art, and music (Halpern, 2002). Many youth are left alone without constructive activities or supervision during after-school hours (Cosden, Morrison, Gutierrez, & Brown, 2004; Vandell et al., 2005). A variety of research has been conducted on the contributions of youth programs and their impact on healthy psychosocial development, especially with low-income, urban children (Fashola, 2003; Hall, Yohalem, Tolman, & Wilson, 2003; Halpern, 1999; Hirsch, 2005; Kahne et al., 2001; Lerner & Galambos, 1998; Mahoney, Lord, & Carryl, 2005; Winfield, 1994). The activities involved in after-school programs often occupy available time that students have after school, but it is important that activities are constructive and instructional to prevent problems and negative behaviors that youth may come in contact with during free unobligated time.

Interestingly, there has been an increase in the development and use of after-school programs but there has been a need for more in-depth research on its effect. Participation in after-school programs helps to eliminate the negative opportunities and experiences that arise with the increase in unstructured time for youth. Additionally,

safety for youth and valued relationships with staff has been found to be provided by after-school programs (Halpern, Barker, & Mollard, 2000). Dungan-Seaver (1999) stated the following:

> Some of the most powerful programs combine "enrichment" activities, such as sports, cultural arts, and dance, with academic activities. Enrichment activities are seen as beneficial because they are more interesting to youth. The enrichment activities meet the social, emotional, and physical needs overlooked in academic approaches, provide opportunities that are oftentimes out of reach for lower income, disadvantaged youth, and invite more involvement from families and community members than academic programs. The assumption that academic achievement will increase indirectly as a result of effective after-school programs, drives the establishment of physical, emotional, and moral support in the development of youth within after-school programs.

Within youth programs we do find that there are gender differences as a result of variations in how they choose to or feel comfortable with participating in activities.

Gender

Typically, there are gender differences in terms of benefits received from after-school or youth programs. Additionally, extensive research on extracurricular activity involvement has demonstrated gender differences in the extent of participation by children and adolescents. Boys have consistently been shown to engage in more team sports through childhood and adolescence (Barber, Stone, Hunt, & Eccles, 2005; Eccles, 2005; Eccles, 1993; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Eccles, Barber, Hunt, & Stone, 2003; Eccles, Barber, & Jozefowicz, 1998; Eccles & Harold, 1991; Fredricks & Eccles, 2002;

Greendorfer, Lewko, & Rosengren, 1996; Mauldin & Meeks, 1990; McNeal, 1998; Medrick, Roizen, Rubin, & Buckley, 1982; Meeks & Mauldin, 1990). Although, socioeconomic and racial differences have been studied and do exist the focus of this study is on gender differences. The effects of resiliency, in comparison to gender differences, have not been examined extensively. However, one study conducted by Wasonga (2002) found that there were significant effects on urban high school perceptions of the development of resiliency. Furthermore, the results indicated higher positive and significant correlations between external assets and resiliency in favor of boys. Additionally, the study suggests that perpetuation of caring relations, high expectations, and opportunities for meaningful participation would enable male students to develop higher levels of resiliency (Wasonga, 2002, pp. 51-52).

Resiliency

Resiliency has the ability to greatly influence and enhance the skill levels of youth. Wolin and Wolin (1993) identified seven skills that resilient people possess: insight, independence, creativity, humor, initiative, relationships and morality. Wolin and Wolin further observed individual's behavior and the ability to cope, adjust, and respond to problems with the use of the resiliency traits, as a critical aspect, to enable individuals to rise above the adversity of their circumstances. Opportunities for meaningful participation and contribution include having opportunities for valued responsibilities, making decisions, giving voice and being heard, and contributing one's talents to the community (Benard, 1991). Daud and Carruthers (2008) noted the following:

> Although the presence of after-school programs provide numerous opportunities and significant features for youth; it is important that they are structured and organized with the appropriate resources and ratio of youth to staff. Halpern (1999) identified common attributes of "good enough" after-school programs. They include the following: an adequate number of staff to assure individualized attention to children; adequate level of staff literacy to help children with learning support needs; adequate facilities and equipment to allow variety and choice in activities; a flexible and relaxed schedule; a predictable environment; opportunities to explore ideas, feelings, and identities; avenues for self-expression; exploration of one's own heritage as well as the larger culture; and time for unstructured play and simple fun. (p. 97)

Statement of the problem

Generally, after-school programs have been shown to produce the following: better emotional adjustment, better peer relationships and social competence, fewer antisocial behaviors, less likelihood of endorsing aggressive behaviors, better work habits, better school performance, and better tests and grades in reading and math (Dungan-Seaver, 1999). Further research indicates that involvement in after-school programs lowers risky behaviors, such as drinking, smoking, drugs, sexual activity, and violence, while increasing positive behaviors such as better social and behavioral adjustment, relationships with peers, conflict resolution strategies, and parental involvement (Miller, 2001). Garmezy (1983) and others have identified individual characteristics of resilient students in high poverty areas who succeeded despite their disadvantaged circumstances. These characteristics include a wide array of social skills,

positive peer interactions, a high degree of social responsiveness and sensitivity, intelligence (measured by IQ), empathy, a sense of humor, and critical problem-solving skills. Additional characteristics of resilient children identified by Garmezy (1983) included the following:

- positive peer and adult interactions,
- low degrees of defensiveness and aggressiveness and high degrees of cooperation, participation, and emotional stability (teachers' ratings),
- a positive sense of self,
- a sense of personal power rather than powerlessness, and
- an internal locus of control (a belief that they are capable of exercising a degree of control over their environment).

Although there is an increase in the use of resiliency towards youth and the benefits of its use; there is no literature on the use of resiliency, resiliency traits, an in-school and after-school component, and the collaboration between a middle school and a university in relation to program effectiveness for at-risk youth. The importance of participation in a program that incorporates all these factors has not been examined or observed. Furthermore, most after-school programs do not incorporate theory into purposeful development of the activities. The combination of the resiliency theory, resiliency traits, recreational activities, and a collaborative in-school and after-school programming component is nonexistent in current literature. The growth of youth programming and resiliency benefits calls for an investigation into a program that studies the effects of a collaborative effort. This study will fill a gap in the literature and provide additional information to the effectiveness and importance of offering such programs.

Statement of the Purpose

This study explores the effects of a resiliency based after-school intervention program on the development of at-risk youth in a public middle school. The

distinguishing factors that makes this study unique is its use of a seamless approach, which consists of the use of resiliency traits and recreational activities in collaboration with a middle school and a University. Additionally, this study seeks to examine the impact that the use of resiliency, as a theory-based approach within an after-school setting, has on gender. This is significant as there is a need for studies on these aspects. The resiliency traits, which are further explained in the literature, were tested to determine if they are reliable constructs measuring resiliency. Furthermore, the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) will be assessed in terms of its construct validity and reliability.

Significance of the Study

The focal point of this study was to fill the gap in research that incorporates the use of resiliency in an after-school setting. This study not only examined the use of resiliency with youth, it explored the use of resiliency in collaboration with recreational activities, mentors, and resiliency traits. A funnel approach is used to enhance the overall well-being of at-risk youth by presenting new opportunities, a network of new relationships between administrators and college students, and new interventions through fun and innovative recreational activities.

Hypotheses

A total of 4 hypotheses were tested in this study.

Research Hypothesis 1

The students who participated in both the in-school and after-school programs will showcase a difference in RASP scores in comparison to those students who only participated in the in-school program. The Null Hypothesis states that there is no

difference between those students participating in the after-school program versus those not participating in the after-school program, H_0: $M_P = M_{NP}$. The Alternative Hypothesis states that there is a difference between those students participating in the after-school program versus those not participating in the after-school program, H_a: $M_P \neq M_{NP}$.

Research Hypothesis 2

Each of the seven resiliency traits will be looked at to assess if there are individual trait differences between those students participating in the after-school program versus those not participating in the after-school program. The Null Hypothesis states that there are no individual trait differences between those middle school students participating in the after-school program and those not participating in the after-school program, H_0: $M_P = M_{NP}$. The Alternative Hypothesis states that there are individual trait differences between those middle school students participating in the after-school program and those not participating in the after-school program, H_{Ins}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Insight)}$, H_{Ind}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Independence)}$, H_{Rel}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Relationships)}$, H_{Ini}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Initiative)}$, H_{Cre}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Creativity)}$, H_{Hum}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Humor)}$, H_{VO}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Values\ Orientation)}$.

Research Hypothesis 3

The Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) will showcase a difference in scores between boys and girls. The Null Hypothesis states that there is no difference in the RASP scores between the male and female participants, H_0: $M_B = M_G$. The Alternative Hypothesis states that there are differences between the RASP scores of the male and female participants, H_a: $M_B \neq M_G$.

Research Hypothesis 4

The subjects who will participate in both components (in-school and after-school) will have higher scores on the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) post test. The null hypothesis states that there will be no difference in RASP scores between the users and non users of the after-school component, H_o: $M_u = M_{nu}$. The alternate hypothesis states that there will be significant differences in RASP scores between the post test of the users and non users, H_a: $M_u \neq M_{nu}$.

Delimitations

1. The study was only provided for sixth grade students in one public middle school within the city of Norfolk, VA.
2. All possible variables measuring the success of after-school programs were not examined; only resiliency was measured.

Limitations

1. This study focuses on a program that requires no commitment; it is a drop in program.
2. The outcomes attained throughout this study cannot necessarily be used congruently with all middle school students (e.g., seventh and eighth graders).
3. The outcomes of this study cannot be generalized to all middle school students because (a) this study was only conducted with sixth grade students at a local public school, and (b) this middle school in Norfolk, VA may not be representative of other middle schools in Virginia or the US.
4. Self-administered surveys may not be entirely appropriate, especially given the nature of the respondent answering the RASP (e.g., the students are not adults and may not take the survey seriously, they may have difficulty reading

or understanding it, English may not be their first language, or students may simply be bored).

5. The effect that the in-school portion of this program may have on the participants was not separated out from the after-school portion in the database.
6. There were either five or six sub groups where the undergraduate advocates led the activities, thereby leaving the possibility of inconsistent leadership (e.g., some undergraduate practitioners were better at leading, programming, and facilitating activities than others).
7. This year long program ran for eight weeks the first academic semester and eleven weeks the second academic semester. Between the two semesters there was a period of six weeks of no after-school programming, due to the Old Dominion University's holiday break.

Definition of Terms

1. Advocates- Mentors that consisted of 40-50 undergraduate students and 2-5 Graduate students from Old Dominion University. These individuals facilitated and participated in the activities with the sixth graders to attain a relationship and provide supportive adult guidance.
2. Character Trait- a distinctive but not necessarily invariable feature exhibited by all individuals of a group and capable of being described or measured (Dictionary.com, 2009, ¶ 1).

3. Daily Activity Plans (DAPs)- The list and full description of six to eight activities that were developed by the CARE NOW staff (Old Dominion University Undergraduates) and facilitated at Blair Middle School.
4. Debriefing- The facilitation of techniques, discussions, and/or activities to further explain the recreational activities, which encompassed the resiliency traits that the sixth grade students had recently participated in. The Advocates, in CARE NOW, debriefed with the sixth grade students immediately following the activities they participated in.
5. Intervention Programming- The use of programming techniques to help individuals cope with any problems or events they need help or guidance with to overcome a situation.
6. Recreation Programming- The implementation, coordination, and evaluation of recreational programs. Activities designed and tailored to the needs and interests of individuals and youth with the overall goal to enhance an individual's overall well-being.
7. The Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP)- an instrument used throughout the study to assess Resiliency in terms of its construct validity and reliability.
8. Resiliency- The ability for an individual to spring back into a state of common ground no matter what situation they have been put through. It has also been described as the ability to "bounce back" from any situation that is thrown one's way (Resiliency In Action, Inc., 2004).

9. Resiliency Traits- There are seven components/skills of resiliency conceptualized and developed by Wolin & Wolin (1993) they include: Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative, Creativity, Humor, and Values Orientation.

The following chapter reviews the literature related to after-school programs, at-risk youths and programming, as well as theories and information related to the concept of resiliency.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review explains the importance of establishing an after-school program with the intention to educate and build resilient youth with various activities and concepts. A variety of concepts, descriptions, and theories are explained to evaluate the use of resiliency in a specific setting. Psychological and social problems have developed in association with the living conditions of youth (Wandersman & Nation, 1998). A lack of available resources, high levels of cultural and ethnic heterogeneity, as well as elevated residential, turnover rates in urban neighborhoods have led to the development of negative social relationships (Leventhal & Brooks-Gunn, 2000). The result of negative social relationships causes juvenile delinquency and child mistreatment as well as other internalized problems and issues such as depression. Another component to youth being alone and unsupervised is when youth return from school to an empty home because their parents are away at work. The problems associated with this component, termed "latchkey kids," are the number of hours that youth are left in the home to potentially partake in delinquent activities, fend for themselves, and take on adult responsibilities. This situation can lead to lack of stimulation, overwhelmed responsibility, and inappropriate exposure to the Internet and television without adult supervision. Wimer et al. (2008) suggested

> families with greater challenges or disadvantages, such as parents who are less engaged and have fewer resources, may be less likely to have youths involved in out-of-school time (OST) programs and activities due to past research by McLoyd

(1998) revealing how parenting behaviors and youth outcomes are influenced by parents' psychological, financial, and social resources.

At-risk youths, due to the susceptibility of their environment, typically become involved in gang influences, sexual promiscuity, criminal activities, and participate in other forms of delinquent behavior (e.g., unplanned pregnancy, alcohol abuse, and criminal activities) (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1992).

There are five themes discussed in the Review of Literature. The first primary theme discussed in this review is delinquency, which examines negative activities that youth become involved in. The second theme involves recreation, youth programming, and after-school programs which suggest the ways that these programs can enhance the overall qualities achieved in youth. Third, positive and negative environmental factors are discussed in conjunction with the effects of the way that at-risk youths are raised. Next, resiliency theory is measured in terms of its effectiveness in youth programs, which is then followed by resiliency and its definition and examination into the ability to build an overall positive attitude and well-being for youth when it is incorporated into activities. Finally, the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile is discussed in terms of how it measures seven resiliency traits and the extent to why it was developed.

Delinquency

It is assumed that juvenile violent crimes occur more often during curfew hours. However, Snyder, Sickmund, and Poe-Yamagata (1996) found that the frequency of violent crimes such as robbery, sexual assault, and aggravated assault is approximately four times greater in the after-school period. The time that children spend participating in activities that encourage life and social skills is greatly needed. Although it is important

that children and adolescents spend time participating in activities rather than sitting at home, watching television, or being involved in irresponsible activities; not all activities are beneficial. For example, evidence indicates that the amount of time U.S. adolescents spend driving around in cars has a longitudinal predictive relationship to increased probability of engagement in delinquent activities (e.g., gang activities, substance or drug abuse, theft, etc.) (Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley, Bachman, & Johnston, 1996). Interestingly, Barnett (2008) explained

> Income, the presence of adults in the home, family size, and father characteristics did not contribute to predicting the total amount of time males spend doing extracurricular activities. The analyses revealed that such participation was best predicted by youth who had mothers with higher levels of education and who worked fewer hours. In addition, the males who had been in preschool full-time, but only for a limited time span, were more likely to have spent time in extracurricular activities. (pp. 40-41)

The occurrence of delinquency can also be accounted for by the transition into early adolescence. The challenges of caring for oneself, managing the influence of their peers, new unsupervised time can affect the ways in which youth behave. Flannery, Williams, and Vazsonyi (1999) examined sixth and seventh grade students in three middle schools from a medium-sized southwestern school district whose families represented all socioeconomic levels. The researchers found that there was a strong association between certain risks of delinquent behavior, vulnerability to peer pressure, and substance use and a lack of parental monitoring. The study also found that

"Latchkey children" were not significantly different from those being monitored at home by an adult based on the outcome measures examined (after-school time, delinquent and aggressive behavior, substance abuse, peer pressure, and parental monitoring (Flannery, Williams, & Vazsonyi, 1999, p. 251).

At-risk students

Youth today are often victims of, and fall prey to a life of destruction and promiscuity due to their economic and social aspects environment. There is only so much good that can come out of a situation in which a family is struggling to live, the children do not have the funds to purchase the materials or clothes they need in school, and the neighborhood they live in has been taken over by drugs, abuse, and destruction. Riggs and Greenberg (2004) explained that urban youth are increasingly finding themselves in a changed landscape where social and economic circumstances are working against their success in school endeavors and, more generally, in life's pursuits. It is unfortunate to think that we could allow our future to be influenced by negative impacts due to the disruptive influences surrounding certain populations or areas. Often, the time of day that young adults tend to partake in negative behaviors is between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. in the afternoon, immediately following dismissal from school when their choice of activity is not in their best interest. According to Newman, Fox, Flynn, and Christeson (2000), this is the period of time that the most frequent rates of violent juvenile crimes occur. Children who relate to various negative circumstances and living conditions where their best interests are compromised often demonstrate a lack of resources and an inability to thrive and can be viewed as disadvantaged youth. Disadvantaged or at-risk youth are defined as youth who, because of certain

characteristics (e.g., deprived, lonely, single-parent homes), circumstances, experiences, or insufficiencies (e.g., lack of self-worth, reside in low income areas, are poor, lack resources, lack healthy peer/adult relationships) are considered at-risk of not succeeding in life and increasing risk of not succeeding in life and increasing risk of delinquent behavior. These individuals also encounter financial, legal, social, educational, emotional and/or health problems and may have significant difficulties growing into adults who are responsible citizens, productive workers, involved members of communities, and good parents (White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, 2003, p. 123).

Recreation, Youth Programming, and After-School Programs

Recreation is an essential experience that youth, teens, and adults should continually engage in to achieve various abilities. Gray and Greben (1974) explained that

> Recreation is an emotional condition with an individual human being that flows from a feeling of well-being and self-satisfaction. It is characterized by feelings of mastery, achievement, exhilaration, acceptance, success, personal worth, and pleasure. It reinforces a positive self-image. Recreation is a response to aesthetic experience, achievement of personal goals, or positive feedback from others. It is independent of activity, leisure, or social acceptance. (p. 26)

This excerpt truly suggests how the concept of recreation is perceived and how people feel when they become engaged in an activity.

Hurtes et al., (2000) and Green et al., (2000) suggest that resiliency can be developed through outcome-based recreation programs that have been specifically designed to educate youth and prepare them for their future. This will in turn increase

their social skills, build their life skills, and develop many other aspects that will turn them into successful adults.

Importance of Role Models

Adults often over regulate the behavior of young people by doing "for" them rather than "with" them, which leads to dependence and a self-fulfilling image of young people as being apathetic or only being motivated by external factors (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000). This is important to point out because it is crucial that children and adolescents are allowed to take initiative and think on their own without input from adults all the time. By giving children the opportunity to process and think about situations on their own, they are allowed to build their individuality and independent skills. Wright (1999), suggests that mentors have to compete against numerous negative influences (e.g., television, advertising and peers), so it is important that they are persistent and patient (p. 86). The effects that a mentor can have on a mentee are endless.

Although mentors have the opportunity to make incredible changes in the lives of the youth they assist, it is important that they are taught the proper ways in which they need to perform, interact, and model behaviors. Essentially, mentors interact directly with the young adults and they have to take the time to make sure that they are accurately teaching the traits and acting responsibly because "monkey see, monkey do," youth are more likely to model the behaviors they see. Furthermore, what a mentor does is just as important as what they say; behavior should be used to promote learning and positive development in their mentee (Wright, 1999, p. 85). Additionally, the connections and associations that the advocates, directors, and coordinators have within the community

can be used to assist the youth by helping them learn about their community, the programs they can become a part of, and the options they can take in life in order to achieve many of the characteristics, they see in the mentors they work with, that they hope to attain in the future. In order to further engage the sixth grade students in the understanding of all the resiliency traits, debriefing activities and sessions are incorporated.

Researchers have found that within adventure-based recreation programs, the use of a processing component is crucial (Gass, 1993a; 1993b; Knapp, 1993; Nadler & Luckner, 1992). As such, any program that incorporates a number of recreational and adventure-based activities should have a debriefing be embraced to assist in the comprehension of each activity and "lessons learned." A debriefing component should be incorporated after each and every activity in order to thoroughly understand the activity, concepts conveyed, and actions that occurred throughout the activity. This process is done to help youths understand and relate the activity to their daily lives, beliefs, and capabilities. Facilitating an activity and having students participate is important, but the true benefit comes through the use of debriefing tools and activities. Additionally, Witman (1993) found that the use of processing (e.g., talking about their experience) was more meaningful, to adolescents, than the actual participation in the activity. This processing segment is very beneficial and could be a deciding factor of whether youths truly understand and value what they are being taught in developmental or intervention based programming.

Gender

As girls and boys go from childhood to adulthood they face a variety of factors and experiences that can alter the ways in which they discover who they are, what interests them, what they want to do in life, and what they have to do to get there. There are biological differences known between boys and girls and how they both face different challenges based on the constructs of society. Some aspects of society that often alter the ways in which boys and girls participate in everyday life, is the outlook on expected gender roles and the ways in which an individual is suppose to act, based on the "norm." Interestingly, Henderson (2005) suggested social contradictions that exist even though North American societies "allow" females to pursue any career, interest, or activity they would like. Those include:

> Girls who are intelligent, who may be perceived as frigid; girls perceived as nurturing may also be perceived as having no needs; girls perceived as strong who might be equated to being masculine; and girls who are assertive who might be considered overbearing or aggressive (in Witt & Caldwell, 2005, p. 408).

Negative social contradictions, such as the ones listed above, clarify that one's gender, as a psychological and cultural term, signifies different meanings in our society (Witt & Caldwell, 2005).

Fredricks and Eccles (2006) conducted a study to determine the relationship between the participation in extracurricular activities and developmental outcomes in adolescents and youth. They found most of the effects of extracurricular participation were generalizable across race and gender. Additionally, they discovered that athletic participation predicted lower externalizing behavior for boys only. They also suggested

future studies to research the effect of a structured activity setting to analyze whether or not it would be more useful for boys than for girls, as they found that athletics are set up in this way to decrease externalizing behaviors.

However, although boys grow up with challenges and issues that they must face, their journey through life is not as tough as their counterpart. Boys have to reach a certain status and maturity to come into adolescence and adulthood but it is not as difficult to attain as males are the "dominant" gender in North American culture. Because men hold a certain prestige in life, they are often seen as having power, which in turn downgrades the abilities that women possess.

Smale and Shaw (2004) found that when girls, in comparison to boys, are within the adolescent stage, they do not participate in sports and vigorous physical activity. This is due to a number of circumstances and issues including lack of time, money, resources, interest, and interestingly, an increase in peer influence. At this stage of development, youth are in the process of trying to figure out who they are and their true feelings about an activity or program are often ignored because of peer pressure and how they think others will perceive them.

Gender differences have been found to affect the benefits received from participating in after-school or youth programs. In a study by Barnett (2008), 216 sixth-grade youth were examined to determine what influenced youth to participate and for their parents to enroll them in different types of programs. The study found that histories of extracurricular activity participation, parental characteristics (e.g., mother and father working hours, occupational status, educational level), family characteristics (e.g., parent in home, siblings, income), and relationships with individuals (e.g., gender, preschool

experience) predicted youth involvement. Results showed a significantly higher difference in the participation of extracurricular activities in boys than in girls, as well as a greater extent of participation across their childhood. Subsequently, based on participation rates, differences concerning benefits derived between boys and girls can be expected. One of the aspects that are being sought within this concept is the issue of resiliency.

Resiliency Theory

Resiliency is a characteristic that is useful in various ways, but has truly been found successful when it is attained as a building tool to make a well-rounded and competent individual. It has been described as the ability to "bounce back" from any situation that is thrown one's way (Resiliency In Action, Inc., 2004). Resiliency helps youth to establish a better sense of overall comprehension in various attributes and skills that they possess. Benard (1993) defined four specific qualities that are found within resilient youth: social competence, problem-solving skills, autonomy and a sense of purpose. It is important for these skills to be learned, developed, and explored early in life while engaged in peer relationships to increase its overall essential concepts and attainment within the community. Resiliency theory suggests that increasing children's ability to use beneficial coping mechanisms, to respond to adversity, will greatly benefit their overall well-being and future lifestyles. Results show that youth programs are more effective when they integrate multiple domains of family, school and community and focus on increasing competence and skills, rather than reducing existing negative behaviors (Browne, Gafni, Roberts, Byrne, & Majumdar, 2004).

A longitudinal study was conducted for 32 years by Werner and Smith (1982) to explore why some children from the same community and some from the same household "made it" in life and some did not. This study was conducted in 1982, 1992, and 2001 with 698 infants who were born in 1955, in Kauai, Hawaii. They found throughout the study that one third of the sample was exposed to at least four familial risk factors before they reached the age of two. The risk factors included: poverty, prenatal health problems, congenital handicaps, low parent education, familial alcoholism, violence, instability/discord, and mental illness. Werner and Smith found that two-thirds of the group who were high risk and showcased at least four familial risk factors also exhibited problem behaviors. Furthermore, the researchers found that with the use of resiliency, five-sixths of the high risk participants bounced back from the problem behaviors they were exhibiting. Illustrating that resiliency was a dynamic construct that could be learned and developed.

In a more recent study, Benard (2004) reported her findings on resiliency and youth. Interestingly, the Positive Youth Development (PYD) movement is paralleled by Benard's viewpoint of resiliency. The ways in which Benard's conception of resiliency matches the PYD is through the way in which the personal strengths of individuals versus what needs to be "fixed." The exploration of the resiliency theory and the positive impact among disadvantage youth has increase over the past five years (Allen, Cox, & Cooper, 2005).

PYD began in hopes to address certain issues and concerns that were faced with the development and support for youth activities and programs. The Positive Youth Development Project began in 1996 with the Department of Health and Human Services,

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). These associations awarded a grant to the Social Development Research Group (SDRG) at the University of Washington to examine and document the existing programs focused towards positive youth development. Since the 1950s an effort has been made to increase the support and acknowledgement of young adults as well as research regarding how important it is to teach youth ways to become successful, caring adults. As years have passed, preventative efforts have been taken to lower health, environmental, and behavioral problems that youth face as they grow into adulthood. Today, this project continues to grow as society is presenting more choices and challenges that shape the future of youth and their ability to succeed (Catalano et al., 1998). Programs that incorporate positive youth development and resiliency together, can achieve huge advances in research, programs, and activities developed for youth.

Resiliency

Resiliency is defined as the ability of an individual to return to a state of common sense and equilibrium from some adversarial situation they may have encountered. This is an important characteristic for adolescents to learn and use throughout their life in order to better cope with the situations that they are faced with. It is important that research is conducted on the impact of experiences on individual resiliency. The current study is not the first to measure the effects of resiliency, nor the use of a scale in recreation settings.

In a study by Hollister et al., (2001), resiliency was examined to determine its effects on adolescent aggression. Garmezy, Masten, and Tellegen (1984) and others

(Brook, Brook, Gordon, Whiteman, & Cohen, 1990; Masten et al., 1988; Moran & Eckenrode, 1992; Rutter, 1985; Wolin & Wolin, 1995) proposed four models of resiliency: the compensatory model, the risk-protective model, the protective-protective model, and the challenge model. Each model offers different explanations for the relationship between risk and protective factors in predicting behavior. These models have not been previously applied to studying youth aggression. A description of each model is included within the following paragraphs (Hollister et al., 2001):

> The *compensatory model* simply states that risk factors and protective factors combine additively to predict outcomes. For example, a child exposed to violence is more likely to become aggressive, and a child with high self-esteem is less likely to become aggressive. Each variable has a direct and independent effect on the outcome (Sugland, Zalsow, & Winquist-Nord, 1993).
>
> The *risk-protective model* is an interaction model. It proposes that the strength of the relationship between risk and outcome will depend on the presence of protective factors and that the presence of protective factors weakens the relationship between risk and outcome. For example, this model predicts that the relationship between exposure to violence and the use of aggression is weaker among adolescents with higher self-esteem than it is for those with lower self-esteem.
>
> The *protective-protective model* is also an interaction model. It is similar to the risk-protective model in that it posits that the presence of a protective factor weakens the relationship between risk and outcome. But, it also posits that the strength of the relationship between risk and outcome will decrease with each

additional protective factor. For example, the protective-protective model suggests that the presence of a close bond with an adult, combined with high-self esteem reduces the association between exposure to violence and the use of aggression more than would either protective factor alone.

The fourth model of resiliency, the *challenge model,* proposes a curvilinear relationship between risk and outcome. In this model, a certain amount of risk actually reduces the likelihood of a negative outcome. The assumption that protective factors are stimulated by low levels of risk underlies this model. When an individual successfully copes with risk, his repertoire of protective factors is stimulated and strengthened, thus preventing expression of the negative outcome despite exposure to risk (Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992; Pollard, 1989; Rutter, 1987; Sugland et al., 1993). Rutter (1987) contends that protection lies in successful engagement with risk, and he argues that the "steeling" effect of stress enhances coping ability (1985). Above a certain level of risk, however, the negative outcome normally associated with the risk does occur (Werner, 1989a). The challenge model also predicts that no exposure to risk may lead to higher levels of problem behavior than does a small amount of exposure to risk. This is because individuals who have not been challenged by low levels of risk may be more vulnerable to participating in problem behaviors. Thus, the relationship between risk and outcome is curvilinear: A small amount of risk does not result in aggressive behavior, but if no challenge has been presented to the individual, or if exposure to violence increases beyond a given point, the likelihood of an aggressive outcome increases (pp. 446-448).

Five studies utilizing scales for measuring resiliency or protective factors were found in the literature. Pierce and Shields (1998) conducted a study with a community comprised of five neighborhoods called the United Church Neighborhood Houses (UCNH) within the center of a Midwestern city. Their program, "Be a Star" began due to the high crime, high rates of abuse and neglect towards children, and a high school dropout rate of 52% within the neighborhood (Patton, 1991). A quasi-experimental design was used where half of the groups were treatment groups and the other half was a comparison group. The subjects attended that after-school session once a week for 90 minutes from September to May during the 1994-1995 school year. Pierce and Shields (1998) documented that the average dosage per child was 33.5 hours or 2007 minutes out of an average of 22.3 sessions. The population that was evaluated was from one of the five participating centers which had almost all (96%) African Americans in its sample, the participants lived in St. Louis. Three instruments were utilized in this study; the Revised Protective Factors Index (RPFI), which was given to the 9-12 age groups, the Revised Cultural Awareness Test, and the "Draw a Person" test which were given to the 5-8 age groups. These instruments focused on self-concept, self-control, family bonding, positive outlook, confidence, attitudes towards drugs, pro-social norms, and other factors that they dealt with on a daily basis.

Pierce and Shields found that twelve of the sixteen subscales of the RPFI showcased significant differences at the .05 probability level or better. Furthermore, the knowledge-based test for the 5-6 age group disclosed only two significant differences between treatment and comparison groups. Additionally,

the authors noted that after the third year of the project being run, immense positive benefits were found for the older children.

The Resilience Scale (RS), which was used and developed by Wagnild and Young (1993), consisted of 25 items and was also initially evaluated by Wagnild and Young (1993). The RS was used to assess positive correlations with adaptational outcomes (e.g., physical health, morale, and life satisfaction with an intervention of resiliency. This study found the Resilience Scale (RS) to be reliable and valid in its measure of resiliency.

Ewert and Yoshino (2008) used a modified version of the Resilience Scale to measure the use and outcome of resiliency in a three-week adventure-based expedition. Within the study there were a total of 71 college students, enrolled as recreation majors, who were given the scale to assess their level of individual resilience. That instrument encompassed 37 items on a 100-point scale where the participants could agree or disagree with each statement.

A third scale was created by Mothner (2001) as a tool to gather information and deliberations on problems associated with resiliency. The instrument was called the Resiliency-Values Personal Profile (RVPP) and was empirically tested throughout the study.

The Resiliency Scales for Children and Adolescents (RSCA) was used to compare personal resiliency among children and adolescents (Prince-Embury & Courville 2008). A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in the study and revealed that the three-factor model is a better fit than the one- or two-factor models for the normative sample. These findings lend support to the construct validity of the RSCA. The study suggests

that the three-factor model be used to relate aspects of resiliency in children and adolescents for the purpose of clinical intervention.

The fifth instrument found in the literature, the Shortened Protective Factor Scale, was developed and piloted by Witt et al., (1996). This questionnaire has 30 statements that relate to resilience domains and protective factors researched previously by Jessor (1993). The study revealed that previous studies had demonstrated that the Shortened Protective Factor Scale is a reliable and valid measure of protective factors (Green et al., 2000). The instrument contains demographic questions within the concluding part of the scale (Bloemhoff, 2006).

The sixth and last scale found in the literature and also used in this study was the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP). The RASP was developed by recreation researchers to measure the affects of resiliency on recreational-based activities.

The RASP was developed in a study focused on recreation and was administered by Allen, Cox, and Cooper (2006). The study was developed for disadvantaged youth to determine the effects of resiliency within a day camp setting. The camp ran for eight weeks for eight-and-a-half hours a day, five days a week (Monday through Friday). The program was ran by a certified school district teacher and two full-time staff members along with three part-time staff members, two junior leaders, and four volunteers. After the RASP was administered and analyzed the authors found a significant difference from pre-test to post-test in comparison to established day camps that were being run.

Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP)

The instrument used for the current study is the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile which was conceptualized by Hurtes (1999) and was used to measure the seven

resiliency traits that were created by Wolin and Wolin (1993). This instrument was given to the participants within the study, twice throughout the school year and they were labeled Pre-test (Time 1) and Post-test (Time 2). The administrators of the instrument were the Co-Directors and Graduate Assistants who worked directly on the establishment and facilitation of the program.

Wolin and Wolin (1993) explained the importance of incorporating the components/skills of resiliency into activities, programs, and situations in order to build an overall positive attitude and well-being. The seven components/skills that make up resiliency are Insight, Independence, Relationships, Initiative, Creativity, Humor, and Values Orientation. Intricate descriptions from Hill, Gómez, and Jeppesen (2007) of each of the seven skills are included in the following paragraphs.

Insight. Fundamentally, insight is defined as "the mental habit of asking searching questions and giving honest answers" (Wolin & Wolin, 1993, p. 67). This key concept is useful within one's life to ensure the ability to look into situations with a watchful eye and to try and understand the meaning and reasoning behind why things are happening in the way that they are.

Independence. The concept of independence occurs when an individual achieves the ability to think on his or her own, to be confident in his or her beliefs, and to fully understand and find what it is that makes them themselves. Independence is not always easily achieved, but it is an essential concept because it challenges youths to be themselves, and not feel the need to rely on others for achievement.

Relationships. A relationship is a bond established between the adolescent youth and others, whether it is for the physical items they like or dislike, the atmosphere they

are in, or the concepts they believe in. The connection that is achieved between two people is essential to shape resilient individuals because adolescents know and feel that the relationships they have with certain individuals can either help them or bring them down. For many of the youth in programs, the relationship that is achieved between them, the advocates, and their peers is incredible because it affords them an opportunity to interact with people who can help or assist them in their time of need.

Initiative. Initiative refers to the inner ability of an individual to stand on his own two feet, even if he or she is alone in the situation, and chooses to participate in an activity, or becomes involved in a situation on his or her own, without the encouragement from others. The importance of attaining this skill during the adolescent stage is crucial, as it is their ability to leave their comfort zone and participate in various activities without the influence of another's perspectives.

Creativity. Creativity provides "safe harbors of the imagination where you can refuge and rearrange the details of your life to your own pleasing" (Wolin & Wolin, 1993, p. 163). The ability to brainstorm new ideas and "think outside of the box" is distinctive because it allows youths to develop new ideas and concepts. When youths are given the ability to be creative and develop new things, they open the door to attaining the ability to be themselves and express their inner thoughts.

Humor. This skill focuses on the concept of how "good" laughter and enjoyment can be a positive trait in its ability to make someone feel comfortable, involved, and stress-free. Humor has the ability to make people feel as though time is standing still because they do not have to think about the "bad" things that are happening around them; instead they get a chance to eliminate negative thoughts and feelings that they have.

Values orientation. Values Orientation is an internally driven force that helps to distinguish between right and wrong. It is important for youths to learn and understand this trait as it assists them in making decisions based on their inner feelings on whether or not they believe it would be good or bad for them to be involved. The ability to make decisions, and provide insight into what they believe is the right thing to do, helps to make youth resilient based on their ability to display appropriate behavior.

The next chapter contains the approach to research that was undertaken, the instruments used, as well as a description of the after-school utilized in the current study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This section will discuss and examine the procedures used to test the hypotheses discussed in Chapter I. Additionally, the program components, the instrumentation, the data collection procedures, and other factors involved in the design of the study will be discussed.

Research Design

The design of the study is aimed to gather information through the use of a pre and post test. In the study, there was no randomization or control group used to select the participants, enabling a quasi-experimental design to be utilized. Due to the overall components of the program, a convenience sample was used. The intervention for the study was an after-school, resiliency-based, recreation program called CARE NOW (Character and Resiliency Education with Norfolk Public School and Old Dominion University).

Subjects

The focus of CARE NOW is on sixth grade students in order to enhance the benefits that they can achieve from being the only grade level in the program. It is also important to note that by catering to the sixth graders only, the program has a chance of instilling values and characteristics as soon as they begin junior high school and are engaged by new people and issues that could arise as they enter the sixth grade. The

subjects were students at Blair Middle School which is located within the Norfolk City Public Schools in Norfolk, VA.

The current grade sizes for the school is as follows: sixth grade- 366 Students, seventh grade- 355 students, eighth grade- 370 students and the demographics are 2.7% Latino, 22.9% White, 65.5% Black, and 3.6% Asian (Muni Net Guide, 2009, ¶ 1). All sixth grade students at Blair Middle School from Norfolk Public Schools District in Virginia were invited to participate in this study. Families whose children attended the middle school represented varied socioeconomic levels. In order to obtain parental consent, various approved methods were taken which included information sessions at Open House, information on the school website, word of mouth, flyers, the school paper, and automated telephone messages. The parents were able to receive information on this program directly from the on-site coordinator at any time. There were 366 possible sixth grade students that could participate in the study. The number of surveys completed during the pre test was 94 and the number of surveys completed during both the pre and post test was 198. Of the data collected, 43% of the surveys could not be used due to conflicting or incomplete data. The mean age of the students in the sample was 11 years of age. The distribution of males (46.5%) was higher compared to the distribution of females (35.9%).

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP), which consists of a 40-item questionnaire that was created to measure specific aspects of resiliency. There are two versions of the scale (child and parent). Items in the questionnaire are scored on a 6-point Likert scale, which measured from "1," for strongly

disagree to "6," for strongly agree. The RASP includes a listing of various questions that pertain to all the resiliency traits that CARE NOW teaches. An example of one of the 40 questions asked in the questionnaire is, "I am good at keeping friendships going." This question pertains to the resiliency trait of relationships. The parent version is identical except each statement is prefaced by, "My child." It is important to note that there is a pre- and post-test given during the program to determine the effectiveness of resiliency education both in the in-school and after-school sessions. The 40-item RASP questionnaire was administered by the Co-directors and Graduate Advocates of both the in and after-school components on the first day of the two-day collection of data.

The data were cross referenced with the after-school program attendance sheets to filter out the data sets of the students who did not attend the after-school portion of the program. The data were also filtered for those last four numbers of the students' phone numbers that did not have a pre-test and post-test match.

Procedure

Students were surveyed twice during the school year, utilizing the RASP. The RASP was administered by Old Dominion University (ODU) faculty. Each of the assessments took no longer than 30 minutes to complete. The pre test was given during the sixth grade math classes, prior to the use of any interventions, to those sixth grade students whose parents returned a signed consent form (see Appendix A). Importantly, the participants in the program did not have to have a signed consent form to attend any component of the CARE NOW after-school program or receive any intervention procedures that could be attained through activities in the after-school component. The post test was then administered after the last after-school intervention program during

every sixth grade math class that had students who were eligible to participate. In order to attain assessments from all the sixth graders who agreed to participate, a roster highlighting each child and separated by each class was made and referred to. Additionally, none of the surveys included student names and were labeled by the last four digits of students' telephone number for data entry.

ODU representatives of the program were given permission to utilize the first half of a math class, prior to the start of the program, to administer the RASP to the six graders with completed consent forms. The ODU representatives helped the students understand the questions asked, but did not help the students answer the questions. The math teachers also allowed the ODU representatives to use a day of their classes to administer the RASP at the end of the year-long program.

Prior to the start of CARE NOW, a schedule was made between the in-school and after-school portions of the program in order to teach and saturate the minds of the sixth graders through instructional and recreational activities. When the students arrived at the after-school portion of CARE NOW, they were given a snack and were divided into five groups, with three to four advocates per group.

The after-school program begins with an overview of Challenge by Choice and Full Value Contract. Challenge by Choice was designed to allow an individual the choice of whether or not to participate in any given activity (i.e., they are "challenged" to participate once they hear about the activity). All participation by the students was voluntary to ensure that they achieve the concepts reviewed in the in-class portion, and reflected in the after-school recreation activities via recreation programming. A Full

Value Contract is a concept that values everyone's participation and expects them to engage in the activity as they have willingly agreed to participate.

Next, everyone participates in a Large Group activity reflecting the resiliency trait of the week. This allows everyone to participate and perform as a group. After the large group activity, the students revert back to their five groups and begin participating in as many of the six activities as their group can get through. They have fifty minutes to complete these six activities (see Appendix F). Most importantly, at the end of each activity, the sixth grade students were debriefed by the Advocates to have them reflect on the resiliency trait focused on in the recreation activity.

Program Components

A quality program that drives to instill the skills and traits that make up a resilient individual has benefits that are often devalued due to lack of relationships. The importance of strong and supportive relationships is overlooked because it takes more time and commitment to achieve these bonds. This often occurs due to a general failure of realizing the importance of educating youth prior to their being affected by outside forces in their development towards adulthood. In the fall of 2008, CARE NOW was created in an effort to "fight the war" against youth disengagement and to acknowledge the growing frustrations and limitations (i.e., latchkey kids, lack of resources, delinquency) resulting from negative impacts that underprivileged youth encounter, by helping to develop youth involvement through activities. CARE NOW was developed by Old Dominion University (located in Norfolk, VA) and Blair Middle School (a public school within the Norfolk Public Schools District). The after-school component specifically targeted the resiliency traits developed by Wolin & Wolin (1993). The

aspect of this after-school program that differentiates it from others is the fact that it incorporates an in-school learning component and an after-school actualizing and reflecting component, and utilizes a theory-based approach to programming within its recreation foundation. For the purposes of this study focus is primary placed on the after-school component and its influence on resiliency. CARE NOW is a collaborative effort between two departments at Old Dominion University (the Recreation and Tourism Studies program and the Counseling program) and the staff at the middle school in order to create a successful and beneficial environment for both the participants (middle schoolers) and those providing the services (undergraduate students). Both of these departments tailored instructional techniques and activities to instill important aspects of resiliency into the sixth grade students during the in-school and after-school sessions. The Counseling Department taught the sixth grade students on Mondays and Wednesdays in either the beginning or end of their math class. The students were taught the resiliency traits that will help to shape their lives and guide them towards becoming successful adults in the future. The after-school portion was held on Tuesdays and Thursdays for sixth grade students and began immediately after school. During the after-school program the students were taught and presented various activities that relate to the resiliency trait of the week.

Advocates

Within the CARE NOW program, the undergraduate and graduate students are referred to as Advocates, as they mentor the students, act as positive role models, and show them appropriate ways to be mature, caring, and sensitive adults. The Advocates were undergraduate and graduate Old Dominion University students within the

Recreation and Tourism Studies Department. The sixth grade students get a chance to interact with a variety of Advocates who showcase various talents, abilities, and backgrounds. Within the program, the advocates consist of college students between the ages of 18-40 within the major studies of Recreation, Tourism Management, and Therapeutic Recreation.

After-School & Out-of-School Programs

Many young adults find it increasingly difficult to find and pursue those activities that could hold great value and promise in their lives due to the lack of opportunities for students, especially immediately following the time they leave school grounds. The program that this reading revolves around is an after-school program that was created in the summer of 2008 that included a seamless approach between itself and the in-school program within Blair Middle School and Old Dominion University. The program is named CARE NOW which stands for Character and Resiliency Education between Norfolk Public Schools and Old Dominion University.

The After-school program involves one of the Co-Directors of CARE NOW, a graduate assistant who is the Assistant Coordinator, between one and four Graduate Advocates, and between 35-50 Advocates. An advocate is an Old Dominion Undergraduate Student who is taking either the Youth Development through Recreation Course (RTS 301), the Recreation Facilitation Course (RTS 302), or graduate students taking an Independent Study in Recreation (RTS 595). These students are taught a variety of learning styles and activities that encompass the seven resiliency traits by Wolin and Wolin which they develop and practice in class prior to reenacting the activities with the students to instill the resiliency traits through fun and creative

activities. The activities are developed into a Daily Activity Plan where the students have to design activities in order to emphasize the resiliency traits that they have previously learned within the In-school portion. Advocates (undergraduate students) developed daily activity plans go through a sequencing form where activities are tailored around a particular resiliency trait, that the undergraduate students have been previously assigned to, then they have to sequence the activities in order from high energy and low skill; to moderate energy and moderate skill; to low energy and high skill, in order to successfully teach the students the traits in a productive way (see Appendix F). The activities are organized in this way because the middle school students arrive directly from school, where they have been sitting in a class for most of the day, to the CARE NOW after-school program where the advocates, staff and participants of the program like to start off with high energy and plenty of fun.

Programming Procedures

Faculty and staff (primarily a lecturer and a graduate assistant) taught the activities, procedures, and facilitation methods to Old Dominion University undergraduate students in two classes that focused on programming interventions tailored towards the CARE NOW program. Youth Development through Recreation (RTS 301) was taught in the fall, and Recreation Facilitation (RTS 302) was taught in the spring and they both incorporated service based learning components where the students had to explore research, theory, practice, and techniques of structuring recreation experiences for youth. Both classes corresponded to the academic year for the sixth grade students. Undergraduate students developed Daily Activity Plans (DAPs) that included between six and eight activities in which the sixth grade students participated in when they attended

the after-school component. Two DAPs were made for each session of the after-school program. Each DAP focused around one character trait and one resiliency trait discussed in the in-school portion of CARE NOW, particularly those that they were currently learning during the in-school component that week. The sixth graders were divided into five groups and within those groups, two focused around Plan A (Groups 1 &2) and three focused around Plan B (Groups 3, 4, & 5) on Tuesdays. The plans were switched and separated in this manner in order to give all the sixth grade students the same activities found in both days of CARE NOW. (i.e., Plan A (Groups 3, 4, & 5) & Plan B (Groups 1 & 2) on Thursdays).

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted through t-tests, factor analyses, and basic descriptive statistics. The RASP will be evaluated in terms of its construct validity and reliability in order to test if it is a reliable construct to measure resiliency. The pre- and post-test data were analyzed using *t*-tests with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 17.0. A *p*-value of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance among the variables. Data were collected and entered into SPSS by a graduate student from the Department of Educational Counseling and Instruction at ODU. The following include a rationale for the use of t-tests and factor analysis.

Factor analysis. Factor analysis is appropriate for the reduction of data into a manageable (composite) item or to assess a construct (factor/dimension) (Heiman, 2006). Summated scales are only valid to the extent that the items measure one and only one construct. This attribute is formally recognized in the factor analytic literature as unidimensionality (Anderson & Gerbing, 1982, 1988; Cook & Campbell, 1979).

Unidimensionality, therefore, is defined as the existence of a latent trait or construct underlying a set of measures. The unidimensionality of each construct must be assessed prior to using the construct in subsequent analyses (Hunter, Gerbing, & Boster, 1982). Unidimensionality is assessed via the two modalities of internal consistency and external consistency or parallelism (Hunter & Gerbing, 1982; Spearman, 1904). While the term "consistency" is often associated with the issue of reliability, a theoretical, historical, and mathematical relationship ties the concept to validity (Ghisselli, 1964). Prior to exploring any relationships in the data, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) with Varimax Rotation were performed on the RASP and the Seven Resiliency Traits to determine if the variables within the RASP constructs (i.e., the constructs representing each of the hypothesized resiliency traits) were valid and reliable.

Validity and reliability. Conceptually, validity is defined as the extent that items measure *what* they purport to measure, and nothing else (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & van Heerden, 2004). An item is reliable to the extent that it measures *whatever* it measures consistently (Dyer, 1995; Rust & Golombok, 1989). These definitions are given to draw the reader's attention to a particular relationship between reliability and validity. *What* is measured is always an issue of validity and it is accounted for in both reliability and validity measures (Ghisselli, 1964; Thurstone, 1935; Tryon, 1957; Tryon & Bailey, 1970). In the factor analytic literature, the validity and reliability of each item can be assessed with communalities (Nunnally, 1967; Thurstone, 1935).

Communalities/factor loadings. Nunnally (1967), Thurstone (1935), and Hunter (1980) noted that communalities in factor analysis are *item reliabilities* that represent how much of the underlying common factor variance is accounted for by each item.

Mathematically, the communality (h^2) is equal to the squared factor loading. Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) concluded that factors are well defined when they have factor loadings of .60 or higher. Communalities and factor loadings are the parameters that need to be estimated to utilize the cluster analytic approach to factor analysis. Additionally, "each communality equals the variance explained by the hypothetical factor" (Nunnally, p. 350).

T-test (dependent samples). The dependent samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores between pre and post tests. This test is appropriate when comparing two groups and their respective means, and there is a relationship between the two groups. In this study there is a relationship between pre and post test scores, as the RASP was taken by the same student at two different time periods.

T-test (independent samples). The independent samples t-test was used to compare the mean scores between boys and girls. This test is appropriate when comparing two groups and their respective means, and there is not a relationship between the two groups. In this study there is no relationship between being a boy and being a girl, and the associated test scores from the RASP for each group.

The next chapter will examine the data found through analyses of attendance, gender, resiliency, and the RASP.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results on the use of resiliency in an after-school program, CARE NOW. The chapter is divided into descriptive statistics, factor and reliability analyses, means of constructs by gender, and hypotheses testing. The comparison in means of two groups was found by running *t*-tests, using a *p*-value of 0.05 or less as the criterion for significance. Included below is a description of the sample, preliminary analyses, research question analyses, and a summary of the findings

Descriptive statistics

The open after-school program was accessible to every one of the approximately 366 sixth graders at a middle school in Norfolk, VA, of which 99 were selected for the study (36% attended both components of CARE NOW and 64% did not attend the after-school component). The full database (99 participants) was utilized for the factor analyses, and to assess general patterns. After ensuring that the "last four" digits were matched and participants answered the RASP at *either* the pre or post test time (*not matched*), the total number of participants in this study was 56, giving this study a 27% response rate. Of the 56 participants, there was an equal (50%) representation with respect to gender. Of the 56 students, those that answered *both* the pre and post test RASPs (*matched*) numbered 20 (35.7%), all of whom were boys. Lastly, those participants who took the pre and post test, had both telephone numbers for each time period and attended the after-school portion of CARE NOW, only yielded six (6) total participants (all boys).

The sample was collected twice throughout the 2008-2009 School Year, first at the beginning of Old Dominion University's Fall Semester in September 2008 and the second sample was collected at the end of Old Dominion University's Spring Semester in May 2009.

Factor and Reliability Analyses of RASP Traits

Prior to exploring any relationships in the data, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) with Varimax Rotation were performed to determine if the variables within the RASP constructs (i.e., the constructs representing each of the hypothesized resiliency traits, see Table 1) were valid and reliable. The sampling adequacy was evaluated by running the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure (adequate at >0.60) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (significant at $p<0.05$) on each of the construct. Each construct, which displayed appropriate values of KMO and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was accepted as meeting the minimum requirements for sampling. Once validity of the items was assessed, they were subjected to a reliability analysis (Chronbach's alpha >0.60). On this basis, some items would be removed from the constructs during the CFA (validity check), while others would be removed during the reliability analysis to ensure a stronger (more reliable) scaled variable (construct).

Items which exhibited factor loadings greater than 0.60 for each of the constructs were retained as measures of separate constructs. In Table 2, factor loadings are only reported for items passing both validity and reliability checks.

RASP components. Table 1 indicates that there were 40 items which were used to measure seven dimensions/subscales (i.e., insight, creativity, relationships, initiative, humor, independence, and values orientation). Because the RASP was conceptualized as

a multidimensional measure of resiliency (Hurtes, 1999; Hurtes & Allen, 2001; Wolin & Wolin, 1993), the approach taken for this analysis involved a validity "check." The first check was to confirm the internal validity of the subscales (dimensions) of the RASP.

Table 1. *RASP- Original 40 Items*

Items	M	SD
Items for the Creativity Trait (CRET)		
CRE 1. I can imagine the consequence of my actions	4.94	1.19
CRE 2. I come up with new ways to handle difficult decisions	4.65	1.31
CRE 3. I come up with different ways to let out my feelings	4.57	1.44
CRE 4. I can entertain myself	4.80	1.54
Items for the Insight Trait (INST)		
INS 1. I learn from my mistakes	5.02	1.21
INS 2. I notice small changes in facial expressions	4.37	1.42
INS 3. I know when I am good at something	5.46	0.86
INS 4. I can change my behavior to match the situation	5.01	1.20
INS 5. I can tell if it was my fault when something goes wrong	4.89	1.41
INS 6. I can sense when someone is not telling the truth	4.80	1.44
INS 7. I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her	5.05	1.26
Items for the Humor Trait (HUM)		
HUM 1. I use my sense of humor to make it easier to deal with tough situations	4.66	1.47
HUM 2. I look for the "lighter side" of tough situations	4.65	1.37
HUM 3. I use laughter to help me deal with stress	5.07	1.41
HUM 4. I can cheer myself up when in a bad mood	3.99	1.76
Items for the Independence Trait (IND)		
IND 1. I can deal with whatever comes in the future	4.61	1.26
IND 2. I say "no" to things that I don't want to do	4.88	1.44
IND 3. I know it's OK if I don't see things the way other people do	4.94	1.23
IND 4. I know it's OK if some people don't like me	5.14	1.33
IND 5. I am comfortable making my own decisions	5.37	1.06
IND 6. I control my own life	4.87	1.49
IND 7. I avoid situations where I could get into trouble	4.62	1.41
IND 8. I share my ideas and opinions even when they are	4.70	1.40

different from other people's

Items for the Relationship Trait (REL)		
REL1. I have friends who know they can count on me	5.20	1.08
REL 2. I have family who is there when I need them	5.44	1.06
REL 3. I avoid people who could get me into trouble	4.73	1.39
REL 4. I choose my friends carefully	4.82	1.33
REL 5. I am good at keeping friendships going	5.24	1.19
REL 6. I have friends that will back me up	5.51	3.0
REL 7. I can be myself around my friends	5.45	1.10
REL 8. I make friends easily	4.89	1.44
Items for the Initiative Trait (INI)		
INI 1. I try harder the next time after my work is criticized	4.87	1.25
INI 2. I don't let anything stop me from reaching a goal I set for myself	4.83	1.22
INI 3. I can change my surroundings	4.65	1.36
INI 4. I try to figure out things that I don't understand	5.05	1.20
INI 5. I don't give up when something bad happens to me	4.77	1.34
Items for the Values Orientation Trait (VAL)		
VAL 1. I am prepared to deal with consequences of my actions	4.89	1.37
VAL 2. I know lying is unacceptable	5.02	1.33
VAL 3. I try to help others	4.93	1.19
VAL 4. I stand up for what I believe is right	5.23	1.15

Once the validity had been assessed, each subscale was then subjected to a reliability analysis. If the subscale was found to be reliable, then a new "composite variable" was created. Assuming all subscales passed the validity and reliability checks, the composite variables can then be subjected to an overall factor analysis of the RASP construct, with the subscales (composite variables) used as items for the RASP construct. In the following analyses, the subscales will be referred to as "traits." The reported factor loadings and alpha reliability are found in Table 2. The components and validity and reliability assessment of the insight, creativity, relationships, initiative, humor,

Table 2. *RASP – Items after Validity & Reliability Checks*

Items	M	SD	*h*
Items for the Creativity Trait (CRET, α= 0.67)[a]			
CRE 1. I can imagine the consequence of my actions	4.94	1.19	0.68
CRE 2. I come up with new ways to handle difficult decisions	4.65	1.31	0.78
CRE 3. I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings	4.57	1.44	0.72
CRE 4. I can entertain myself	4.80	1.54	0.66
Items for the Insight Trait (INST, α = 0.70)			
INS 1. I learn from my mistakes	5.02	1.21	0.79
INS 2. I notice small changes in facial expressions	4.37	1.42	0.53
INS 3. I know when I am good at something	5.46	0.86	0.66
INS 4. I can change my behavior to match the situation	5.01	1.20	0.56
INS 5. I can tell if it was my fault when something goes wrong	4.89	1.41	0.70
INS 6. I can sense when someone is not telling the truth	4.80	1.44	0.82
INS 7. I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her	5.05	1.26	0.79
Items for the Humor Trait (HUMT, α = 0.65)			
HUM 1. I use my sense of humor to make it easier to deal with tough situations	4.66	1.47	0.69
HUM 2. I look for the "lighter side" of tough situations	4.65	1.37	0.71
HUM 3. I use laughter to help me deal with stress	5.07	1.41	0.67
HUM 4. I can cheer myself up when in a bad mood	3.99	1.76	0.72
Items for the Independence Trait (INDT, α = 0.71)			
IND 3. I know it's OK if I don't see things the way other people do	4.94	1.23	0.75
IND 4. I know it's OK if some people don't like me	5.14	1.33	0.71
IND 5. I am comfortable making my own decisions	5.37	1.06	0.84
IND 6. I control my own life	4.87	1.49	0.78
IND 7. I avoid situations where I could get into trouble	4.62	1.41	0.72
IND 8. I share my ideas and opinions even when they are different from other people's	4.70	1.40	0.61
Items for the Relationship Trait (RELT, α= 0.81)			
REL 1. I have friends who know they can count on me	5.20	1.08	0.69
REL 2. I have family who is there when I need them	5.44	1.06	0.66
REL 3. I avoid people who could get me into trouble	4.73	1.39	0.65

REL 4. I choose my friends carefully	4.82	1.33	0.69
REL 5. I am good at keeping friendships going	5.24	1.19	0.70
REL 7. I can be myself around my friends	5.45	1.10	0.73
REL 8. I make friends easily	4.89	1.44	0.67
Items for the Initiative Trait (INIT, $\alpha = 0.75$)			
INI 1. I try harder the next time after my work is criticized	4.87	1.25	0.70
INI 2. I don't let anything stop me from reaching a goal I set for myself	4.83	1.22	0.72
INI 3. I can change my surroundings	4.65	1.36	0.72
INI 4. I try to figure out things that I don't understand	5.05	1.20	0.71
INI 5. I don't give up when something bad happens to me	4.77	1.34	0.70
Items for the Values Orientation Trait (VALT, $\alpha = 0.69$)			
VAL 1. I am prepared to deal with consequences of my actions	4.89	1.37	0.68
VAL 2. I know lying is unacceptable	5.02	1.33	0.65
VAL 3. I try to help others	4.93	1.19	0.73
VAL 4. I stand up for what I believe is right	5.23	1.15	0.83

independence, and values traits are each discussed in turn. This analysis borrows heavily from Johnston's (2009) unpublished thesis work on the assessment of the RASP, as such, comparisons will be made between the findings in this thesis and Johnston's prior findings where relevant.

Creativity trait (CRET). In the questionnaire, CRET was measured using four items. Initially, a factor analysis was performed. All of the items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as measuring CRET. The factor analysis resulted in a KMO of 0.72, which revealed adequate sampling and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity result ($p = 0.0001$), which confirmed that the items were valid measures of CRET. The items measuring CRET are listed in Table 2, and had factor loadings of 0.66, 0.68, 0.72, and 0.78. A factor loading represents the correlation of the item with the underlying

construct, in this case CRET. Thus, one can see a very strong relationship between the items and the underlying support construct they are measuring.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Chronbach's alpha of 0.67, which was interpreted as a moderate level of reliability that the items consistently measured CRET. In addition, consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability, thus the four items measuring resiliency's creativity trait were retained. Based on sample scores, CRET items provided evidence of validity and reliability.

Insight Trait (INST). The initial factor analysis of the seven items intended to measure the RASP's insight trait resulted in a KMO of 0.75 and a significant result of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). However, the factor loadings component matrix revealed two dimensions of the insight trait. The first dimension of INST was labeled "internally directed insight" or IN-INST, and consisted of four items (INS1, INS3, INS4, and INS5). The second dimension of INST was labeled "externally directed insight" or EX-INST, and consisted of three items (INS2, INS6, and INS7). Although two items (see Table 2) were below the criterion of 0.60 for factor loadings, it was decided to retain the items, unless the reliability would increase with the deletion of these two items. Assuming a two dimensional trait/subscale, the items were assessed for reliability.

A test of reliability resulted in a Chronbach's alpha of 0.70 and therefore suggested a high reliability. The scale reliability did not increase with the deletion of any variable, therefore all items were retained (see Table 2 for respective factor loadings).

The findings on the CRET trait compare favorably to Johnston's (2009) findings, with some minor differences. This study found that all four items measured creativity,

whereas Johnston only found two items measuring CRET (CRE2, CRE3, see Table 2). Additionally, Johnston combined the items found in the CRET and INST dimension into one dimension, based on his external validity check. The external validity check for this study did not warrant this combination, and both the CRET and INST traits were retained as separate constructs. Furthermore, this study confirms a two dimensional INST construct, also noted by Johnston, but deleted in consequent analyses in his study. Lastly, unlike Johnston's study, this study retained all items for both the CRET and the INST scale.

Humor Trait (HUMT). The initial factor analysis of the four items intended to measure the humor trait of the RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.71 and a significant result of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). All items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as being unidimensional on the HUMT construct, with factor loadings measuring 0.67, 0.69, 0.71, and 0.72 (see Table 2).

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Chronbach's alpha of 0.65, which was interpreted as a moderate level of reliability that the items consistently measured HUMT. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability, thus the four items measuring resiliency's humor trait were retained. HUMT items were found to be valid and the scale reliable. Unlike Johnston's (2009) study that found only two items measuring HUMT (HUM1 and HUM3), this study supports the use of all four items.

Independence trait (INDT). The first factor analysis of the eight items included in INDT resulted in a KMO of 0.81 and a significant level of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$), confirming good sampling adequacy and valid factor measures. The factor loadings component matrix, however, demonstrated that there were two dimensions of

INDT. One of the items (i.e., "I can deal with whatever comes in the future") had a factor loading below the critical value of 0.60 (0.54) and was removed from the analysis. Another item ("I can say no to things that I don't want to do") loaded equally on both dimensions of INDT, and was consequently deleted as a case of invalidity.

Similar to the INST construct, the two dimensions also appeared to be internally and externally directed. The first dimension of INDT was labeled "internally directed independence" or IN-INDT, and consisted of two items (IND5 and IND6). The second dimension of INDT was labeled "externally directed independence" or EX-INDT, and consisted of four items (IND3, IND4, INS7, and IND8). Assuming a two dimensional trait/subscale, the items were assessed for reliability.

A reliability analysis was performed on the two dimensional INDT construct. Chronbach's alpha for this analysis was 0.71. The deletion of any additional items did not improve the scale reliability, thus the six items measuring resiliency's independent trait were retained. When comparing these findings to Johnston's (2009) findings, Johnston only found support for a two-item (rather than six items), unidimensional (rather than two dimensions) INDT construct. The two items used in Johnston's study were IND4 and IND8, which in this study only reflects the external dimension of INDT.

Relationship trait (RELT). The initial factor analysis of the RELT items resulted in a KMO value of 0.80 and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). The exploration of the factor loadings component matrix revealed two dimensions. However, the second dimension consisted of only one item (REL6, see Table 1) with a factor loading of 0.93, which indicates that the item is a "stand alone" item, and was removed from the analysis. The removal of this item resulted in an increased KMO of 0.83. All of

the remaining seven items for RELT held with factor loadings ranging from 0.65 to 0.73 (see Table 2).

The Chronbach's alpha for the reliability analysis on RELT was a 0.81, which was interpreted as a high level of reliability that the items measure RELT. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability, thus the seven items measuring resiliency's relationship trait were retained. RELT items were found to be valid and the scale reliable. Similar to Johnston's study, Chronbach's alpha was also 0.81; however, Johnston's RELT construct was composed of three items, while the current study found support for seven items.

Initiative trait (INIT). The initial factor analysis of the INIT items resulted in a KMO value of 0.79 and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). The exploration of the factor loadings component matrix revealed a unidimensional structure. No items were dropped from the analysis (see Table 2), and the items had factor loadings ranging from 0.70 to 0.72. The Chronbach's alpha for the reliability analysis on INIT was a 0.75, which was interpreted as a high level of reliability that the items measure INIT. Deletion of any items would not improve the scale reliability, thus the five items measuring resiliency's initiative trait were retained (see Table 2). Unlike Johnston's (2009) study, items INI4 and INI5 were retained in this study.

Values orientation trait (VALT). The initial factor analysis of the four items intended to measure the values orientation trait of the RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.71 and a significant result of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). All four items in the analysis held with factor loadings ranging from 0.65 to 0.83 (see Table 2).

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Chronbach's alpha of 0.69, which was interpreted as a moderate to high level of reliability that the items consistently measured VALT. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability, thus the four items measuring resiliency's values orientation trait were retained. VALT items were found to be valid and the scale reliable.

Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP). As a final step in the factor analysis, the seven subscales were converted to items (composite measures) measuring the RASP. Factor analysis and reliability analysis were performed on the seven subscale items of the RASP (e.g., items from the INST, CRET, HUMT, INDT, RELT, INIT, and VALT subscales). The initial factor analysis resulted in a KMO value of 0.91 and a significant result ($p = 0.0001$) of the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, which confirmed that all components represented a valid measure of the RASP construct.

It was confirmed that all seven composite items held as measures of the RASP, noting a unidimensional fit with factor loadings ranging from 0.76 to 0.88 (see Table 3). Chronbach's alpha for the RASP was 0.93, and if any of the components were deleted it would not have increased Chronbach's alpha. Thus, all seven components were retained as valid and reliable factor measures of the RASP construct and were summed and averaged to make a RASP "score" for each student at both the pre and post test. Table 3 demonstrates the factor loadings for the subscales/traits and the Chronbach's alpha for the RASP based on the seven traits.

Table 3. *Components of RASP construct (N = 165)*

Items	M	SD	h^b
RASP Construct (RASP, α = 0.93)			
Creativity Trait	4.74	0.97	0.84
Insight Trait	4.94	0.76	0.82
Humor Trait	4.59	1.05	0.76
Independence Trait	4.94	0.85	0.87
Relationship Trait	5.11	0.84	0.85
Initiative Trait	4.83	0.90	0.88
Values Trait	5.02	0.91	0.86
RASP Scores	4.87	0.75	

Means of Constructs by Gender.

Table 4 shows the RASP score means between gender and time taken. For the overall RASP scores, the girls had a higher mean score on the pre test with a score of 4.96, whereas the boys scored a 4.92 average on the pre test. As for the post tests, the girls' mean score was 4.95, and the boys mean score was 4.80. The mean score for both boys and girls dropped from pre to post test. As for the overall sample, the average RASP score for the preliminary testing was 4.89. As for the second testing, the average RASP score was 4.85 resulting in a negative change of 0.04. This compares similarly to Johnston's findings, where the RASP scores also decreased (negative 0.03). However, in both cases there was not a significant difference between pre and post test scores.

Table 4. *Means of RASP Scores by Gender*

Gender	M	SD	*N*
	Pre Test RASP Scores (PRE)		
Boys	4.92	0.87	25
Girls	4.96	0.66	35
Both	4.94	0.76	60
	Post Test RASP Scores (POST)		
Boys	4.80	0.90	50
Girls	4.95	0.49	26
Both	4.87	0.69	76
	Total RASP Scores (TOT)		
Boys	4.84	0.89	75
Girls	4.95	0.59	61
Both	4.90	0.74	136

Comparison of means (two tailed t-test).

The analysis of gender of the after-school program users only, in terms of RASP scores, and individual resiliency traits was not able to be performed due to the fact that only males were represented in the sample who (a) had paired four digit classification, (b) took both the pre and post test RASPs, and (c) attended the after-school component of CARE NOW. Only six students completed all components. In a dependent samples t-test of these six boys who participated in the after-school portion of CARE NOW, there was no difference between pre ($M = 4.36$, SD=0.89) and post (M =4.28, $SD = 0.96$) test scores, with $t\ (5) = 0.34$, $p = 0.74$. Additionally, the subscales were examined to see if there were any differences between pre-post scores on the different resiliency characteristics. There were no significant differences among any of the subscales.

Another t-test (independent samples) was performed to compare the means of the boys and girls who were participants in the CARE NOW program. The data met the assumptions of performing an independent samples t-test, and the *n* of boy respondents (*n*=75) is similar to the *n* for girls (*n*=61). The boys ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 0.88$) were not significantly different in their *overall* RASP scores compared to the girls ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 0.59$), $t\ (134) = -0.88$, $p = 0.38$. Similarly, boys ($M = 4.92$, $SD = 0.87$) were not significantly different in their *pre-test* RASP scores compared to the girls ($M = 4.96$, $SD = 0.66$), $t\ (58) = -0.27$, $p = 0.83$. Lastly, boys ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.90$) were not significantly different in their *post-test* RASP scores compared to the girls ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 0.49$), $t\ (74) = -0.80$, $p = 0.43$. Analyses on the subscales between boys and girls and their respective average scores was also performed and only two subscales were significantly different based upon gender. The first resiliency trait difference between boys ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.89$) and girls ($M = 5.07$, $SD = 0.60$), $t\ (153) = -1.93$, $p = 0.056$ (but within standard error variance), was the *insight trait* for resiliency. The other resiliency trait difference between boys ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.00$) and girls ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 0.49$), $t\ (153) = -2.60$, $p = 0.01$, was the *relationship trait* for resiliency.

Attendance in the After-school Program

Attendance in the after-school program was measured in one of two ways: (a) in a dichotomous manner, either they attended or did not attended; and (b) in a continuous manner (i.e., how many number of times a student attended the after-school program of CARE NOW). The former coding of attendance lends itself to an independent samples t-test, and the latter lends itself to a correlation analysis.

When looking at whether there are differences in RASP scores between participants and non-participants of the after-school program, there was no significant difference between participants ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 0.69$) and non participants of the after-school program ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 0.79$), $t\ (163) = -0.91$, $p = 0.37$. Furthermore, when looking at differences between attendance and non-attendance in the after-school program, there were also no significant differences between the seven resiliency traits/constructs. Additionally, there was no significant correlation between the number of times (frequency of visits) the students participated in the program and their RASP scores ($r = +0.40$, $p = 0.22$), nor in consequent correlations between frequency of participation and the individual seven resiliency traits.

Discussion

The identified RASP dimensions in the present study (CRET, INST, HUMT, INDT, RELT, INIT, and VALT), besides demonstrating clear statistical validity and reliability, also confirm previous research on resiliency, and re-affirms the findings of Johnston (2009). The results of the present study are aligned with previous research on the dimensions of resiliency. As Wolin and Wolin (1985) initially suggested, the seven resiliency traits all measured general resiliency, as operationalized by the RASP (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). Unlike, Johnston's study, which found support for combining the "insight" and "creativity" traits into one trait, evidence in this study suggested that the these two resiliency traits should remain separated. The RASP was confirmed to incorporate the dimensions of insight, creativity, humor, independence, relationships, initiative, and values. Thus, the present study can be regarded as a confirmation of previous research; however, more research is needed to continue to test all the items, as

there were discrepancies between the current study and Johnson's examination. Further analyses could be conducted as well, such as separating the database into pre and post test and comparing the RASP scores using a split-half reliability method, or splitting the data between boys and girls.

Within the RASP, the strongest component in terms of the highest mean was the "relationship" trait. Additionally, the relationship trait also had the highest Chronbach's alpha, noting it was the most consistent measure ($\alpha = 0.81$). Lastly, with respect to the RASP's strongest indicator (factor loading, see Table 3), the "initiative" trait was found to be the strongest indicator of resiliency, as measured by the RASP.

Knowing the positive effects that the relationship and initiative traits have had on the participants are critical in the next steps of programming for the future. As a recreation programmer it is important to continue to acknowledge and encourage the use of these traits as the current study supports their being understood and retained by the sixth graders. The first step is to go through all the activities that were developed for both the relationship and initiative trait and compare them to the others to discover why their resiliency traits were more easily retained. Then, it is important to make changes in the other daily activity plans for the other five traits in order to test whether or not the ways in which the activities were facilitated, developed, or organized may have had an effect on the way in which the sixth grade students comprehended the traits. It would also be important to recheck the ways that the in-school portion has taught certain traits to see if an overall connection for each trait can be attained in collaboration with the after-school activities. In relation to the participants who did not score well within

certain traits, it would also be important to figure out if an individual consistently scored poorly, or if it was just with a certain construct.

Additionally, it would be important for the after-school portion to use different techniques and activities that included more chances to incorporate an educational component that really broke down each trait and allowed the participant to understand its meaning and why it was used within a particular activity.

With respect to the RASP as a measure itself, most of the items used to measure resiliency held up to the various iterations of validity tests, and reliability analyses. However, because in some cases, differences were found between this study's findings and Johnston's (2009) study, replication of the RASP, on the same and other populations should continue.

Related to the issue of administering the RASP, consideration should be given to administering the RASP in between the two semesters, as an additional repeated measure, rather than only before and after the academic year.

Data collection and coding was extremely problematic for this study. One of the primary concerns involves the matching of "last four digits" of the phone number. This is problematic because phone numbers can change in the course of a year, students forget their number from pre to post test, students may have multiple phone numbers (e.g., one for mom, one for dad, or cell vs. home phone), and some students may have the same last four numbers. Another problem with the after-school portion versus the in-school portion is that students do not need to sign a consent form to participate in the after-school portion of CARE NOW. As such, the students may participate in CARE NOW's after-school component, but not have completed the RASP. So even though the students

are receiving the after-school recreation intervention, comparisons with respect to resiliency cannot be made, and low numbers (such as an "n" of six in this study) will be evident, and insufficient, to "tease out" the effect of only the after-school component.

The current study closely relates to the day camp program called "Be a Star," examined previously in the literature (Pierce & Shields, 1998), as its results had not been truly significant within the first year of the program due to certain problems that occurred based on the development of the program. CARE NOW is also working through the beginning stages and issues that come with the development of a new program and the collaboration between two different agencies and the ability to retain participants through various other activities, sports programs, and personal commitments that kept certain participants from becoming involved in the program. Although significant findings were not found, the completion of one year of this program has enabled the administrators and students to help in the process of making a more consistent and efficient program for the future.

Unfortunately, correlations cannot be made regarding the use of resiliency and the effect on boys and girls due to the fact that when the database was organized and sorted to analyze such affect, the data resulted in a sample of six male participants who completed both RASPs (the pre and post test), was labeled by the "last four digits" for both tests, and attended both the in-school and after-school portion of CARE NOW. However, although there are no tangible items that can be reported throughout this process; there are some non-quantitative aspects that were witnessed "on-site." The excitement that the sixth graders had when their advocate (mentor) came to the school, or when the advocate participated in an activity with them, or when the advocates allowed

the sixth graders to help in the facilitation process, where they could show their leadership skills and ability to "have a voice" within their group was "priceless" and evident in their demeanor.

As the results confirmed higher scores for girls in both resiliency traits of relationships and insight, further analysis within the literature is needed to discover the difference in the ways that boys and girls are socialized to further assist the findings in this study. Strough and Berg (2000) conducted a study, with subjects who were the same age as the subjects within this study, to examine whether or not there were gender differences among dyadic conversations and goals. Findings indicate that high-affiliation conversations and mutual-participation goals were more prevalent in female then in male and mixed-gender dyads (p. 121). Although the focus of the study by Strough and Berg centered on conversations, it ties into the resiliency traits of imitative and relationships in the way that girls conversations are reported to consist of high-affiliation strategies: collaborative strategies, such as providing information and elaborating on the peer's proposals, and obliging strategies, such as agreeing or seeking support (Leaper, 1991; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Strough & Berg, 2000).

In relation to the components of the RASP construct, the resiliency trait that presented the highest factor loading was Initiative (0.88), while the lowest was Humor (0.76). These findings help to showcase why some resiliency traits need to be emphasized more within the after-school program to ensure that it is being understood. In the case of the Humor trait, there are a variety of factors that may have affected the subject's ability to grasp its overall concept. Those include the cognitive level of the sixth grade students, their ability to laugh at themselves, their ability to act appropriately

within the use of this resiliency trait, and the overall environment of CARE NOW and its ability to arrange more activities and techniques that involve more opportunities for humor and laughter.

Within the study, some factors should be reevaluated (each resiliency item) to determine if this program played a role in other aspects within the sixth grade students' lives. Those aspects could be a rise or fall in attendance, truancy rates, delinquency rates, detention rates, school spirit, friends, etc. Also, it would be good to consider whether or not students felt more at ease with their peers from their attendance within the program versus how they felt prior to the program.

Although this study only concentrated on the use of resiliency traits within the in-school and after-school components; the program did incorporate the use of character traits in conjunction with the resiliency traits. This is significant because the use of these interventions simultaneously could have either shown benefits or a flattening effect due to the inability for the subjects to fully comprehend both concepts in the same way or even at the same time. This issue should be researched in the future to determine the effects that these concepts have on one another when they are being taught and facilitated simultaneously.

Lastly, the use of recreational activities for sixth grade students was great and seemed to correlate with past studies regarding the use of recreation in an after-school program. The sixth grade students were always excited to participate in the activities and a number of individual behaviors changed from bad to good as they became comfortable with the advocates and the program. Also, the activities were a great way for the sixth graders to relieve some energy, as they had been in school for seven hours, sitting in

classes the entire day, and CARE NOW was the fun and excitement that they needed and wanted, where they could participate in activities with their peers.

The next chapter will highlight the overall focus of this study, the findings attained in this study, future recommendations, and whether the hypotheses were rejected or retained based on the findings from the data analyses.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While an overall focus and use of resiliency seems to be a potential antidote to meet the needs of youth at risk, it is important to note that it takes much time and effort to combine a number of organizations, individuals, and teaching concepts to accurately tailor a program that provides benefits that at-risk youth can use and gain to enhance their general well-being. Overall, the analysis of this study was somewhat weakened due to the new and early stages of development in a program like CARE NOW and the data collection process. There may have been different results if additional and complete data were collected. It is important to make note of the fact that this is the first year in which a program like this one is being run in conjunction with only sixth grade students, a University, and a resiliency based component that guides the entire program. There are no effects (positive or negative), as of yet, being seen in the CARE NOW program because of limited data.

A shortcoming found during the alterations of the database to clear any and all information that was insufficient was the use of the "last four digits" of the participants in the study. This was difficult to use as the participants' code for the entire database and it made the number of actual participants whose answers could be analyzed, lower, because a number of participants had to be removed due to illegible handwriting and a change of a telephone number during the year for some of the participants. Another shortcoming in the collection of the data is the fact that it is only collected twice during the school year in which there is no intervention available for the mentors, University, and sixth grade students; where a decrease in the proficiency of resiliency can be accounted for. If a mid

survey was given during the winter break of Old Dominion University, more analysis could possibly be made on the benefits of the program.

Unlike previous findings mentioned, this study found no significant difference between participating in recreational activities or achieving more benefits of resiliency and gender. With the use of an independent samples t-test to analyze the twenty participants who completed both the pre and post (RASP) test, the data revealed that there were only males who had completed both RASP 1 (pre) and RASP 2 (post) and had a correctly labeled survey with the "last four digits." As such, there was no way to compare the boys to the girls.

Based on the data analyses, a number of tests and descriptive statistics had to be conducted to examine the data sufficiently. The Resiliency and Skills Profile was found to be a valid and reliable tool. Interestingly, "relationships" was the only resiliency trait that lowered the RASP score from 5.07 to 4.71. Additionally, it was the only subscale to demonstrate significance. Furthermore, the third hypothesis examined in the study had to be voided due to the fact that during analyses of the data, the descriptive statistics revealed that there were only boys who, congruently and accurately, answered the RASP, attended CARE NOW, and were labeled to showcase the "last four digits" of their telephone number, that was used to code each participant.

Analyses of Hypotheses

Failure to reject the null hypotheses occurred in all four hypotheses.

Research Hypothesis 1

There are differences between students participating in both the in-school and after-school programs versus students only participating in the in-school program.

H_0: $M_P = M_{NP}$.

H_a: $M_P \neq M_{NP}$.

Fail to Reject the H_o

Research Hypothesis 2

In relation to the resiliency traits that are taught in both the in-school and after-school program, there is at least one trait that shows the greatest development as a result of the after-school programming.

H_0: $M_P = M_{NP}$.

H_{Ins}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Insight)}$, H_{Ind}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Independence)}$, H_{Rel}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Relationships)}$, H_{Ini}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Initiative)}$, H_{Cre}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Creativity)}$, H_{Hum}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Humor)}$, H_{VO}: $M_P \neq M_{NP\ (Values\ Orientation)}$.

Fail to Reject the H_o

Research Hypothesis 3

The Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) will showcase a difference in scores from the boys, in comparison to the girls.

H_0: $M_B = M_G$.

H_a: $M_B \neq M_G$.

This hypothesis was not tested due to the fact that the sample size of those participants who took both the pre and post test were only males (N=20).

Fail to Reject the H_o

Research Hypothesis 4

The subjects who will participate in both components (in-school and after-school) will have higher scores on the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) post test.

H_o: $M_u = M_{nu}$.

H_a: $M_u \neq M_{nu}$.

Fail to Reject the H_o

Future Studies

This study can be useful for continued studies related to resiliency, structured after-school time, and the use of the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile. Although this study showed little significance throughout its analysis, it could be further explored and measured to determine new ways to achieve success in a program like the one in this study. Unfortunately, with a new program like CARE NOW there are a number of environmental and programming factors that occur due to the fact that it is a new program.

If the study was to be conducted again, there are a number of factors that should be examined and changed. Those factors include the use of the "last four digits" of the participants' phone numbers, the connection and bond between the middle school and the University, the way in which students are accounted for in the program, and the

examination of multiple recreational activities to measure which ones accurately measure and benefit the resiliency intervention.

Conclusion

The concepts and explanations above have provided an in-depth framework of how the Care Now program encourages a progressive support based approach to program planning and implementation. It is hoped that advocates interacting in the CARE NOW program will help improve the overall quality of life of individuals participating while increasing skills and character traits that have been tailored, within the curriculum, to help the sixth grade students achieve the overall value to understand and appreciate the resiliency traits that CARE NOW teaches. All these things can be achieved with the successful completion of the following areas: continuing to implement youth development, staying involved within the community, improving positive transitional outcomes, continuing positive connections with others, mentoring outside the box, and trying to stay motivational and inspirational for the stability and success of the program.

REFERENCES

Allen, L., Stevens, B., Hurtes, K., & Harwell, R. (1998). *Benefits-based programming of recreation services.* Ashburn, VA: National Recreation and Parks Association.

Allen, L. R. & Cooper, N. L. (2003). *Benefits-based programming curriculum manual.* Asburn, VA. The National Recreation and Park Association.

Allen, L., Cox, J., & Cooper, N. (2006). The impact of a summer day camp on the resiliency of disadvantaged youths. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 77*(1), 17-23.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1982). Some methods for respecifying measurement models to obtain unidimensional construct measurement. *Journal of Marketing Research, 19,* 453-460.

Barber, B. L., Stone, M. R., Hunt, J. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Benefits of activity participation: The roles of identity affirmation and peer group norm sharing. In J. L. Mahone, R. W. Larson, & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Organized activities as contexts of development* (pp. 185-210). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barnett, L. A. (2008) Predicting youth participation in extracurricular recreational activities: Relationships with individual, parent, and family characteristics. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 26*(2), 28-60.

Benard, B. (1991). *Fostering resiliency in kids: Protective factors in the family, school, and community.* Portland, OR: Western Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.

Benard, B. (1993). Fostering resiliency in kids. *Educational Leadership, 51,* 44-48.

Benard, B. (2004). *Resiliency: What we have learned.* San Francisco, CA: West Ed.

Bloemhoff, H. J. (2006). The effect of an adventure-based recreation programme (ropes course) on the development of resiliency in at-risk adolescent boys confined to a rehabilitation centre. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 28*(1), 1-11.

Brook, J. S., Brook, D. W., Gordon, A. S., Whiteman, M., & Cohen, P. (1990). The psychological etiology of drug use: A family interactional approach. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 116,* 111-267.

Browne, G., Gafni, A., Roberts, J., Byrne, C. & Mmajumdar, B. (2004). Effective mental health programs for school-age children. *Social Science and Medicine, 58,* 11367-1384.

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (1992). A *matter of time: Risk and opportunities in the nonschool hours.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Carter, M. J., Van Andel, G. E., & Robb, G. M. (2003). *Therapeutic recreation: A practical approach.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc., p. 6.

Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M. L., Ryan, J. A. M., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (1998). *Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs.* Retrieved July 20, 2009, from http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/PositiveYouthDev99/.

Character trait. (n.d.) In Dictionary.com online. Retrieved June 6, 2009, from http://www.dictionary.com.

Cook, T. D. and Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis for Field Settings*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Cooper, N., Estes, C. A., & Allen, L. (2004). Bouncing back: How to develop resiliency through outcome-based recreation programs. *Parks & Recreation: National Recreation & Park Association, 39(*4), 28-35.

Cosden, M., Morrison, G., Gutierrez, L., & Brown, M. (2004). The effects of homework programs and after-school activities on school success. *Theory Into Practice, 43*(3), 220-226.

Daud, R., & Carruthers, C. (2008). Outcome study of an after-school program for youth in a high-risk environment. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 26,* (2), 95-114.

Davidson, M. L., & Khmelkov, V. (2005). *Collective responsibility for excellence and ethics (cree).* Cornerstone Consulting & Evaluation, LLC.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11,* 227-268.

Dungan-Seaver, D. (1999). *After-school programs: An analysis of research about characteristics of effectiveness.* Retrieved February 30, 2009, from http://www.mcknight.org/cfc/lab.aspx.

Eccles, J. S. (1993). School and family effects on the ontogeny of children's interests, self-perception, and activity choice. In J. Jacobs (Ed), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Developmental perspectives on motivation* (pp. 145-208). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14,* 10-43.

Eccles, J. S., & Harold, R. D. (1991). Gender differences in sport involvement: Applying the Eccles' expectancy-value model. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 3,* 7-35.

Eccles, J. S., Barber, B. L. & Jozefowicz, D. (1998). Linking gender to educational, occupational and recreational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. In W. B. Swan, J. H. Langlois, & L. C. Gilbert (Eds.), *Sexism and stereotypes in modern society: The gender science of Janet Taylor Spence* (pp. 153-192). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Eccles, J. A., Barber, B. L., Stone, M., & Hunt, J. (2003). Extracurricular activities and adolescent development. *Journal of Social Issues, 59,* 865-889.

Ewert, A. & Yoshino, A. (2008). A preliminary exploration of the influence of short-term adventure-based expeditions on levels of resilience. *Journal of Experiential Education, 30*(3), 262-266.

Fashola, O. (2003). Developing the talents of African American male students during the nonschool hours. *Urban Education, 38*(4), 398-430.

Flannery, D. J., Williams, L. L., & Vazsonyi, A. T. (1999). Who are they with and what are they doing? Delinquent behavior, substance abuse, and early adolescents' after-school time. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 69*(2), 247-253.

Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2002). Children's competence and value beliefs from childhood through adolescence: Growth trajectories in two male sex-typed domains. *Developmental Psychology, 38,* 519-533.

Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(4), 698-713.

Garmezy, N. (1991). Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34*(4), 416-430.

Garmezy, N. (1983). Stressors of childhood. In N. Garmezy & M. Rutter (Eds.), *Stress, coping, and development in children* (pp. 43-84). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Garmezy, N., Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (1984). The study of stress and competence in children: A building block for developmental psychopathology. *Child Development,* 55, 97- 111.

Gass, M. A. (1993a). The evolution of processing adventure therapy experiences. In Gass, M. A. (Ed.). *Adventure therapy: Therapeutic applications of adventure programming* (pp. 219-229). Dubuque, IA: Kendall & Hunt Publishing Company.

Gass, M. A. (1993b). Enhancing metaphor development in adventure therapy programs. In Gass, M. A. (Ed.). *Adventure therapy: Therapeutic applications of adventure programming* (pp. 245-258). Dubuque, IA: Kendall & Hunt Publishing Company.

Gerbing, David W. and James C. Anderson (1988), An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research, 25,* 186-192.

Gray, D., & Greben, S. (1974). Future perspectives in recreation. *Parks and Recreation, 9*(7), 26-35.

Green, G. T., Kleiber, D. A., & Tarrant, M. A. (2000). The effect of an adventure-based recreation program on development of resiliency in low income minority youth. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 18*(3), 79-97.

Greendorfer, S. L., Lewko, J. H., & Rosengren, K. S. (1996). Family and gender-based influences in sport socialization of children and adolescents. In F. L. Smoll, & R. E. Smith (Eds.), *Children and youth in sport: A biopsychosocial perspective* (pp. 89-111). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). *Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns.* Psychological Bulletin, *103,* 265-275.

Hall, G., Yohalem, N., Tolman, J., & Wilson, A. (2003). How after-school programs can most effectively promote positive youth development as a support to academic achievement: A report commissioned by the Boston after-school for all partnership. *National Institute on Out-of-School Time.*

Halpern, R. (1999). After-school programs for low-income children: Promise and challenges. *The Future of Children: When School Is Out, 9*(2), 81-95.

Halpern, R. (2002). A different kind of child development institution: The history of after-school programs for low-income children. *Teacher College Record, 104*(2), 178-211.

Halpern, R., Barker, G., & Mollard, W. (2000). Youth programs as alternative spaces to be: A study of neighborhood youth programs in Chicago's west town. *Youth & Society, 31*(4), 469-506.

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., & Miller, J. Y. (1992). Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood: Irnplications for substance abuse prevention. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 64-105.

Heiman, G. W. (2006). *Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Henderson, K. A. (2005) *What about the girls?* In P. Witt and L. Caldwell (Eds.), *Recreation and youth development* (p. 408). State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Hill, E., Gómez, E., & Jeppesen, G. (2007). Adolescent Resiliency: A multidisciplinary approach. *Therapeutic Recreation, 15,* 60-74.

Hirsch, B. (2005). *A place to call home: After-school programs for urban youth.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hochschild, J., & Scovronick, N. (2004). *The American dream and the public schools.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hollister-Wagner, G. H., Foshee, V. A., & Jackson, C. (2001). Adolescent aggression: Models of resiliency. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*(3), 445-466.

Hunter, John E. (1980). Factor analysis. In P. Monge and J. Capella, (Eds.), *Multivariate techniques in human communication research,* (pp. 229-257). Academic Press.

Hunter, J. E., & Gerbing, D. W., & Boster, F. J. (1982). Machiavellian beliefs and personality: Construct validity of the Machiavellianism dimension. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 1293-1305.

Hurtes, K., & Allen, L. (2001). Measuring resiliency in youth: The resiliency and attitudes skills profile. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 35*(4), 333-347.

Hurtes, K. P., Allen, L. R., Stevens, B. W., & Lee, C. (2000). Benefits-based programming: Making an impact on youth. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 18*(1), 34-49.

Jessor, R. (1993). Successful adolescent development among youth in high-risk settings. *American Psychologist, 48*(2), 117-126.

Johnston, A. (2009). After-school programs: Resiliency through recreation. *Unpublished Thesis*, Old Dominion University.

Kahne, J., Nagaoka, J., Brown, A., O'Brien, J., Quinn, T., & Thiede, K. (2001). Assessing after-school programs as contexts for youth development. *Youth and Society, 32*(4), 421-446.

Kahne, J., Nagaoka, J., Brown, A., O'Brien, J., Quinn, T., & Thiede, K. (2000). *School and after-school programs as contexts for youth development: A qualitative and quantitative assessment.* In M. Wang and W. Boyd (Eds.), Improving Results for Children and Families by Connecting Collaborative Services with School Reform Efforts. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Knapp, C. E. (1993). Designing processing questions to meet specific objectives. In M. A. Gass, *(Ed.). Adventure Therapy: Therapeutic Applications of Adventure Programming* (pp. 239-244). Dubuque, IA: Kendall & Hunt Publishing Company.

Larson, R., & Verma, S. (1999). How children and adolescents spend time across the world: Work, play, and developmental opportunities. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(6), 700-736.

Leaper, C. (1991). Influence and involvement in children's discourse: Age, gender, and partner effects. *Child Development, 62,* 797-811.

Lerner, R. M., & Galambos, N. L. (1998). Adolescent development: Challenges and opportunities for research, programs, and policies. *Annual Review Psychology, 49,* 413-446.

Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2000). The neighborhoods they live in: The effects of neighborhood residence on child and adolescent outcomes. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(2), 309-337.

Lobo, F., & Olson, E. (2000). Leisure services and children at risk: Against all odds. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 18* (1), 5-18.

Mahoney, J. L., Lord, H., & Carryl, E. (2005). An ecological analysis of after-school program participation and the development of academic performance and motivational attributes for disadvantaged children. *Child Development, 76*(4), 811-825.

Masten, A. S., Garmezy, N., Tellegen, A., Pellegrini, D. S., Larkin, K., & Larsen, A. (1988). Competence and stress in school children: The moderating effects of individual and family qualities. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 29,* 745-764.

Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. Gumpertz (Ed.), *Language and social identity,* (pp. 196-216). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mauldin, T., & Meeks, C. B. (1990). Sex differences in children's time use. *Sex Roles, 22,* 537-554.

McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist, 53*, 185-204.

McNeal, R. B. (1998). High school extracurricular activities: Closed structures and stratifying patterns of participation. *Journal of Educational Research, 91,* 183-191.

Medrick, E. A., Roizen, J. A., Rubin, V., & Buckley, S. (1982). *The serious business of growing up: A study of children's lives outside of school.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Meeks, C. B., & Mauldin, T. (1990). Children's time in structured and unstructured leisure activities. *Lifestyles, 11,* 257-281.

Miller, B. M. (2001). Beyond school time: The promise of after-school programs. *Educational Leadership, 58*(7).

Moran, P. B., & Eckenrode, J. (1992). Protective personality characteristics among adolescents from maltreating homes. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 16,* 743-754.

Muni Net Guide. (2009). Demographics of Blair Middle School. Retrieved June 2, 2009, from http://www.muninetguide.com/schools/VA/Norfolk/Blair-Middle-School-charter-school/.

Nadler, R. S., & Luckner, J. L. (1992). *Processing the adventure experience: Theory and practice.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall & Hunt Publishing Company.

Nelson, C., Estes, C., & Allen, L. (2004). Bouncing back. *Journal of Parks & Recreation, 39*(4), 28-35.

Newman, S., Fox, J., Flynn, E., & Christeson, W. (2000). America's after-school choice: The prime time for juvenile crime or youth enrichment and achievement. Retrieved February 9, 2009 from http://www.fightcrime.org/reports/as2000.pdf.

Osgood, D. W., Wilson, J. K., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Johnston, L. D. (1996). Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review, 61,* 635-655.

Patton, R. (1991). *Addressing the needs of St. Louis children at risk.* St. Louis: The Public Policy Research Centers, University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Pierce, L. H., & Shields, N. (1998). The be a star community-based after-school program: Developing resiliency factors in high-risk preadolescent youth. *Journal of Community Psychology, 26*(2), 175-183.

Pollard, D. (1989). Against the odds: A profile of academic achievers from the urban underclass. *Journal of Negro Education, 58,* 297-308.

Prince-Embury, S., & Courville, T. (2008). Comparison of one-, two-, and three-factor models of personal resiliency using the resiliency scales for children and adolescents. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 23*(1), 11-25.

Resiliency In Action, Inc. (2004). Retrieved February 10, 2009, from www.resiliency.com.

Riggs, N. R., & Greenberg, M. T. (2004). After-school youth development program: developmental-ecological model of current research. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 7*(3), 177-190.

Robertson, B. J. (2000). Leisure education as a rehabilitative tool for youth in incarcerated settings. *Journal of Leisure Ability, 27*(2), 27-34.

Rutter, M. (1985). Resilience in the face of adversity: Protective factors and resistance to psychiatric disorder. *British Journal of Psychiatry,* 147, 598-611.

Rutter, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57*(3), 16-33.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55,* 68-78.

Smale, B. J. A., & Shaw, S. M. (1994). *Teenage drop-outs: Explaining the decline in physical activity and participation during adolescence.* Paper presented at the 10th Commonwealth and International Scientific Congress, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

Snyder, H.N., Sickmund, M., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (1996). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 1996 update on violence.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Strough, J., & Berg, C. A. (2000). Goals as a mediator of gender differences in high-affiliation dyadic conversations. *Developmental Psychology, 36*(1), 117-125.

Sugland, B. W., Zaslow, M., & Winquist-Nord, C. (1993). *Risk, vulnerability, and resilience among youth: In search of a conceptual framework* (paper prepared for the William T. Grant Foundation). Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Tabacknick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics (3rd ed.).* New York: Harper Collins.

Traub, J. (2000, January 16). What no school can do. *New York Times Magazine.*

Vandell, D. L., Shernoff, D. J., Piere, K. M., Bolt, D. M., Dadisman, K., & Brown, B. B. (2005). Activities, engagement, and emotion in after-school programs (and elsewhere). *New Directions for Youth Development*, 105.

Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the resilience scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement, 1*(2), 165–178.

Wandersman, A., & Nation, M. (1998). Psychological contributions to understanding toxicity, resiliency, and interventions. *American Psychologist, 53*(6), 647-656.

Wasonga, T. (2002). Gender effects on perceptions of external assets, development of resilience and academic achievement: Perpetuation theory approach. *Gender Issues, 20*(4), 43-54.

Werner, E. (1982). High risk children in young adulthood: A longitudinal study from birth to 32 years. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59*, 72-81.

Werner, E. E. (1989, April). Children of the garden island. *Scientific American,* 106-111.

Werner, E. E. (1995). Resilience in development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4,* 81-85.

Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, 2003, p. 123. Retrieved on February 11, 2009 from http://www.ncfy.com/publications/disadvantaged/FirstReport.pdf.

Wimer, C., Simpkins, S., Dearing, E., & Bouffard, S. M. (2008). Predicting youth out-of-school time participation: Multiple risks and developmental differences. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 54*(2), 179-207.

Winfield, L. F. (1994). *NCREL monograph: Developing resilience in urban youth.* Urban Education Monograph Series.

Witman, J. P. (1993). Characteristics of adventure programs valued by adolescents in treatment. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 27*(1), 44-50.

Witt, P. A., & Caldwell, L. L. (2005). *Recreation and youth development.* State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Wolin, S., & Wolin, S. (1995). Resilience among children growing up in substance abusing families. *Pediatric Clinics* of *North America, 42,* 415-429.

Wolin, J., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The resilient self: How survivors of troubled families rise above adversity.* New York Villard Books.

Wright, P. S. (1999). Understanding and mentoring with at-risk youths. *The Haworth Press: Activities, Adaptation & Aging, 23*(2), 75-99.

Appendix A:

Student RASP

Sex: Male or Female **Age:** _____
Last four digits of your home phone # _____ **Grade:** _____

The following items relate to your opinions of yourself and your personal characteristics. Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one. **There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as honest as possible!**

	STRONGLY DISAGREE					STRONGLY AGREE
1. When my work is criticized, I try harder the next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I can deal with whatever comes in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Once I set a goal for myself, I don't let anything stop me from reaching it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I learn from my mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I notice small changes in facial expressions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I can imagine the consequences of my actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I know when I'm good at something.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I'm prepared to deal with the consequences of my actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I say "no" to things that I don't want to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I can change my behavior to match the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. My sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. My friends know they can count on me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I can change my surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. My family is there for me when I need them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was my fault.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. It's OK if I don't see things the way other people do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Lying is unacceptable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I avoid people who could get me into	1	2	3	4	5	6

trouble.						
	STRONGLY DISAGREE					STRONGLY AGREE
19. It's OK if some people do not like me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I am comfortable making my own decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I can sense when someone is not telling the truth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. When I'm faced with a tough situation, I come up with new ways to handle it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. I choose my friends carefully.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I look for the "lighter side" of tough situations.						
26. I control my own life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I try to help others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I stand up for what I believe is right.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I try to figure out things that I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I'm good at keeping friendships going.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I have friends who will back me up.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Laughter helps me deal with stress.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. I avoid situations where I could get into trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. I can be myself around my friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. When I'm in a bad mood, I can cheer myself up.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. When something bad happens to me, I don't give up.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I share my ideas and opinions even if they are different from other people's.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I can entertain myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. I make friends easily.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B:

SURVEY KEY:
Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP)

CREATIVITY: 6, 22, 23, and 39

HUMOR: 11, 25, 33, and 36

INDEPENDENCE: 2, 9, 16, 19, 20, 26, 34, and 38

INITIATIVE: 1, 3, 13, 30, and 37

INSIGHT: 4, 5, 7, 10, 15, 21, and 27

RELATIONSHIPS: 12, 14, 18, 24, 31, 32, 35, and 40

VALUES ORIENTATION: 8, 17, 28, and 29

There are no reverse coded items.

*****The numbers by each resiliency trait shows which question within the RASP that it correlates with.***

Appendix C:

Parent Informed Consent Form

September 2008

Dear Parents,

This school year, your 6th grader will participate in Character and Resilience Education. Norfolk Public Schools and Old Dominion University Working together (CARE NOW). The project provides programming both during and after-school that targets the needs of our youth. Our goal is to determine the impact of a new and exciting project on your child's social and academic achievement. To do so, we are asking for you and your child's participation in completing surveys relating to CARE NOW. We have enclosed a "Consent/Permission for Child's Participation" form for you to sign. Your child may participate in CARE NOW even if he or she does not complete the surveys.

Please carefully read the attached "Consent/Permission for Child's Participation" form. It provides important information for you and your child. If you have any questions pertaining to the attached form or to the research study, please feel free to contact Drs. Tammi Milliken, Dr. Laurie Craigen, or Mrs. Barbara Freidt at the numbers below.

After reviewing the attached information, please return to your child's math teacher a signed copy of the "Consent/ Permission for Child's Participation" form if you (and your child) are willing to participate in the study. If you forget, we will have extra copies at Blair. An additional copy will be provided for you if desired. Even if you give consent/permission, your child will complete the surveys only if he/she is willing to do so. Either way, your child will still be able to participate in the CARE NOW program activities.

We thank you in advance for taking the time to consider you and your child's participation in this study.

We look forward to seeing you this school year!

Sincerely,

Tammi F. Milliken, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Old Dominion University
ELC, Human Services Program
Norfolk, VA 23529
(757) 683-3850 phone
(757) 683-5756 fax
tmillike@odu.edu

Laurie Craigen, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Old Dominion University
ELC, Human Services Program
Norfolk, VA 23529
(757) 683-3221 phone
(757) 683-5756 fax

Barbara Freidt, M.S.Ed.
Visiting Assistant Professor
Old Dominion University
Department of ESPER
Norfolk, VA 23529
(757) 683-4881 phone
(757) 683-4270 fax
bfreidt@odu.edu

Appendix D:
CONSENT/PERMISSION FOR CHILD'S PARTICIPATION DOCUMENT

The purposes of this form are to provide information that may affect decisions regarding you and your child's participation and to record the consent of those who are willing to participate in this study.

TITLE OF RESEARCH: CARE NOW: Examining the Impact of an In-Class and After-school Intervention on Character, Resiliency and Academic Performance at Blair Middle School

RESEARCHERS: Dr. Tammi Milliken, Assistant Professor, Old Dominion University
Dr. Laurie Craigen, Assistant Professor, Old Dominion University
Mrs. Barbara Freidt, Visiting Assistant Professor, Old Dominion University

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH STUDY: Prevention programming has long been considered beneficial to students. By being conducted during school and through after-school activities, CARE NOW is a new approach to serving youth. This program targets areas of social and academic performance. A variety of in-class activities such as life-skills training, character education, and academic assistance will be used. In the after-school component, techniques such as cooperative recreational activities will be used. Leading the programming will be CARE NOW advocates. These are hand-selected, undergraduate and graduate students from Old Dominion University's Human Services and Therapeutic Recreation Programs.

The goal of the research is to assess the impact of the CARE NOW program. If you decide to participate in this study, you and your child will be asked to complete surveys two times. You would complete the survey at the beginning and at the end of the school year. You and your child's participation will take approximately thirty minutes each time. The surveys will help us determine what you and your child liked about the program and how children may have improved from participation in CARE NOW. The surveys will ask questions such as: "My Child doesn't let anything stop him/her from reaching a goal once he/she sets it for himself/herself." Names will not be used on the surveys, instead, we will use a code (i.e., last four digits of home phone numbers) to match the answers from the pre-test to the post-test.

EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA: In order for your child to participate in this study, your child must be enrolled in the 6^{th} grade at Blair Middle School.

RISKS: There are no identified risks for this study. However, as with any research, there is some possibility that you or your child may be subject to risks that have not yet been identified.

BENEFITS: There are no direct benefits to your child for participating in this study. However, parents and students that participate will have access to a summary of results about how participation in CARE NOW impacts children's perspective on healthy activity and resiliency.

COSTS AND PAYMENTS: Following collection of informed consent forms from those who wish to participate in the study, the will provide a pizza party for *all* sixth graders. Participation in the study is free of charge.

NEW INFORMATION: You will be contacted if new information is discovered that would reasonably change your decision about your or your child's participation in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Participants will be assigned a code number so that you or your child's name will not be attached to responses. Only researchers involved in the study or in a professional review of the study will have access to data sheets. All data and participant information will be kept in a locked and secure location.

WITHDRAWAL PRIVILEGE: You and your child's participation in this study is completely voluntary. It is okay to refuse you and your child's participation. Even if you agree now, you and your child may withdraw from the study at any time by not completing surveys, but still remain in CARE NOW. In addition, your child may withdraw at any time if he or she so chooses.

COMPENSATION FOR ILLNESS AND INJURY: Agreeing to you and your child's participation does not waive any of your legal rights. However, in the event of harm arising from this study, neither Old Dominion University nor the researchers are able to give you any money, insurance coverage, free medical care, or any other compensation. In the event that your child suffers harm as a result of participation in this research project, you may contact Dr. Tammi Milliken at (757) 683-3850, Dr. Laurie Craigen at (757) 683-3221, Mrs. Barbara Freidt at (757) 683-4881 or the Office of Research at (757) 683-3460.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT: By signing this form, you are saying 1) that you have read this form or have had it read to you, and 2) that you are satisfied and understand this form, the research study, and its risks and benefits. The researchers will be happy to answer any questions you have about the research. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Drs. Tammi Milliken (757) 683-3850 Dr. Laurie Craigen at (757) 683-3221, Mrs. Barbara Freidt at (757) 683-4881 or the Office of Research at (757) 683-3460.

If at any time you [or your child] feel pressured to participate, or if you have any questions about your rights or this form, please call the Old Dominion University Office of Research (757-683-3460).

Note: By signing below, you are telling the researchers YES, that you agree to participate in the study and that you will allow your child to participate in this study. Please keep one copy of this form for your records.

Your child's name (please print): _____

Your child's birth date: _____

Your name (please print): _____

Relationship to child (please check one):
Parent: _____

Legal Guardian: _____

Your Signature: _____

Date: _____

INVESTIGATOR'S STATEMENT: I certify that this form includes all information concerning the study relevant to the protection of the rights of the participants, including the nature and purpose of this research, benefits, risks, costs, and any experimental procedures.

I have described the rights and protections afforded to human research participants and have done nothing to pressure, coerce, or falsely entice the parent to allowing this child to participate. I am available to answer the parent's questions and have encouraged him/her to ask additional questions at any time during the course of the study.

Experimenter's Signature: Tammi F. Mallicoat

Date: 9/10/08

Appendix E:
LETTER ATTACHED TO THE RASP

CARE NOW

Character And Resilience Education, Norfolk Public Schools/Old Dominion University Working together

Our names are Tammi Milliken, Laurie Craigen, and Barbara Freidt. We teach at Old Dominion University.

This school year, you get to participate in fun activities both during and afterschool. These activities are part of CARE NOW, a new program at Blair. We are asking you to answer questions about how CARE NOW helps you.

If you agree, you will also be asked to complete surveys two times throughout the school year. You will be asked your age, grade level, and if you are male or female. Next, you will be asked the last four digits of your home phone number. This is only used to match up your surveys so we can see how your answers change during and after you participate in CARE NOW. Finally, you will be asked other questions, for example about how you deal with tough situations. No one but us will see your answers. Answering these questions will take about 30 minutes at the beginning of the school year and 30 minutes at the end of school year. **Do not** put your name on the surveys.

You do not have to fill out the surveys. No one will be mad at you if you decide not fill out the surveys. Even if you start filling out the surveys, you can stop later if you want. You may ask questions about the surveys and the program at any time.

If you decide to fill out the surveys, we will not tell anyone else what you say or do in the survey. Even if your parents or teachers ask, we will not tell them about what you say or do in the surveys.

Signing here means that you have read this form or have had it read to you and that you are willing to be in this study.

Signature of participant_____

Participant's printed name _____

Signature of investigator *Tammi F. Milliken* _____

Date_____

Appendix F:

Daily Activity Plan (DAP) Example

CARE NOW
Daily Activity Plan (DAP)

Resiliency & Character Trait/s: **Pro social behavior and Humor Plan A**
Week number: Week 6 Spring Semester of CARE NOW

Objective: By completing the following activities, the Blair sixth grade students will demonstrate their ability to use humor and see humor in situations by completing the group games. During debriefing, 100 %of the students will verbally acknowledge at least one time that they showed humor and helped each other.

Name of Activities:

1. Round About
2. Captain, Captain, what is the sea today?
3. Shark
4. Ball up!
5. Triple Threat
6. Grapes

List All Materials Needed: cones, bandanas, blindfold, pins, hula-hoop, bouncy balls, beach ball, big pad of paper, pens, or pencils

Activity 1: Round About

1. Ask the group. "Who's ready for the next game"!!? Are you ready!!?
2. Have each player count off and remember their number. (Or pick a color or animal).
3. After everyone is assigned a number, have the players get in a circle. One person starts with the ball in the center.
4. The person with the ball (who is in the center) throws the ball upwards to the sky while yelling a number. Everyone disperses and runs in all different directions except for the

person whose number was called.

5. The person whose number was called catches the ball and then yells "ROUND ABOUT!" When he or she yells this, everyone must freeze.

6. The person with the ball then is allowed to take three giant steps toward any player. He or she throws the ball and tries to hit someone.

7. If a player is hit the first time, he or she earns the letter "R", eventually spelling the word R-O-U-N-D -A-B-O-U-T. The person who was hit becomes the new thrower; otherwise, the thrower who missed earns a letter. The next round begins and play continues. Whoever spells the word R-O-U-N-D -A-B-O-U-T, is out of the game.

8. If you do not want to eliminate players, you can set a time limit and whoever has the least amount of letters when time expires is the winner.

Activity Modifications: To make the game harder. To dodge, players are allowed to move all parts of their body except their feet.

Materials Needed: Ball

Debriefing Questions: using the ball as a talking tool while passing it around and ask:

Did you find it more or less fun dodging the ball or throwing the ball? Why?

Did it get more or less challenging when you couldn't move your feet to dodge?

Activity 2: Captain, captain, what is the sea today?

1. Are you guys ready to have some fun, if yes, yell O YEAH, as loud as you can. (If the O YEAH is not loud enough, repeat the question)…So, guys, ARE YOU READY TO HAVE FUN? (O YEAHHH!!!)

2. Okay, this game is called: "Captain, Captain, what is the sea today?" This time I will need a volunteer who will be the Captain in the first round. Who wants to volunteer? All right!!! So, now you are our Captain. The Captain stays in the middle of the play area blindfolded. The rest of us surround the Captain and we ask him: "Captain, Captain, what is the sea today?" The Captain has three options: Rough, Calm, or Frozen. If rough, everybody starts making noise, for example "Boooo-booo" and while doing that we are running around the captain. If calm, we have to move as quietly as possible around the captain. If frozen, everybody freezes. The round is over when the Captain catches

somebody. The person who is caught is our new Captain! (Pretty much after each round, we have new captain).

3. The Captain needs to spin three times before starting chasing people.

Activity Modifications: Have all participants on one side of the play area and play every round till all participants go safely on the opposite site. If the Captain did not catch anybody, the same player remains the captain until he/she does catch somebody.

Materials Needed: Bandanas or blindfold

Debriefing Questions: In between rounds, give some time for strategizing and ask:

Did you like to be a Captain? Why so- because you had the power to lead the others by telling them what to do or because of something else?

Which was the most humorous order given or the funniest round?

What are some strategies you guys came up with to catch somebody faster?

(Congratulate them with the loudest O YEAH!!)

Activity 3: Shark

1. Tell the group. "If you like the last game, you are going to love this game!! Are you ready!!! If not enthusiastic, enough say "I CANT HEAR YOU!!!"

2. Spread hula hoops out in playing area. Two or more students should stand in each hoop. They are the "sharks". The other half are "swimmers" begins at the shorter end of the playing area.

3. On the "go" signal "swimmers" bounce the ball in attempt to cross the ocean as many times back and forth, as they can by dribbling around each "shark" without losing control of their ball (swimmer should visit each shark).

4. It is the shark's job to keep both feet inside the hoop and attempt to steal the swimmer's ball by reaching with one's arms. If a swimmer loses control of their ball (for any reason), they dribble in place 5 times before they can continue swimming across the ocean. Or do a little dance!

5. Have students switch positions for each new game every few minutes, so that all students have an equal amount of time as sharks and swimmers.

Activity Modifications: To increase difficulty for the swimmers, allow sharks to have only one foot in the hoop at a time, which allows them to reach further. If you notice that some

sharks are not being visited, have these sharks stand in hoops in the middle of the area so they are in a higher traffic area.

Materials Needed: Cones to designate area, hula-hoop, bouncy balls or basketballs.

Debriefing Questions: (using the ball. Bounce to the person you want to answer the question)

When you were a shark, was it hard or easy trying to catch the swimmers?

When you were a swimmer, did you lose control of the ball? What did you think when that happen?

If you lost control of your ball, did you choose to do a little dance or dribble 5 times? Why?

Activity 4: Ball up!

1. Have everyone Get in a circle and join hands or grab hold on to bandanas. The object of the game is to try to keep the ball from hitting the ground without letting go hands.
2. Tell them they can use any part of their body to achieve the goal. BE CREATIVE!

Activity Modification: to increase difficulty, everyone on the team can be blindfolded but one person and they have to give direction to the team to keep the ball up!

Materials Needed: Ball/ beach ball, bandanna, blindfolds.

Debriefing Questions:

What techniques did you use to keep the ball off the ground? Did you use teamwork?

What did you find funny during the game?

Did anyone find it easy or hard to work as a team?

Was there positive or negative communication between your team members?

Activity 5: Triple Threat

1. Okay! This game is going to challenge you. Are you ready!!?
2. Introduce one ball. Ask the group to toss the ball around the circle.
3. Then have them repeat the toss exactly in the same pattern.
4. When they get a rhythm. Introduce a second ball. Then introduce a third ball.
5. The task is for the group to pass three balls without dropping any.

Activity Modification: To add difficulty. Have them expand the circle, make the circle smaller, or walk around while passing the ball.

Materials Needed: Three balls

Debriefing Questions: While walking in a circle passing the ball you can ask:

Which was the funniest part of the challenge?

How did you work together as a team?

Activity 6: Grapes

1. Tell the team to circle up. Pick a student we will name the "caller" at random [for example, the student who favorite subject is math]. Tell the group that this game is called GRAPES! The object is for the caller to call out a number and the rest of the students must make a group that corresponds with that number.

2. The group spread out and a caller yells out "I THE CALLER WANT TO MAKE A GROUP OF 2!" The players then race to make a group with that number of people. After the groups are formed, the player that is not in a group is out and gets to become the caller. [There should be a different caller every round].

3. The caller can say anything… for example; the caller can say "I THE CALLER WANTS TO MAKE A GROUP OF 3 BUNNIES!" then the players must bunny hop around to make a group of three. Or, "I THE CALLER WANTS TO MAKE A GROUP OF 5 CATS!" the group has to meow! REMEMBER. There has to be 5 cats in the group.

Activity Modifications: To make it difficult, the caller can make a math problem. Example: the sum of two times two. And the players race to make a group of four.

Materials Needed: none

Debriefing Questions:

Was it more fun being the caller more? If yes explain why?

When you got out, did you feel better when you found out you could be the caller?

What was the funniest part of the game?

Does anyone think they used their sense of humor in this game?

Debriefing/Processing questions:

1. Did you like to be a Captain? Why so- because you had the power to lead the others by telling them what to do or because of something else?
2. Which was the funniest round?
3. What are some strategies you guys came up with to catch somebody faster? (Congratulate them with the loudest O YEAH!!)
4. Did you find it more or less fun dodging the ball or throwing the ball? Why?
5. Did it get more or less challenging when you could not move your feet to dodge?
6. When you were a shark, was it hard or easy trying to catch the swimmers?
7. When you were a swimmer, did you lose control of the ball? What did you think when that happen?
8. If you lost control of your ball, did you choose to do a little dance or dribble 10 times? Why?
9. What techniques did you use to keep the ball off the ground? Did you use teamwork?
10. What did you find funny during the game?
11. Did anyone find it easy or hard to work as a team?
12. Was there positive or negative communication between your team members?
13. Which was the funniest part of the challenge?
14. How did you work together as a team?
15. Was it more fun being the caller more? If yes explain why?
16. When you got out, did you feel better when you found out you could be the caller?
17. What was the funniest part of the game?
18. Does anyone think they used their sense of humor in this game?

TAKEYRA COLLINS
VITA

EDUCATION

M.S. Physical Education, Concentration: Recreation and Tourism Studies
Old Dominion University- Norfolk, VA *Graduation Date: August 2009*
B.S. Recreation and Leisure Studies, Concentration: Therapeutic Recreation
Minor: Psychology, **Virginia Wesleyan College-** Norfolk, VA, *May 2008*

CERTIFICATION

2008 ***Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist*** (CTRS)

EXPERIENCE

Graduate Teaching Assistantship Fall 2008/Spring 2009: August 1-May 15
Old Dominion University, Department of Exercise Science, Physical Education, Sport & Recreation: After-School Coordinator: Participated in the design and implementation of the CARE NOW program. RTS 301 Youth Programming & RTS 302 Facilitating the Recreation Experience

Therapeutic Recreation Activity Center Leader August 2008-April 2009
City of Virginia Beach Department of Parks & Recreation: KV Recreation Center

Therapeutic Recreation Activity Center Assistant Leader May 2008 to August 2008
City of Virginia Beach Department of Parks & Recreation: KV Recreation Center

Youth Activities Assistant Leader: Middle School Mania January 2007 to June 2007
Larkspur Middle School: Virginia Beach Public Schools

Youth/Adult/Athletic Services Assistant June 2005 to August 2006
City of Virginia Beach Department of Parks & Recreation: ST Recreation Center

MEMBERSHIPS

2007 Rho Phi Lambda; *Honorary Professional Recreation, Park, and Leisure Services Fraternity, Alpha Delta Chapter*
2008 Virginia Recreation and Park Society

HONORS/AWARDS

2004 Coaches Award Recipient (Varsity Volleyball)
2004 Navy Wife's Club Scholarship Recipient
2006 Coaches Award Recipient (Varsity Volleyball)
2006 Navy Wife's Club Scholarship Recipient
2008 Virginia Recreation and Park Society Eastern Therapeutic Recreation Student Scholarship Award Recipient

VOLUNTEERISM

2009 Monarch Adventure Race, Portsmouth Invitational Tournament, Shamrock Marathon, Toys for Tots, and YDAT (Youth Doing Awesome Things) Volunteer