

SAFE HAVEN PROGRAM EVALUATION (1994-95)

Deborah Lowe Vandell and Kim Pierce

A Report Prepared for the City of Madison  
and the Madison Metropolitan School District

REVISED February 4, 1997

(Original Report dated January 16, 1996)

## INTRODUCTION

During 1994-95, the City of Madison operated Safe Haven after-school programs in schools serving the Broadway-Simpson (Glendale Elementary), Glendale Townhouse (Glendale Elementary), Darbo-Worthington (Lowell Elementary), and Vera Court (Mendota Elementary) neighborhoods. The programs were developed so that beneficial after-school experiences could be provided to children who were at risk for academic and social difficulties. Specific objectives of the programs included enhancing children's physical and cognitive skills, teaching conflict resolution strategies to children, and helping children learn how to interact positively and effectively in groups.

KDV Associates (Deborah Lowe Vandell and Kim Pierce, Co-Principal Investigators) was asked by the City of Madison and the Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) to evaluate the impact of the Safe Haven after-school programs on children in the targeted neighborhoods during the 1994-95 academic year (the first year of the program). This evaluation had several components:

1. A determination of a profile of children who attended the Safe Haven programs, including demographic, academic, behavioral, and attitudinal characteristics. Children who attended the Safe Haven programs during 1994-95 were contrasted with (a) all other children in their respective elementary schools and (b) other children in the targeted neighborhoods who did not participate in the Safe Haven programs. The purpose of these comparisons was to ascertain if the Safe Haven programs were successful in identifying and serving children who were at risk for academic and social problems.

2. A limited examination of the children's Safe Haven experiences. This included a determination of how often the targeted children actually attended the Safe Haven programs, and ratings of the quality of the programs in term of their activities, physical facilities, and staff-child interactions. It was expected that positive program effects would occur only when the Safe Haven programs were of high quality and when children attended the programs regularly.

3. A stringent test of program effects on children's development. Four aspects of child adjustment were investigated: academic grades, conduct grades, school absences, and conflict resolution strategies. We sought to determine if program attendance and program quality were associated with children's academic grades, conduct grades, school absences, and conflict resolution strategies.

## SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Children in Grades 3-5 at Glendale (N = 216), Lowell (N = 218), and Mendota (N = 213) elementary schools participated in the study.<sup>1</sup> Demographic characteristics of these 647 children

---

<sup>1</sup>The Safe Haven programs served children in Grades 1-5 at each of the schools. Younger children in Grades 1 and 2 were not included in this evaluation because of the difficulties inherent in group administration of measures with children of this age.

are summarized in the first column of Table 1. As this table shows, children were evenly distributed across the three grades. Similar numbers of boys and girls were assessed. The majority of the children in the schools were White (56%), although a substantial proportion of children were Black (35%). The remainder of the sample belonged to other ethnic minority groups (American Indian, Asian, and Hispanic, 9%). More than half of the children (53%) received free or reduced-price school lunch. Nearly half of the children's households (46%) consisted of single-parent families. One hundred thirty-four children (21%) were reported by either the MMSD or classroom teachers to have exceptional education needs (EEN): 72 were learning disabled, 5 were cognitively disabled, 26 received speech and language services, 9 used a primary language other than English, 11 were hearing impaired, 1 was visually impaired, 9 were emotionally disturbed, and 1 child was reported to have an "other" impairment.

As shown in Table 1, 220 children (34%) lived in the targeted neighborhoods, as reported by MMSD (96 in Broadway-Simpson, 10 in Glendale Townhouses, 57 in Darbo-Worthington, and 57 in Vera Court). Of these children, 142 (65%) were enrolled in the after-school programs.

A total of 219 children were enrolled in the Safe Haven programs: 118 at Glendale, 58 at Mendota, 40 at Lowell, and 3 at the program operated by the Atwood Community Center for Lowell children. It appears that 77 children who did not live in the target neighborhoods were enrolled in the programs.<sup>2</sup>

One hundred two children participated in Club programs operated at Lowell Elementary, but did not participate in Safe Haven.

## DESCRIPTION OF ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

The basic research strategy adopted in this evaluation was a pre-test / post-test comparison of an experimental and a control group. The pre-test assessments were conducted by project staff during January 1995.<sup>3</sup> The post-test assessments were conducted during May 1995. This evaluation did not adhere to a strict experimental design in that children were not randomly assigned to the experimental (i.e., Safe Haven experience) and control (no Safe Haven experience) conditions. As a result, particular attention was paid to the Time 1 assessments in order to identify pre-existing differences between children who participated in Safe Haven and those who did not; it would be necessary to control for any differences in determining program effects.

---

<sup>2</sup>Accurate residence data were difficult to obtain because a significant proportion of children in the targeted schools move frequently. Residence data made available to the study were accurate as of January 1995. It likely is the case that many of the non-neighborhood children who were enrolled in the after-school programs did in fact reside in one of the targeted neighborhoods at the time of program recruitment.

<sup>3</sup>The pre-test assessment occurred later than would have been optimal. The Safe Haven programs had been in operation for varying lengths of time before the pre-test could be conducted.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Study Children

|                                      | Targeted<br>schools<br>N = 647 | Targeted<br>neighborhoods<br>N = 220 | Safe Haven<br>programs<br>N = 219 | Targeted<br>neighborhoods,<br>Safe Haven<br>programs<br>N = 142 |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>GRADE</b>                         |                                |                                      |                                   |   |
| Third                                | 238                            | 85                                   | 84                                | 52  |
| Fourth                               | 200                            | 71                                   | 72                                | 47  |
| Fifth                                | 209                            | 64                                   | 63                                | 43  |
| <b>GENDER</b>                        |                                |                                      |                                   |   |
| Boys                                 | 309                            | 103                                  | 99                                | 66  |
| Girls                                | 304                            | 117                                  | 103                               | 76  |
| <b>RACE/ETHNICITY</b>                |                                |                                      |                                   |   |
| White                                | 344                            | 50                                   | 38                                | 18  |
| Black                                | 216                            | 151                                  | 144                               | 114   |
| Other minority                       | 53                             | 19                                   | 20                                | 10  |
| <b>LUNCH SUBSIDY</b>                 |                                |                                      |                                   |   |
| Yes                                  | 322                            | 195                                  | 169                               | 133   |
| No                                   | 291                            | 25                                   | 33                                | 9   |
| <b>FAMILY STRUCTURE</b>              |                                |                                      |                                   |   |
| Two parents                          | 316                            | 64                                   | 67                                | 39  |
| One parent                           | 272                            | 150                                  | 129                               | 99  |
| <b>EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS</b> |                                |                                      |                                   |   |
| Yes                                  | 134                            | 46                                   | 38                                | 29  |
| No                                   | 513                            | 174                                  | 181                               | 113   |

Note. Demographic data were missing for 34 children. Within the family structure section, children who lived in unclear home situations (e.g., foster parent, relative) are not shown.

Children's school performance was assessed in terms of academic grades, conduct grades, and school absences. In addition, children's reports of how they would respond to different types of peer conflicts were measured. Independent assessments of the quality of the individual after-school programs were obtained on two occasions. Finally, child attendance figures at the Safe Haven programs were recorded.

It should be noted that all child assessments were conducted (or overseen) by project staff who were not aware of which children attended the Safe Haven programs, thereby minimizing the likelihood of halo effects. Program observations were conducted by City of Madison staff who were not aware of the children's performance on the child assessments.

### Child Assessments

Academic grades. Elementary schools within the MMSD do not use a standardized report card. Consequently, it was necessary to have classroom teachers complete a "mock" report card for all study children at both Time 1 and Time 2. Teachers evaluated each child's reading, oral language, written language, and math performance using 5-point ratings (1 = failing, 5 = excellent). Appendix 1 contains a copy of this mock report card. Composite scores were created for the four academic subject areas together.

Conduct grades. The mock report card also included teacher ratings of children's work habits and ability to work well with others in the classroom. These conduct marks were made using the same 5-point ratings as were used for academic grades (see Appendix 1).

School absences. The MMSD reported number of excused and unexcused school absences, in half days, for each study child during Semester 1 and Semester 2 of the 1994-95 academic year.

Conflict resolution strategies. Conflict resolution strategies were assessed with School Stories, a paper-and-pencil measure in which children reported how they would respond to four hypothetical peer conflict situations that can occur at school (see Appendix 2). This measure currently is being used in a large-scale study being conducted by the University of Illinois of social information processing in 1150 children in the 3rd-6th grades, and has been used in published studies of elementary school children's conflict resolution skills (e.g., Crick & Dodge, in press).

The hypothetical vignettes were administered to children in their school classrooms, in January 1995 (Time 1) and May 1995 (Time 2). The vignettes were read aloud to children as they followed along with a written copy. There was a minimum of three staff members present during each administration: One staff person read the stories, while the others circulated the classroom to ensure that children were on the correct page of the protocol, and to answer questions that the children may have had.

In the hypothetical stories, children were presented with four difficult situations: (1) the child is ignored by other children at the lunch table, (2) another child cuts in line in front of the child, (3) another child takes the child's seat at lunch, and (4) the child overhears other

children making fun of him/her. For each story, four kinds of conflict management strategies were assessed: assertive friendliness (e.g., "I would go up to the two kids and say, 'Please be quiet, I don't like it when people talk about me like that'"), overt aggression (e.g., "I would walk up to the two kids and push them down"), relational aggression (e.g., "I would say mean things about the two kids back in class"), and avoidance (e.g., "I wouldn't do anything, I'd just walk away"). Children were asked which of the four strategies they would use if the situation presented in the story happened to them (response decision, yes or no), how often they would use each of the four strategies if the situation happened frequently (strategy use, 5-point scale ranging from "never" to "all the time"), and how good or bad it is to use each strategy (strategy evaluation, 4-point scale ranging from "bad" to "good").

From the vignettes, it was possible to derive three sets of scores. The first set of scores indicated the proportion of stories for which children reported their most likely response being assertive-friendly, overt aggressive, relationally aggressive, or avoidant. The second set of scores indicated how likely the children would be to use each of the four types of responses if the situation occurred frequently. The final set of scores reflected how good it would be to use each of these four strategies.

### Child and Family Demographic Information

The MMSD provided demographic data on the study children. These data included children's birthdate, gender, ethnicity, household type, receipt of subsidized school lunch, and neighborhood of residence. A description of how this information was coded for data analyses is included in Appendix 3.

### Safe Haven Assessments

Data about the programs were provided by City of Madison and Safe Haven staff. A City of Madison staff member observed each of the four programs two times, during Fall 1994 and Spring 1995, and rated them with the School-Age Care Environment Rating Scale (SACERS; Harms, Jacobs, & White, 1996). This measure uses a 7-point rating scale, ranging from 1 = inadequate to 7 = excellent, to assess school-age care programs in terms of space and furnishings, health and safety policies and practices, available activities, interactions between children and staff, program structure, staff development, and accommodations for special needs children.

Safe Haven staff provided reports on the number of days that enrolled children attended the programs.

## RESULTS

### Descriptive Statistics Summarizing Results of the Child Assessments

Table 2 summarizes the means and standard deviations for all child assessments for the sample as a whole. This table shows that the mean academic grade at both Time 1 and Time 2 fell between "average" and "very good", with the full range of grades represented. Conduct

Table 2

Summary Statistics for the Sample as a Whole

|                                      | Range of scores | Time 1 mean (SD) | Time 2 mean (SD) |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>SCHOOL VARIABLES</b>              |                 |                  |                  |
| Academic grades                      | 1-5             | 3.34 (0.96)      | 3.52 (0.99)      |
| Work habits                          | 1-5             | 3.48 (1.10)      | 3.56 (1.16)      |
| Works well with others               | 1-5             | 3.71 (1.11)      | 3.70 (1.14)      |
| Excused absences, number half days   | 0-58            | 6.49 (6.93)      | 8.31 (7.84)      |
| Unexcused absences, number half days | 0-176           | 2.26 (5.43)      | 3.13 (9.94)      |
| <b>CONFLICT RESOLUTION VARIABLES</b> |                 |                  |                  |
| Response decision                    |                 |                  |                  |
| Assertive friendliness               | 0-1             | 0.42 (0.30)      | 0.42 (0.30)      |
| Overt aggression                     | 0-1             | 0.14 (0.25)      | 0.16 (0.27)      |
| Relational aggression                | 0-1             | 0.06 (0.14)      | 0.07 (0.13)      |
| Avoidance                            | 0-1             | 0.39 (0.28)      | 0.36 (0.26)      |
| Strategy use                         |                 |                  |                  |
| Assertive friendliness               | 1-5             | 3.40 (0.89)      | 3.36 (0.93)      |
| Overt aggression                     | 1-5             | 2.27 (1.15)      | 2.32 (1.23)      |
| Relational aggression                | 1-5             | 2.57 (1.09)      | 2.54 (1.10)      |
| Avoidance                            | 1-5             | 3.27 (0.92)      | 3.25 (0.97)      |
| Strategy evaluation                  |                 |                  |                  |
| Assertive friendliness               | 1-4             | 3.41 (0.61)      | 3.46 (0.62)      |
| Overt aggression                     | 1-4             | 1.52 (0.79)      | 1.53 (0.81)      |
| Relational aggression                | 1-4             | 1.86 (0.76)      | 1.80 (0.78)      |
| Avoidance                            | 1-4             | 3.19 (0.71)      | 3.23 (0.71)      |

grades also exhibited the full range; both work habits scores and ratings of ability to work well with others averaged between "average" and "very good" at Times 1 and 2. There was considerable variability across children, with some children exhibiting academic and conduct problems and other children exhibiting strong academic and conduct records as measured by teacher report.

Table 2 also shows that the number of school absences, both excused and unexcused, ranged widely, with some children never absent from school and other children missing as much as half the school year. There was more of each type of school absence during Semester 2 than during Semester 1.

Table 2 contains summary descriptive statistics for the conflict resolution vignettes as well. Mean scores for each type of strategy within the three types of scores show that children were more likely to respond to each vignette with assertive friendliness or avoidance than with overt aggression or relational aggression. Children also indicated that they would use assertive friendliness and avoidance more often than overt and relational aggression if the presented conflict situations occurred frequently, and they evaluated assertive friendliness and avoidance more positively than the two types of aggression. There was, however, considerable variation in children's responses. Each type of conflict resolution score showed the full range of possible scores, meaning that each of the four types of strategies was chosen exclusively by some children.

Evidence for the psychometric validity of the assessments was found in Pearson correlations between some of the variables. As shown in Table 3, a composite score of the four academic grades was highly positively correlated with work habits at Time 1 and at Time 2. Teacher ratings of children's ability to work well with others at school were correlated with children's selection and evaluation of conflict resolution strategies--positively correlated with assertive friendliness, and negatively correlated with overt aggression and relational aggression.

### Contrasts of the Demographic Characteristics of Study Children

There were significant demographic differences between children living in the targeted neighborhoods and other children at the three schools. Chi-square analyses indicated that the children who lived in the Broadway-Simpson, Glendale Townhouse, Darbo-Worthington, and Vera Court neighborhoods were more often Black (69%) whereas students living outside of the targeted neighborhoods were more often White (75%;  $X^2(2) = 176.8, p < .001$ ). Children in the targeted neighborhoods also were more likely to live in single-parent households and receive lunch subsidies (70% single parents versus 33% single parents for children living outside of the targeted neighborhoods,  $X^2(1) = 76.9, p < .001$ ; 89% subsidized school lunch in the targeted neighborhoods versus 32% subsidized lunch for children in non-targeted neighborhoods,  $X^2(1) = 179.4, p < .001$ ). Similar proportions of boys and girls, and EEN children, resided in the targeted and non-targeted neighborhoods.

Approximately 35% of the children who were enrolled in the Safe Haven programs did not live in the targeted neighborhoods. These non-neighborhood children, however, had a similar demographic profile to that of the neighborhood children who were enrolled in Safe Haven.



Table 3

Pearson Correlations of Conduct Grades with Academic and Conflict Resolution Variables

|                                | Work Habits            |                     |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
|                                | Time 1                 | Time 2              |
| Academic grades                | .71 <sup>***</sup>     | .70 <sup>***</sup>  |
|                                | Works Well with Others |                     |
|                                | Time 1                 | Time 2              |
| CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGIES |                        |                     |
| Response decision              |                        |                     |
| Assertive friendliness         | .22 <sup>***</sup>     | .19 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Overt aggression               | -.26 <sup>***</sup>    | -.23 <sup>***</sup> |
| Relational aggression          | -.03                   | -.17 <sup>***</sup> |
| Avoidance                      | .01                    | .09 <sup>*</sup>    |
| Strategy use                   |                        |                     |
| Assertive friendliness         | .02                    | .03                 |
| Overt aggression               | -.31 <sup>***</sup>    | -.32 <sup>***</sup> |
| Relational aggression          | -.28 <sup>***</sup>    | -.30 <sup>***</sup> |
| Avoidance                      | .01                    | -.01                |
| Strategy evaluation            |                        |                     |
| Assertive friendliness         | .14 <sup>**</sup>      | .16 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Overt aggression               | -.23 <sup>***</sup>    | -.28 <sup>***</sup> |
| Relational aggression          | -.24 <sup>***</sup>    | -.30 <sup>***</sup> |
| Avoidance                      | .01                    | -.03                |

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$     \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Comparisons of children who were enrolled in Safe Haven with other students in the targeted elementary schools indicated significant differences. Safe Haven children were more likely to be Black (71%), whereas 18% of the non-program children were Black ( $X^2(2) = 186.4, p < .001$ ). Approximately 84% of the program children received lunch subsidies; 37% of the non-program children received subsidies ( $X^2(1) = 117.1, p < .001$ ). Sixty-six percent of the program children resided in single-parent households, whereas 36% of the non-program children lived in one-parent families ( $X^2(1) = 45.2, p < .001$ ). There were no differences in terms of gender and EEN status between program and non-program children.

A final set of Chi-square analyses determined whether the children who lived in the target neighborhoods and who were enrolled in the after-school programs differed demographically from neighborhood children who were not enrolled in the programs. These results indicated that, within the targeted neighborhoods, Black children were relatively more likely (75%) and White children were relatively less likely (36%) to be enrolled in Safe Haven ( $X^2(2) = 26.9, p < .001$ ). Approximately 94% of the neighborhood children attending Safe Haven received lunch subsidies, whereas 79% of the neighborhood children who did not attend the programs received these subsidies ( $X^2(1) = 10.0, p < .01$ ). There were no differences between neighborhood children who were enrolled in the program and those who were not in terms of household type, gender, and EEN status.

These results confirm that the Safe Haven programs were successful in enrolling substantial numbers of children who might benefit from special after-school programs.

### Description of the Safe Haven Programs

Program quality data obtained by City of Madison staff revealed that the four Safe Haven programs varied widely in quality (Table 4). Mean scores on the SACERS indicated considerable program variability at Time 1. Two of the programs (Programs 1 and 4) were rated as having higher quality than Programs 2 and 3. The total mean item scores for Program 1 (5.1) and Program 4 (5.6) at Time 1 indicated that these programs were providing the basic dimensions of developmentally appropriate care, whereas the total mean item score for Program 2 (2.6) was representative of a custodial level of care, and the score for Program 3 (1.8) was representative of care that compromised children's development.

Differences in program quality also were observed at Time 2, although the gap was considerably smaller at that time. Mean item scores for Programs 1 and 4 were slightly higher at Time 2 relative to Time 1 scores, approaching excellence in care that expands children's experiences, extends their learning, and provides warm and caring support. Programs 2 and 3 improved considerably, approaching basic developmentally appropriate care.

It should be noted that program differences were not surprising. The staff at Program 4, who participated in developing Program 1, have been operating after-school programs for a number of years. The other two programs, however, were new. The scores for these latter programs probably reflected the fact that the newly-hired staff required training, activities and materials were not in place, etc. The improvement in program quality over time in the two new programs was promising and reassuring.

Table 4

Quality Scores for Safe Haven After-School Programs

|                              | Program 1     |               | Program 2     |               | Program 3     |               | Program 4     |               |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                              | <u>Time 1</u> | <u>Time 2</u> | <u>Time 1</u> | <u>Time 2</u> | <u>Time 1</u> | <u>Time 2</u> | <u>Time 1</u> | <u>Time 2</u> |
| Mean Item Score              |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
| Total score                  | 5.1           | 5.7           | 2.6           | 4.3           | 1.8           | 4.2           | 5.6           | 6.1           |
| Space and furnishings        | 5.0           | 5.7           | 2.5           | 4.5           | 2.4           | 3.9           | 6.3           | 6.4           |
| Health and safety            | 5.1           | 4.9           | 2.4           | 4.1           | 1.9           | 3.4           | 5.3           | 5.6           |
| Activities                   | 4.0           | 5.4           | 1.5           | 3.9           | 1.3           | 3.9           | 4.9           | 6.0           |
| Interactions                 | 6.2           | 6.4           | 3.7           | 5.6           | 1.8           | 4.9           | 5.4           | 6.4           |
| Program structure            | 6.8           | 6.8           | 3.7           | 4.8           | 1.5           | 5.5           | 6.5           | 7.0           |
| Staff development            | 4.0           | 6.0           | 4.3           | 3.3           | 2.0           | 4.7           | 5.7           | 6.7           |
| Provisions for special needs | 4.8           | 4.8           | 2.0           | 3.0           | 1.5           | 4.2           | 5.2           | 5.2           |

In addition to program quality variations, there also was substantial variability in how often children actually participated in the Safe Haven programs. The number of days that children attended the after-school programs varied from a single day to 91 days (median = 20 days). Table 5 shows the distribution of participation. Ten percent of the program enrollees attended the programs 7 or fewer days across the school year; half the children attended 20 or fewer days. Just 5% of the children attended the programs 69 or more days, and 10% attended 40 or more days.

#### Comparisons of Safe Haven and Non-Safe Haven Children's Academic Performance, Conduct Grades, School Absences, and Conflict Resolution Strategies

A major focus of the Safe Haven evaluation was a determination of program effects on children's academic performance, conduct grades, school absences, and conflict resolution strategies. A critical decision was a determination of which children should be included in these analyses. For all analyses reported here, children who were previously identified by the MMSD or by classroom teachers as having exceptional education needs (EEN) were excluded from the computations, because of our concern that these children may have had difficulty understanding the conflict resolution measure, and because many of the classroom teachers indicated that they use a different grading scale for their EEN students.<sup>4</sup>

A second decision reflected a need to determine which program and non-program children should be included in the analyses. Two approaches were taken. First, analyses were conducted which considered only the children who resided in the targeted neighborhoods, so that comparisons could be made between target neighborhood children who were enrolled in the Safe Haven after-school programs, and target neighborhood children who were not enrolled. These analyses focused on children who resided in the at-risk neighborhoods. As demonstrated in the demographic analyses, a substantial majority of these children were Black, and resided in low-income, single-parent households. The second approach contrasted all children who were enrolled in the Safe Haven programs with the performance of all other children at the targeted elementary schools (66% of these children did not live in the targeted neighborhoods). Results from these two types of analyses are reported below.<sup>5</sup>

Neighborhood program and non-program children at Time 1. Between-group t-tests were used to contrast program and non-program children who lived in the targeted neighborhoods at Time 1 (January 1995). These tests were conducted to determine if there were pre-existing differences in the two groups of neighborhood children. As shown in Table 6, numerous Time 1 differences were found. Prior to substantial involvement with the Safe Haven programs, program children who were living in the targeted neighborhoods, compared to

---

<sup>4</sup>Analyses which included the EEN students were conducted as well, as a test. The results of those analyses did not differ substantially from those reported here.

<sup>5</sup>In all of the analyses that follow, children who were enrolled in the Club programs at Lowell but who did not attend Safe Haven programs were excluded. This allowed us to make comparisons only between children who received Safe Haven intervention and those who received no intervention during the after-school hours.

Table 5

Distribution of Number of Days Children Attended Safe Haven Programs

| Number of days attended | Number of children | Number of days attended | Number of children | Number of days attended | Number of children |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| 1                       | 10                 | 25                      | 6                  | 61                      | 1                  |
| 2                       | 9                  | 26                      | 2                  | 62                      | 1                  |
| 3                       | 5                  | 27                      | 3                  | 63                      | 1                  |
| 4                       | 8                  | 28                      | 2                  | 64                      | 3                  |
| 5                       | 8                  | 31                      | 1                  | 65                      | 1                  |
| 6                       | 7                  | 32                      | 2                  | 66                      | 1                  |
| 7                       | 5                  | 34                      | 1                  | 69                      | 1                  |
| 8                       | 8                  | 35                      | 4                  | 70                      | 1                  |
| 9                       | 2                  | 36                      | 4                  | 71                      | 1                  |
| 10                      | 4                  | 37                      | 2                  | 72                      | 2                  |
| 11                      | 3                  | 39                      | 6                  | 74                      | 1                  |
| 12                      | 5                  | 40                      | 3                  | 75                      | 2                  |
| 13                      | 4                  | 41                      | 1                  | 77                      | 1                  |
| 14                      | 3                  | 42                      | 4                  | 78                      | 3                  |
| 15                      | 5                  | 43                      | 2                  | 79                      | 5                  |
| 16                      | 1                  | 44                      | 1                  | 81                      | 5                  |
| 17                      | 7                  | 46                      | 2                  | 82                      | 2                  |
| 18                      | 4                  | 51                      | 1                  | 83                      | 1                  |
| 19                      | 4                  | 55                      | 1                  | 84                      | 1                  |
| 20                      | 6                  | 56                      | 1                  | 90                      | 1                  |
| 21                      | 6                  | 57                      | 1                  | 91                      | 1                  |
| 23                      | 2                  | 58                      | 1                  |                         |                    |
| 24                      | 8                  | 59                      | 1                  |                         |                    |

Note. Attendance data were missing for seven children who were enrolled in Safe Haven programs.

Table 6  
Time 1 T-Test Comparisons of Mean Scores

|                               | Neighborhood residents |                       |            | All children      |                       |            |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|
|                               | Program mean (SD)      | Non-program mean (SD) | Sig. level | Program mean (SD) | Non-program mean (SD) | Sig. level |
| <b>SCHOOL VARIABLES</b>       |                        |                       |            |                   |                       |            |
| Academic grades               | 2.98 (0.79)            | 3.40 (0.87)           | **         | 3.06 (0.78)       | 3.68 (0.86)           | ***        |
| Work habits                   | 3.05 (1.08)            | 3.64 (1.08)           | ***        | 3.11 (1.07)       | 3.77 (1.05)           | ***        |
| Works well with others        | 3.17 (1.12)            | 3.85 (1.04)           | ***        | 3.31 (1.15)       | 4.06 (0.98)           | ***        |
| Excused absences, half days   | 6.09 (5.63)            | 6.44 (7.12)           | ns         | 5.60 (5.24)       | 6.60 (7.29)           | ns         |
| Unexcused absences, half days | 5.08 (7.90)            | 4.36 (8.65)           | ns         | 3.85 (6.94)       | 1.72 (5.19)           | ***        |
| <b>CONFLICT RESOLUTION</b>    |                        |                       |            |                   |                       |            |
| <b>Response decision</b>      |                        |                       |            |                   |                       |            |
| Assertive friendliness        | 0.36 (0.29)            | 0.45 (0.32)           | ns         | 0.37 (0.29)       | 0.42 (0.30)           | ns         |
| Overt aggression              | 0.22 (0.28)            | 0.11 (0.22)           | *          | 0.20 (0.28)       | 0.11 (0.23)           | **         |
| Relational aggression         | 0.06 (0.11)            | 0.04 (0.12)           | ns         | 0.07 (0.12)       | 0.04 (0.12)           | *          |
| Avoidance                     | 0.36 (0.27)            | 0.40 (0.27)           | ns         | 0.37 (0.27)       | 0.43 (0.28)           | *          |
| <b>Strategy use</b>           |                        |                       |            |                   |                       |            |
| Assertive friendliness        | 3.59 (0.98)            | 3.40 (0.95)           | ns         | 3.53 (1.00)       | 3.37 (0.83)           | ns         |
| Overt aggression              | 2.76 (1.24)            | 2.12 (1.09)           | **         | 2.72 (1.21)       | 2.03 (1.06)           | ***        |
| Relational aggression         | 3.04 (1.18)            | 2.55 (1.07)           | *          | 3.02 (1.12)       | 2.33 (0.96)           | ***        |
| Avoidance                     | 3.25 (1.01)            | 3.39 (0.96)           | ns         | 3.25 (0.97)       | 3.40 (0.87)           | ns         |
| <b>Strategy evaluation</b>    |                        |                       |            |                   |                       |            |
| Assertive friendliness        | 3.37 (0.68)            | 3.57 (0.42)           | *          | 3.37 (0.67)       | 3.48 (0.56)           | ns         |
| Overt aggression              | 1.82 (0.97)            | 1.50 (0.81)           | *          | 1.75 (0.94)       | 1.37 (0.66)           | ***        |
| Relational aggression         | 2.18 (0.85)            | 1.86 (0.68)           | *          | 2.10 (0.86)       | 1.69 (0.67)           | ***        |
| Avoidance                     | 3.11 (0.82)            | 3.24 (0.68)           | ns         | 3.15 (0.79)       | 3.32 (0.65)           | *          |

ns = not significant \*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .01$  \*\*\*  $p < .001$

neighborhood children who did not attend the programs:

- had poorer academic grades and work habits at school
- received lower ratings for working well with others at school
- chose an overt aggressive strategy more often in response to the presented conflict situations
- indicated they would use overt aggressive and relationally aggressive strategies more often if the presented conflicts occurred frequently
- evaluated the assertive friendliness strategy less positively, and the overt and relationally aggressive strategies more positively

These Time 1 analyses suggest that the children in the targeted neighborhoods who participated in Safe Haven programs had substantially poorer performance in school and poorer conflict resolution skills than neighborhood children who did not participate in the programs.

Safe Haven versus Non-Safe Haven children at Time 1. When children who attended Safe Haven were contrasted with all other children at their elementary schools, pre-existing differences at Time 1 were found (see Table 6). Children who were subsequently enrolled in Safe Haven, compared to children who did not enroll in the programs:

- earned poor academic grades and work habits ratings
- earned lower ratings for working well with others at school
- had more unexcused absences from school
- chose overt aggressive and relationally aggressive strategies more often, and an avoidance strategy more often, in response to the presented conflict situations
- indicated they would use overt and relational aggressive strategies more often if the presented conflicts happened frequently
- evaluated the avoidant strategy more negatively, and the overt aggressive and relational aggressive strategies more positively

These differences suggest that children targeted for the Safe Haven programs did evince considerable behavioral difficulties (reflected in conduct grades, unexcused absences, and endorsement of overt and relational aggression) relative to other children who were enrolled at their elementary schools. These differences also indicate that Safe Haven was successful in enrolling children who would benefit from a program designed to improve conflict resolution skills.

Comparisons of neighborhood program and non-program children over time. The next issue to be evaluated was whether participation in Safe Haven was associated with changes in children's school performance and conflict resolution strategies over time. This issue was first investigated for children in the targeted neighborhoods. Mixed model analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to determine the effects of program participation on children's academic grades, conduct grades, school absences, and conflict resolution strategies. The results of these 2 (program participation) by 2 (time) repeated measures ANOVAs are reported on Table 7. Also included in the table are mean scores at Times 1 and 2. Significant statistical interactions between participation and time would indicate that participation in the Safe Haven programs had a differential effect over time on child adjustment. As indicated in the Time X Program column of Table 7, no such statistical interaction effects were obtained.

There was, however, further evidence that children who participated in Safe Haven were particularly in need of services. As shown in the Program column of the table, program children continued to differ from non-program children at Time 2 as well as Time 1. In particular, the program children:

- received lower ratings from teachers for academic grades, work habits, and ability to work well with others
- chose an assertive-friendly strategy less often and an overt aggressive strategy more often in response to the hypothetical situations
- reported that they would be more likely to use overt aggression and relational aggression in the future
- evaluated assertive-friendly responses less positively

Prediction of all children's scores at Time 2 by program enrollment. The next step in data analyses was to determine the effects of program enrollment for the sample as a whole on children's academic grades, conduct grades, school absences, and conflict resolution strategies. These simultaneous multiple regressions enabled us to determine the effects of enrollment in the Safe Haven programs after controlling for child gender, child race, family structure, and lunch subsidy. It was necessary to statistically control for demographic characteristics in these analyses because of the differences between children who were enrolled in Safe Haven programs and the other children at their schools. In addition, the child's performance at Time 1 for a given assessment was included in the regression equation so that we could ascertain changes in children's behavior over time associated with Safe Haven participation. The regressions allowed us to determine the influence of the various demographic variables and program enrollment on the Time 2 scores when each of the other variables was statistically controlled. Separate regression equations were tested for each Time 2 score.

The results of these analyses are summarized on Table 8. As indicated on the table, enrollment in Safe Haven did not significantly predict any of the Time 2 scores when the demographic variables and the Time 1 comparable score were statistically controlled. There were, however, other factors predicting children's performance at Time 2.



Table 7

Repeated Measures Analyses of VarianceComparing Target Neighborhood Program and Non-Program Children

|                            | Target neighborhood children |             |                       |              | Significance level |         |                |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------|----------------|
|                            | Program mean (SD)            |             | Non-program mean (SD) |              | Time               | Program | Time x Program |
|                            | Time 1                       | Time 2      | Time 1                | Time 2       |                    |         |                |
| <b>SCHOOL VARIABLES</b>    |                              |             |                       |              |                    |         |                |
| Academic grades            | 3.04 (0.80)                  | 3.13 (0.89) | 3.45 (0.84)           | 3.57 (0.92)  | ***                | ***     | ns             |
| Work habits                | 3.15 (1.03)                  | 3.07 (1.15) | 3.64 (1.11)           | 3.62 (1.03)  | ns                 | ***     | ns             |
| Works well w/others        | 3.23 (1.10)                  | 3.05 (1.16) | 3.96 (1.01)           | 3.77 (1.08)  | **                 | ***     | ns             |
| Excused absences           | 6.09 (5.63)                  | 8.04 (8.04) | 6.44 (7.12)           | 8.09 (7.39)  | ***                | ns      | ns             |
| Unexcused absences         | 5.08 (7.90)                  | 6.51 (9.42) | 4.36 (8.65)           | 6.87 (24.20) | ns                 | ns      | ns             |
| <b>CONFLICT RESOLUTION</b> |                              |             |                       |              |                    |         |                |
| Response decision          |                              |             |                       |              |                    |         |                |
| Assertive friendliness     | 0.36 (0.29)                  | 0.30 (0.26) | 0.45 (0.33)           | 0.43 (0.34)  | ns                 | *       | ns             |
| Overt aggression           | 0.21 (0.28)                  | 0.25 (0.32) | 0.11 (0.24)           | 0.17 (0.27)  | **                 | **      | ns             |
| Relational aggression      | 0.05 (0.10)                  | 0.10 (0.14) | 0.05 (0.13)           | 0.09 (0.17)  | **                 | ns      | ns             |
| Avoidance                  | 0.37 (0.27)                  | 0.35 (0.25) | 0.39 (0.27)           | 0.30 (0.21)  | *                  | ns      | ns             |
| Strategy use               |                              |             |                       |              |                    |         |                |
| Assertive friendliness     | 3.59 (0.96)                  | 3.29 (1.00) | 3.46 (0.95)           | 3.33 (1.08)  | *                  | ns      | ns             |
| Overt aggression           | 2.73 (1.25)                  | 2.76 (1.35) | 2.21 (1.14)           | 2.34 (1.23)  | ns                 | *       | ns             |
| Relational aggression      | 3.02 (1.14)                  | 3.02 (1.21) | 2.62 (1.12)           | 2.60 (1.20)  | ns                 | *       | ns             |
| Avoidance                  | 3.30 (0.92)                  | 3.20 (0.97) | 3.41 (0.98)           | 3.06 (1.04)  | *                  | ns      | ns             |
| Strategy evaluation        |                              |             |                       |              |                    |         |                |
| Assertive friendliness     | 3.39 (0.64)                  | 3.26 (0.76) | 3.62 (0.33)           | 3.52 (0.61)  | **                 | *       | ns             |
| Overt aggression           | 1.81 (0.98)                  | 1.83 (1.01) | 1.55 (0.87)           | 1.59 (0.88)  | ns                 | ns      | ns             |
| Relational aggression      | 2.16 (0.87)                  | 2.10 (0.96) | 1.91 (0.72)           | 1.92 (0.81)  | ns                 | ns      | ns             |
| Avoidance                  | 3.15 (0.80)                  | 3.27 (0.78) | 3.24 (0.70)           | 3.22 (0.64)  | ns                 | ns      | ns             |

ns = not significant    \*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$     \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Table 8

Simultaneous Multiple Regressions on Time 2 Scores with Demographic and Enrollment Predictors

|                        | Predictors (betas) |                  |                      |                      |                       |                           | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
|                        | <u>Gender</u>      | <u>Ethnicity</u> | <u>Single parent</u> | <u>Lunch subsidy</u> | <u>Time 1 control</u> | <u>Program enrollment</u> |                     |
| SCHOOL VARIABLES       |                    |                  |                      |                      |                       |                           |                     |
| Academic grades        | .03                | -.10**           | -.03                 | -.04                 | .82***                | .01                       | .80***              |
| Work habits            | .03                | -.10*            | -.07                 | .02                  | .74***                | -.03                      | .64***              |
| Works well w/others    | -.003              | -.06             | -.09*                | .0003                | .72***                | -.08                      | .64***              |
| Excused absences       | -.003              | -.09             | -.06                 | .09                  | .38***                | .02                       | .14***              |
| Unexcused absences     | .03                | .10              | .03                  | .0002                | .58***                | -.001                     | .39***              |
| CONFLICT RESOLUTION    |                    |                  |                      |                      |                       |                           |                     |
| Response decision      |                    |                  |                      |                      |                       |                           |                     |
| Assertive friendliness | .16**              | -.05             | -.08                 | -.01                 | .41***                | -.04                      | .22***              |
| Overt aggression       | -.18***            | -.02             | .13*                 | -.02                 | .56***                | .03                       | .41***              |
| Relational aggression  | -.06               | .06              | -.02                 | .09                  | .21***                | .04                       | .05**               |
| Avoidance              | .11*               | .04              | -.09                 | -.01                 | .40***                | -.01                      | .18***              |
| Strategy use           |                    |                  |                      |                      |                       |                           |                     |
| Assertive friendliness | .10                | .03              | -.02                 | -.02                 | .47***                | -.05                      | .22***              |
| Overt aggression       | -.12*              | .04              | .02                  | .01                  | .59***                | -.02                      | .40***              |
| Relational aggression  | -.005              | .08              | .05                  | -.02                 | .53***                | -.04                      | .30***              |
| Avoidance              | .17***             | -.07             | -.08                 | .02                  | .49***                | .002                      | .30***              |
| Strategy evaluation    |                    |                  |                      |                      |                       |                           |                     |
| Assertive friendliness | .12*               | -.01             | -.06                 | -.01                 | .50***                | -.09                      | .30***              |
| Overt aggression       | -.14**             | .05              | .01                  | .06                  | .61***                | -.04                      | .43***              |
| Relational aggression  | -.11*              | .15*             | -.01                 | .06                  | .53***                | -.05                      | .36***              |
| Avoidance              | .12*               | -.13*            | .09                  | -.03                 | .54***                | .09                       | .31***              |

\* p &lt; .05    \*\* p &lt; .01    \*\*\* p &lt; .001

The most powerful predictor of children's performance at Time 2 was the Time 1 score for that particular variable. For each of the Time 2 child assessments, children's scores at Time 1 were strong positive predictors of children's scores at Time 2. This indicates that there was substantial stability across the school year in children's behavior, in terms of conflict resolution strategies, academic grades, conduct grades, and school absences.

Children's Time 2 performance also was associated with child gender. Girls, compared to boys:

- selected assertive-friendly and avoidance strategies more often, and overt aggression less often, in response to the presented conflict situations
- indicated they would use an avoidance strategy more often, and an overt aggression strategy less often, if the presented conflicts occurred frequently
- evaluated assertive friendliness and avoidance more positively, and overt aggression and relational aggression less positively

Systematic effects of minority race and single-parent household also were observed at Time 2. Minority race children, compared to White children:

- had lower academic grades
- received lower work habits ratings
- evaluated relational aggression more positively, and avoidance more negatively

Children from single-parent homes, compared to children living with two parents:

- received lower ratings for working well with others
- chose an overt aggression strategy more often in response to the presented conflict situations

### Variations in Child Experiences Within the Safe Haven Programs

All analyses reported thus far have contrasted children who participated in Safe Haven programs with children who did not participate. There were, however, substantial variations in children's after-school experiences within the Safe Haven group. As shown in Table 5, program children varied widely in the number of days that they attended the program (1 to 91 days). In addition, the programs varied in terms of their observed quality rating, especially early in the school year (see Table 4). Two programs were rated as offering good- to high-quality, developmentally appropriate care, whereas the other two programs were rated as providing poor-quality care. The next set of analyses focused on the effects of these attendance and quality variations on children who were enrolled in the Safe Haven programs. Program attendance was scored at eight levels: 1 = 1-10 days, 2 = 11-20 days, 3 = 21-30 days, 4 = 31-40 days, 5 = 41-50

days, 6 = 51-60 days, 7 = 61-70 days, and 8 = 71 or more days. Program quality was scored as 0 or 1: The two lower-quality programs (Programs 2 and 3) were given a code of 0, and the two higher-quality programs (Programs 1 and 4) were given a code of 1.

Simultaneous multiple regressions were conducted to determine if children's Time 2 adjustment could be predicted by (a) residence in the targeted neighborhoods, (b) the comparable Time 1 child measure, (c) program quality, and (d) number of days that the child attended the Safe Haven program. As shown on Table 9, only one effect was found to be associated with number of program attendance days: Program attendance was associated with fewer excused school absences. There also was one effect associated with program quality: Children who attended the lower-quality programs had better academic grades at Time 2.

Other factors were associated with child adjustment in the regressions. The most pronounced associations reflected the stability of children's behavior over time. Children's behavior at Time 1 predicted children's behavior at Time 2 on all but one of the measures. In addition, systematic neighborhood effects were obtained. Program children who resided in the targeted neighborhoods were less likely to report using assertive-friendly responses to conflict, in contrast to program children who did not live in the targeted neighborhoods. Program children in the targeted neighborhoods also evaluated relational aggressive responses more positively than non-neighborhood program children, and neighborhood program children reported being more likely to use relational aggression in conflict situations in the future.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. Demographic factors were associated with academic and social difficulties. Specifically, living in a single-parent home was associated with poorer conduct grades (works well with others) and poorer choices of conflict resolution strategies (overt aggression), and ethnic minority status was associated with poorer academic grades, poorer conduct grades (work habits), and endorsement of poor conflict resolution choices (positive evaluations of relational aggression and negative evaluations of avoidance). These associations underscore the importance of providing intervention for children with the traditional "risk" demographic characteristics.
2. Safe Haven (a joint effort of the City of Madison and the Madison Metropolitan School District) successfully targeted children who were at risk for academic and social difficulties. Recruitment strategies resulted in the programs enrolling primarily poor minority children who lived in single-parent homes. The majority of the children who were enrolled resided in the targeted neighborhoods and appeared to be at especially high risk. These program children, in comparison to non-program children, evidenced more academic and school conduct problems (in terms of grades, work habits, ability to work well with others, and unexcused absences from school) and more problems with conflict resolution strategies (greater selection of and more positive views of aggressive strategies, and less selection and poorer evaluation of more positive strategies).
3. There were no effects of participation in the Safe Haven programs on children's academic performance, conduct in school, absences from school, and conflict

Table 9  
Simultaneous Multiple Regressions on Time 2 Scores  
with Program Quality and Program Attendance Predictors

|                            | Predictors (betas)            |                       |                        |                                | Adj. R <sup>2</sup> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
|                            | <u>Neighborhood residence</u> | <u>Time 1 control</u> | <u>Program quality</u> | <u>Number of days attended</u> |                     |
| <b>SCHOOL VARIABLES</b>    |                               |                       |                        |                                |                     |
| Academic grades            | -.05                          | .86 <sup>***</sup>    | -.11 <sup>*</sup>      | .01                            | .76 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Work habits                | -.05                          | .77 <sup>***</sup>    | .0003                  | -.05                           | .59 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Works well w/others        | -.09                          | .73 <sup>***</sup>    | .04                    | .07                            | .57 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Excused absences           | .06                           | .32 <sup>***</sup>    | .08                    | -.16 <sup>*</sup>              | .12 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Unexcused absences         | -.04                          | .70 <sup>***</sup>    | .04                    | .03                            | .47 <sup>***</sup>  |
| <b>CONFLICT RESOLUTION</b> |                               |                       |                        |                                |                     |
| <b>Response decision</b>   |                               |                       |                        |                                |                     |
| Assertive friendliness     | -.23 <sup>**</sup>            | .39 <sup>***</sup>    | -.09                   | .06                            | .19 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Overt aggression           | .09                           | .53 <sup>***</sup>    | .09                    | -.02                           | .29 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Relational aggression      | .13                           | .07                   | -.03                   | -.009                          | -.01                |
| Avoidance                  | -.03                          | .40 <sup>***</sup>    | -.05                   | -.10                           | .14 <sup>***</sup>  |
| <b>Strategy use</b>        |                               |                       |                        |                                |                     |
| Assertive friendliness     | -.03                          | .34 <sup>***</sup>    | .10                    | .004                           | .09 <sup>**</sup>   |
| Overt aggression           | .15                           | .50 <sup>***</sup>    | .14                    | -.07                           | .29 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Relational aggression      | .27 <sup>***</sup>            | .44 <sup>***</sup>    | .04                    | -.02                           | .27 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Avoidance                  | -.003                         | .33 <sup>***</sup>    | -.11                   | .12                            | .12 <sup>***</sup>  |
| <b>Strategy evaluation</b> |                               |                       |                        |                                |                     |
| Assertive friendliness     | -.15                          | .55 <sup>***</sup>    | -.12                   | .09                            | .34 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Overt aggression           | .13                           | .59 <sup>***</sup>    | .12                    | -.005                          | .38 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Relational aggression      | .16 <sup>*</sup>              | .53 <sup>***</sup>    | .10                    | .03                            | .33 <sup>***</sup>  |
| Avoidance                  | -.04                          | .42 <sup>***</sup>    | -.15                   | .02                            | .20 <sup>***</sup>  |

\* p < .05    \*\* p < .01    \*\*\* p < .001

resolution strategies at Time 2. There are two possible explanations to be found in the data. First, the programs were of variable quality, with some programs being of poor quality while others were of good quality. A plethora of research has shown that high-quality child care is associated with children's behavioral and social outcomes (e.g., Howes, Phillips, & Whitebook, 1992; Phillips, 1990). A second explanation lies in the number of days that children actually attended the programs they were enrolled in. Many of the children attended very few days; with less exposure to the programs, it is more difficult to find an effect of the programs on children's outcomes. Neither of these two possibilities are strong explanations, however.

Other explanations for the failure to find program effects are possible. For example, the short period of time between the pre-test and the post-test (4 months) may not have been long enough to observe changes in what were remarkably stable behaviors and attitudes. A longer-term evaluation may be necessary to discern effects of the Safe Haven intervention for children in the upper elementary grades. Another possible explanation is related to problems with the conflict resolution skill enhancement that the programs aimed to do. Training sessions for Safe Haven staff in how to teach conflict resolution strategies to children did not occur until May 1995, near the time of our post-test. Consequently there was little, if any, exposure to conflict resolution techniques for the children who participated in the after-school programs by the time of the post-test.

Finally, it should be noted that each of the three elementary schools involved in the study (Glendale, Lowell, and Mendota) had a conflict resolution and mediation curriculum in place during the 1994-95 school year. It may be the case that additional exposure to conflict resolution techniques during the after-school hours does not provide much more benefit beyond what already is learned during the course of the regular school day.

4. The children who were targeted for Safe Haven intervention clearly are in need of intervention. There is potential for these children to benefit from involvement in the Safe Haven programs. It is recommended that staff carefully consider how best to design their after-school programs in terms of activities and goals. For example, one-on-one tutoring may help to improve children's academic grades. An additional recommendation is that further evaluation of the Safe Haven programs be conducted. There may be longitudinal effects of involvement in the programs that will appear after a longer period of time than the four months this study encompassed.

## References

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (in press). Social information processing mechanisms in reactive and proactive aggression. Child Development.

Harms, T., Jacobs, E. V., & White, D. R. (1996). School-Age Care Environment Rating Scale. New York: Teachers College Press.

Howes, C., Phillips, D. A., & Whitebook, M. (1992). Thresholds of quality: Implications for the social development of children in center-based care. Child Development, *63*, 449-460.

Phillips, D. A. (1987). Quality in child care: What does research tell us? Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young children.





## Appendix 3

Data Coding Scheme for Statistical Analyses

The Madison Metropolitan School District provided data on the study children's gender, ethnicity, household type, receipt of subsidized school lunch, and neighborhood of residence. These data were dummy coded for data analyses as follows.

Gender

0 = male, 1 = female. In data analyses, positive associations indicated that girls scored higher on the pertinent variables, and negative associations indicated that boys scored higher.

Ethnicity

0 = White, 1 = minority (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic). In data analyses, positive associations indicated that minority race children scored higher on the pertinent variables, and negative associations indicated that White children scored higher.

Household Type

0 = two-parent family, 1 = single-parent family. In data analyses, positive associations indicated that children from single-parent families scored higher on the pertinent variables, and negative associations indicate that children who live in two-parent families scored higher.

Receipt of Subsidized School Lunch

0 = did not receive subsidized school lunch, 1 = received free or reduced-price school lunch; proxy variable for poverty status. In data analyses, positive associations indicated that poor children scored higher on the pertinent variables, and negative associations indicated that non-poor children scored higher.

Neighborhood of Residence

0 = did not reside in one of the targeted neighborhoods, 1 = resided in a targeted neighborhood. In data analyses, positive associations indicated that children who lived in the targeted neighborhoods scored higher on the pertinent variables, and negative associations indicated that children who did not live in these neighborhoods scored higher.