

Getting Involved: How Summer Enrichment Programs Improve Social Development and Behavior



*Annie Read
Program in Urban Studies
Stanford University
May 16, 2011*

*Adviser: Shelley Goldman
Professor of Education*

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	5
Preface	6
Abstract	9
 Chapter I. Introduction and Literature Review	
Introduction	10
Literature Review	13
<i>Background</i>	13
<i>The Importance of Social Development Early On</i>	13
<i>Effective Factors Within Programs</i>	15
<i>The Importance of Parents, Teachers, and Peers</i>	18
<i>How Factors and Mechanisms within Programs Affect Student Growth</i>	22
<i>Summer School</i>	22
<i>Afterschool Programs</i>	23
<i>Enrichment Programs</i>	25
 Chapter II. Methodology	
Methodology	29
<i>Defining Project Scope</i>	29
<i>Identifying Research Sites</i>	29
<i>Program Background</i>	31
<i>NEP</i>	31
<i>BYSI</i>	32
<i>Conducting Research</i>	34
<i>Observations</i>	34
<i>Parent Permission Forms</i>	35
<i>Teacher Surveys</i>	35
<i>Interaction</i>	36
<i>Discipline</i>	36
<i>Academic Engagement</i>	36
<i>Survey Scale</i>	37
<i>Teacher Interviews</i>	37
<i>Parent Surveys</i>	37
 Chapter III. Results	
Results	39
<i>Organizing Results</i>	39

<i>Pre/Post Survey Results</i>	40
<i>NEP</i>	40
<i>Interaction</i>	40
<i>Teachers</i>	40
<i>AR</i>	41
<i>Combined (AR and Teachers)</i>	41
<i>Discipline</i>	42
<i>Teachers</i>	42
<i>AR</i>	42
<i>Combined (AR and Teachers)</i>	42
<i>Academic Engagement</i>	43
<i>Teachers</i>	43
<i>AR</i>	43
<i>Combined (AR and Teachers)</i>	43
<i>BSYI</i>	44
<i>Interaction</i>	44
<i>Teachers</i>	45
<i>AR</i>	45
<i>Combined (AR and Teachers)</i>	45
<i>Discipline</i>	46
<i>Teachers</i>	46
<i>AR</i>	46
<i>Combined (AR and Teachers)</i>	47
<i>Academic Engagement</i>	47
<i>Teachers</i>	47
<i>AR</i>	47
<i>Combined (AR and Teachers)</i>	48
<i>General Findings</i>	48
<i>Parent Survey Results</i>	49
<i>NEP</i>	49
<i>BSYI</i>	49

IV. Discussion

Discussion	51
<i>Overview</i>	51
<i>NEP</i>	51
<i>Interaction</i>	51
<i>Discipline</i>	57
<i>Academic Engagement</i>	61
<i>BSYI</i>	64
<i>Interaction</i>	64
<i>Discipline</i>	68
<i>Academic Engagement</i>	71

V. Recommendations

Recommendations	75
<i>Combination of Academics and Recreation</i>	75
<i>Program Philosophies that Emphasize Preparation</i>	78
<i>Committed and Organization Staff and Administration</i>	80
<i>Support From Parents, Peers, and Community</i>	82
<i>Future Research and Limitations</i>	83
 Bibliography	 86
 Appendices	 92
<i>Appendix A: Teacher Survey</i>	92
<i>Appendix B: Parent Survey</i>	95
<i>Appendix C: Teacher Interview</i>	97
<i>Appendix D: Director Interview</i>	98
<i>Appendix E: Parent Permission Form</i>	99
<i>Appendix F: Survey Consent Form</i>	101
<i>Appendix G: Interview Consent Form</i>	103
<i>Appendix H: Tables</i>	105

Acknowledgements

There are many people I would like to thank and recognize for helping me to complete both this journey and this project. First, my thesis adviser, Shelley Goldman, who supported me throughout this entire process. She was always there for me, through the ups and downs, and helped me to accomplish my research goals and expand my intellectual horizons. Her passion for education is invigorating and admirable. I hope to infuse this energy into my future endeavors and hope to touch the lives of others as she has as a teacher, role model, and mentor. Second, I would like to thank my major adviser, Doug McAdam, for pushing me to pursue a thesis and encouraging me throughout the process. In addition, I would like to thank the Urban Studies Department for providing me with the means and resources to complete this project. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their support. Whether it was bringing me coffee in the library or giving me advice, I could not have made it without all of you!

Preface

Throughout my life, enrichment has played a significant role in my character development. Be they clubs or athletics, they have shaped my growth. Whether it was a supportive coach on the lacrosse field, or an afterschool science club with friends, I have experienced the importance of positive mentorship, effective structure, and interaction with peers. Because enrichment has been so significant in my development, I was curious to discover if, or how, enrichment affects others.

My curiosity was further provoked after interning at East Palo Alto Success School (EPASS) in Fall 2009. There I worked with second and third graders in the afterschool program. This program differed from many other elementary afterschool programs in the Bay Area, giving the students the opportunity to enroll in both academic and recreational classes. Normally, the students worked on math and reading for the first period each day and had some sort of recreational period, such as playing soccer, gardening, and cooking, during the second period. I was intrigued by this concept and wondered how the combination of these classes affected student development: Were these students developing more rapidly than students who were only enrolled in solely academic or recreational programs? If so, what factors affected student growth?

During my internship at EPASS, I kept thinking about these research questions as I took part in the program. I observed the manner in which students interacted during academic and recreational periods, as well as during free time. I saw the smiles on their faces when teachers gave them stars for finishing books, their competitive drives during soccer games, and their enthusiasm during gardening club, where they could go into the backyard of their school and pick fresh tomatoes. During my experience, one thing became very clear: the students loved the

afterschool program and this sentiment most likely influenced them to be positive, productive young individuals. After observing the students in the classroom, I noticed that they were willing to help their peers, were excited to complete academic assignments, and remained well behaved during class. When I talked to the student's grade-school teachers, they confirmed my assumptions. They noted that students in the afterschool programs were more engaged and focused, which allowed them to grow and develop faster than their classmates who were not involved in the program. I was interested to see if this was the case at other schools, and to see if afterschool programs had this effect elsewhere.

After talking to Matt Noland, the director of the afterschool program, I learned the type of enrichment program run at EPASS was rare in elementary schools across the district. He emphasized that other afterschool programs tend to be one-sided, taking on either an academic or a recreational slant. I investigated further and found that research focused in large part on academic development, not on social growth. This surprised me, because I had noticed students developed the most during social activities. This gap in the scholarship left me excited to find out more.

While I would ideally have liked to conduct my research in an afterschool program setting, I realized that holidays would have made it difficult to collect data for a summer project. That raised another question: Are there summer programs that include academic and recreational components?

I soon discovered that summer enrichment programs do exist. While summer camp and summer school programs were most prevalent, a number of enrichment programs were run across the country. Which of course led to more questions: What if I looked at summer

enrichment programs in different geographic and demographic areas? Would one summer enrichment program have more of an effect on a student's social growth than another?

From these question and inquiries, I was able to develop a research project and research question: Do summer enrichment programs positively affect student social growth? From this question I hoped to answer the following sub-questions: What factors and mechanisms within these programs influence behavior? In which activities are the students most engaged and interactive with their peers? How is their behavior and academic engagement affected over the course of the summer? What types of teaching styles do students respond to best? From there, my research project began to take shape.

Abstract

This study examines second graders' social behavior in two summer enrichment programs: Norwalk Enrichment Program (NEP) in Norwalk, CT and The Brooklyn Summer Youth Institute (BSYI) in Brooklyn, NY. Three students were selected from each program and tracked over the course of six weeks through surveys, field notes, interviews, and observation. After reviewing my findings, I concluded that the more rigorously structured and organized summer enrichment program better enhanced and improved the growth and development of students. Additionally, certain factors and mechanisms in the structured program were more effective at enhancing growth than others. Thus, as a whole, students enrolled in the more structured program that had access to strong resources, such as diverse curriculum and positive mentorship, exhibited the most growth because it provided opportunities that enhanced communication, teamwork, and cooperation skills.

Chapter I. Introduction and Literature Review

Introduction

Social and educational development at an early age is critical for human growth over time. Development is often influenced by the structure of a child's day-to-day activities. For example, a child may develop stronger language skills by doing half an hour of spelling exercises a day. While these skills may be easy to sustain during the academic year, they are more difficult to maintain over the summer. Though parents want to prepare their children for the coming school year, they also want them to participate in fun and enjoyable activities. With that, an interesting paradox is created. Parents debate whether their children would be better served by a summer camp or summer school. Answering this question has become easier with the growth of summer enrichment programs.

Enrichment programs supplement regular school activities with special projects and activities (Dictionary-MSN Encarta, 2011). Initially, such programs were only offered to gifted students, but they are now available for students of all abilities and socioeconomic backgrounds. For the purposes of this study, I define summer enrichment programs as programs that include both academic and recreational components and consider the effects of these offerings on student development.

My research examines two summer enrichment programs, Norwalk Enrichment Program, located in Norwalk, CT, and The Brooklyn Summer Youth Initiative, in Brooklyn, NY. These two programs were selected for their differences in location, student demographics, and program structure. I was curious to see how these factors affected student development. During the six weeks I spent observing the programs, I took field notes, conducted teacher and program director interviews, and distributed parent and teacher surveys. After analyzing the data, on both

the aggregate and individual level, it was apparent that certain components, such as program schedule, teachers/TA, class size, and program philosophy directly shaped the role and organization of summer enrichment programs. The forms that the summer enrichment programs took impacted the social growth and development of the students throughout the course of the summer. For the most part, students enrolled in the more structured program that had access to strong resources, such as a diverse curriculum and positive mentorship, exhibited the most growth. The structured program was most effective because it provided students with opportunities to enhance communication, teamwork, and cooperation skills.

For this paper, I define “structured” as periods that include set curricula taught by teachers and “organized camp events” run by camp directors. Additionally, in this thesis, “strong resources” are those mechanisms that positively encourage student growth. Such resources include effective curricula, dedicated and positive teachers, financial support, and any other factors that might have affected students’ social skills, such as their perception of the program, the supportiveness of their peer networks, and the diversity of their activities.

My conclusions are supported throughout the remainder of the thesis. In Chapter I, a literature review is presented. The literature review addresses important factors related to development in students’ early years, mechanisms found in earlier research to have successfully promoted positive social growth, the role of parents, teachers, and peers throughout development, and the different kinds of summer offerings in order to provide background on what has been effective in promoting positive student social growth.

In Chapter II, I offer a description of my methodology description. For this study, I employed a mixed-method approach that included interviews with program staff and teachers, parents, the observation of program activities and of children, and the administration of surveys.

Such mixed methods allowed me to gain a variety of perspectives on factors and structures within the programs to better understand if they promoted development. Chapter III and Chapter V present my results, a discussion of the data analyses, and include many of the findings that contributed to the final conclusion that the structured program which incorporated more resources, activities, and structures more positively affected childrens' development than the one that was less structured and had fewer resources.

Because only six students within two programs were evaluated, I recognize that my results and conclusions are limited in their scope. Nonetheless, it is my hope that such research might be expanded in the future to offer a more comprehensive account of summer enrichment education.

Literature Review

Background

Summer enrichment programs include both academic and recreational components. Program directors stress that enrolled students flourish academically and socially through such diverse offerings. Because enrichment programs are a somewhat recent development, little research has been conducted on their effectiveness and impact. Many questions thus remain unanswered. What factors most influence student growth? What styles of teaching do students respond to best? During which activities are the students most engaged and interact the most with their peers? What factors affect academic engagement? Though some research has considered the effects of summer school programs and afterschool programs on development, few publications have explored the impact of enrichment programs on students, especially socially. In this section, I present research that demonstrates the importance of social development during the early years of a child's life. I then examine the factors and mechanisms within afterschool and summer school summer programs that affect student growth. Finally, I present case studies on successful enrichment programs, and demonstrate how my study will fill a void in current research and literature.

The Importance of Social Development Early On

What a child learns in his or her early years is essential to development. Brains are developing and children are able to pick up language and phonics easily. Social behaviors are most plastic in early childhood and children are embedded in social networks from birth (Campbell, 2004; Lewis & Feiring, 1984). Thus, incorporating social skills into a child's daily life is important for growth and development. Early social experiences with peers are a part of

social development, and early childhood experiences may affect interpersonal skills in adolescence and adulthood (Hepler, 1997). Though attending school is an essential feature of development, time spent away from the classroom is important as well. Whether at home, in extracurricular activities, or during free time, the various people, environments and experiences to which children are exposed can be influential. As a consequence, it is essential that students have access to positive social interactions that promote healthy growth and adjustment (Hepler, 1997). Student development between entering formal schooling until about the age of nine is also critical: social growth has been found to correlate with school adjustment, school success, and life-long success (Hartup, 1983).

Children develop based on their own needs and experiences, yet research points to some universal behaviors and attitudes. Frederick Howe, a prominent sociologist, has studied elementary development in depth, offering a broad outline and overview of second graders and common behavioral patterns (Howe, 1993). On the whole, Howe describes second graders as “generally friendly” and able to “get along well with others” (p. 40). He argues that, by the second grade, children have developed a strong combination of reasoning and interpersonal skills, which leads to less “running around” and more participation in games. He emphasizes that though students love to participate in physical games, they also begin to enjoy games that include more thinking and analytical skills, such as Who’s Missing, Connect Four, and Checkers. Nonetheless, though second graders have more awareness and take on more responsibility, they are still immature. As a result, they are sometimes unsure what to do during unassigned time, which may lead them to becoming caught up in their own thoughts and staring into space. Above all, second grade marks a period of crucial social awareness and the role of peer groups. Students are preoccupied with the acceptance of others and begin to fear embarrassment. Additionally,

class leaders start to emerge, which can fracture and discourage student participation. When students face challenges and difficulties, they become dependent on adults, looking to them as safety nets (Howe, 1997). In his stages of development, Piaget categorizes 7- to 11-year-olds in the concrete operational stage. Children within this range master logical thinking and begin to develop more advanced capabilities (Piaget, 1971). As a result, as students reach this stage, they become more aware of their surroundings and how social relationships work.

Effective Factors Within Programs

Earlier research has found that successful and influential programs feature three main components: the philosophies of staff members, the commitment of the administrators to social development, and the activities and orientation programs that emphasize social development. Teachers can greatly impact students, profoundly affecting the development of their academic careers. Additionally, through instruction, students learn about social skills and societal behavioral expectations (McArthur, 2002). Accordingly, it is essential that schools enhance both the academic and social skills of a student, preparing him or her for life outside of institutional structures. Through instruction, students should develop a strong sense of cultural knowledge (or “cultural capital”) and of social norms, to increase their opportunities and access in society (Bourdieu, 1997). Bourdieu argues that individuals of different social locations are socialized differently. Annette Lareau (2003) alludes to his work in her literature:

“This socialization provides children, and later adults, with a sense of what is comfortable or what is natural (he terms the *habitus*). These background experiences also shape the amount and forms of resources (*capital*) individuals inherit and draw upon as they confront various institutional arrangements (*fields*) in the social world.” (Lareau, 2003, p. 275)

Learning social skills can better prepare students for school, eventually enabling them to become more productive and well-rounded citizens, which is essential for social integration (Durkheim, 1956). Enhancing social skills is one component of a deeply structured system through which students develop social capital. Different mechanisms can act as a stepping-stone for the acquisition of social skills. Institutions can offer students greater access to useful material and nonmaterial resources, such as supportive networks, by increasing a student's opportunities to develop social capital through various events and outings.

Social and behavioral skills are of central importance to employers and to productivity. Thus, if a person has strong social skills and social capital, they are likely to be given greater opportunities to advance and make gains professionally (Tach & Farkas, 2006). It is important that students have exposure to resources that will allow them to develop socially at a young age so that they are prepared for social situations throughout their lives. Students who have experience forming relationships and interacting with others can use such skills and valuable tools into their adult lives.

Within programs, it is essential that staff and administrators understand the importance of social skills and provide students with the resources and mentorship that will help them to develop. Research has shown that the dedication and commitment of staff strongly correlates with the effectiveness of a given program. When senior managements and administrations have dedicated individuals and strong philosophies, programs are more successful (Hallam, 2011). Administrators should be leaders and provide opportunities for staff that will deepen their understanding of social development. They should allow time for staff training and planning, which allow staff members to understand children's social and emotional development. They should also encourage teaching within a program, while facilitating innovative and creative

curricula (Hallam, 2011). Strong staff organization and commitment are very important components that can lay the foundation for successful programs.

To facilitate maximum growth, summer learning programs should include enrichment activities designed to support student success. Extracurricular activities have the potential to promote youth development and give students access to extra resources. Such activities promote student interaction and growth (Little, 2009). This can be accomplished by creating a positive, welcoming environment. If a child is able to relate and identify with the program in which they are enrolled, they are able to acquire increased social and academic competence, confidence, and comfort (Comer, 2001).

Additionally, by participating as part of a community, children can develop strong social networks, which can also enhance growth. Recently, districts have redesigned curricula to better address the educational and social needs of students (Protheroe, 2007). Educators are realizing how influential structured experiences can be for students, and believe that effective programs should help struggling students make academic and social gains (Protheroe, 2007).

Though parents value academic classes, they also stress that nonacademic activities are important in development when choosing summer programs for their children. A recent survey has shown that 16% of parents place their students in summer programs solely to “improve how well they do in school,” while 57% of parents enroll their children both “to develop their interests and hobbies” and “to have fun” (Duffet, Johnson, & Farkas, 2004, p. 29). Parents appreciate diverse summer programs that can promote development on multiple levels, enabling access to strong resources through which students can excel.

The Importance of Peers, Teachers, and Peers

Because development is so important during a child's early years, the presence of positive and supportive figures in a child's life is paramount. There are a range of people who can contribute to a child's growth, including of parents, teachers, and peers (Rones & Hoagswood, 2001). Different members of a child's social network provide children with different types of social support and provision, which can have differing effects (Furman, 1989). Children are most affected by life at home and life at school. Because of the potential significance of these environments to promote growth, there should be communication between the two settings. Teachers and parents should communicate and work together to increase opportunities and to enhance social functioning (Nokali, 2010).

Home influences play an important role in student growth and development. Students find familiarity and comfort within their homes. Parents play a critical role in teaching and reinforcing social skills (Armstrong & McPherson, 1991). Children often relate to those they trust, thus choosing parents as primary attachment figures with whom they can explore new environments and in whom they can find safe haven in times of distress (Siebert & Kerns, 2000).

Children learn to socialize through different types of parental interaction. Such interactions influence behavior and the child's perception of social norms. Lareau, a sociologist, has studied extensively parenting styles and social class (Lareau, 2002). Her research has suggested two broad styles of parenting: concerted cultivation and natural growth. In concerted cultivation, parents participate in the organization of their child's afterschool activities and provide a structured organized set of activities for their child. These parents are generally well educated and try to use organized activities and exposure to adults during such activities as a means through which students are taught lessons that they might not otherwise learn in school. In

natural growth, parents are less involved with the structure of their child's afterschool activities and allocate more free time for their children to play with other children in the neighborhood. Children are able to socialize and play with other students, but may not have access to a strong adult network, unlike other students. Though some parents believe that academics outside of school are important, many also believe that development of other skills is important as well, and try to present their children with opportunities to enhance such skills. Both concerted cultivation and natural growth provide children with social and effective learning opportunities, although they provide access to differential social experiences.

Exposure to social networks, which can extend from parental connections, can be significant to student socialization. Social networks are determined by a host of complex factors, such as the density of the network, the extent to which network members know one another, and the relationship the networks members have to the individual (Oslzweski & Grant, 1994) Having access to strong social networks can be very beneficial to students, providing a gateway to social and academic opportunities.

In away-from-home institutional settings, teachers are a major force in the lives of children. As Nicola Schutte and John Malouff (1998) have observed, there is a "vital ingredient in any good education: a talented teacher who knows how to engage students and make learning come alive" (p. 169). Patricia Jennings notes that teachers can have long-lasting and profound effects on students' social and behavioral skills (Jennings & DiPrete, 2009). Because teachers provide a gateway to social opportunities, students benefit greatly from their teaching and mentorship. Teachers who are able to broaden students' horizons and expose them to new and interesting experiences by, for instance, encouraging them to learn outside of the classroom or by introducing innovative curriculums have been shown to be strong mentors and positively impact

upon student development (Tach & Farkas, 2006). In order to promote optimal growth, teachers must be cognizant of how a school's climate and the student's relationships and feelings can affect behavior, allowing students of all abilities to succeed (Hallam, 2011).

In addition to parents and teachers substantially influencing social growth, peers can greatly impact student development. The role of peers is crucial, yet what happens socially in school is often overlooked in research (Hepler, 1997). Students spend time with peers throughout the entirety of the school day, whether during academics, at lunch, in the gym, or during recess. Social competence is mainly acquired through social interaction and play activities with other children. Thus, the relationships that a student develops play a huge role in his or her daily routines (Cohen, Lotan, Scarloss, & Arellano, 1999).

Children who are more socially competent and emotionally perceptive are capable of more successful relationships (Brouillette, 2010). Social support provided by intimate relationships, such as those with parents, teachers, and peers, can have a major impact on psychological health and adjustment (Furman, 1989). As children develop strong relationships, they can improve their networks and social circles.

Conversely, children who are unable to form strong relationships with peers can face negative experiences and be singled out and placed in poor standing among their peers (Hepler, 1997). As a result, students may have greater difficulty feeling comfortable participating in various activities throughout the school day, which can in turn negatively affect their growth while limiting their opportunities for involvement in positive, cooperative interactions (Hepler, 1997). This may not only affect students socially, but may impact them academically, as academic and social competencies are reciprocally related for elementary students (Gest, Welsh, & Domitrovich, 2005).

Recently, parents, educators, and scholars have argued that the traditional school day and calendar alone are not enough to produce continuous educational improvement and, as a result, they believe that expanding school activities is a promising solution that promotes student success (Little, 2009).

Social skills are enhanced through a variety of relationships and experiences that children are exposed to from an early age. In classroom settings, these can include smaller instruction groups, higher staff-to-student ratios, and a harmonious classroom atmosphere (Carter, 1984). We expect that pre-school and kindergarten are times for both social and academic acclimation, and social development is of paramount concern. As students graduate from grade to grade, they are expected to have grown socially and their educational focus thus shifts towards academics. Still, many teachers attend to their students' social development regularly and programmatically, and incorporate a variety of ways to help students enhance the social side of their learning. Some ways are formally tied to academics such as Complex Instruction (Cohen, Lotan, Scarloss, & Arellano, 1999), which helps reorganize group work through rotating roles in order to equalize status relationships in the context of academics. By intermixing students in a systematic way that ensures equal student participation, they promote activities, such as open-ended, interdependent group work, that maximize student interaction and allow students to be resources for one another. In addition to incorporating innovative techniques into curricula, some schools are trying to reorganize the amount of time students spend in school as a way of ensuring more consistent social and academic access. As it turns out, modified school calendars have had mixed results (Schutte & Malouff, 1998).

How Factors and Mechanisms Within Programs Affect Growth

Over the past few decades, there have been many studies that have examined summer schools, afterschool programs, and some enrichment programs, evaluating the extent to which these influence student growth.

Summer School.

Summer schools can provide students with protection from what is known as “summer slide” (pg. 2), a term used to describe the erosion of academic skills and knowledge over the summer (Kirkland, 2006). Most traditional summer school programs typically have an emphasis on “skill and drill” curricula, providing students with extra reading, writing, and math assignments. While extra practice can enhance skills, summer schools have a negative connotation among students, who perceive attending summer school as a penalty for below-proficiency work during the school year (Kirkland, 2006). As a result, students often feel little self-efficacy and self-worth and are reluctant to willingly forfeit their summer vacations for such unsatisfying experiences (Allington, 2006).

One summer school program that has shown positive student growth is Chicago’s Public Summer Bridge Program (Protheroe, 2007). In this program, third through sixth graders receive 90 hours of instruction, attending summer school three hours per day for six weeks. By the end of the program, students’ test scores had improved, with the students themselves outperforming themselves from the previous academic year. While extra academic work played a role in the success, the positive relationships the students formed with teachers seemed to have influenced student growth most. Teachers taught in ways that engaged students, provided substantive feedback, and addressed individual needs, and offered strong mentorship and leadership (Protheroe, 2007).

As mentioned above, program structure greatly affects student experience. David Denton (2004), for instance, has stressed the importance of components in summer school programs, arguing that they produce more lasting benefits when they operate for only a few hours a day but over a number of weeks (Denton, 2004). Additionally, Denton has found that adequate funding and effective resources, such as teachers who know how to connect with students, are essential factors. Successful programs should never be static and teachers and directors should think of innovative ways to relate to their participants (Ross et al., 1992). For example, if the students all like a song that they sang in music class, then teachers should try to incorporate it into their curricula as a “theme of the day” and have writing, phonic, and reading exercises based on the song. It is important that educators make personal connections with students and construct unique curricula.

Afterschool Programs.

Previous studies have emphasized the role of strong relationships in afterschool programs and positive student growth. Scholars stress that afterschool teachers should communicate with one another to ensure the best instruction for each student (Protheroe, 2007). Kim Pierce, Jill Hamm, and Deborah Vandell (1999) in their study of 150 first graders in afterschool programs in Madison, WI, evaluated programs in regard to three different aspects: emotional climate, quality of peer interaction, and program curriculum (Pierce, Hamm, & Vandell, 1999). Having measured the students in a variety of ways, such as individual observation and data collection from parents and teachers, the researchers found that warm and positive climates were positively associated with a child’s ability to adjust to the classroom. Students who admired staff had better grades and social skills in their first grade classrooms, while students who felt the effects of staff negativity

and experienced a more hostile environment had lower grades, poorer social skills, and were more likely to misbehave, highlighting how influential certain factors can be.

Anne Bouie (2007), a sociologist, agrees with the ideas raised in Pierce, Hamm, and Vandell, arguing that afterschool programs can be valuable tools for student development (Bouie, 2007). In her afterschool program, Project Interface Math and Science Enrichment, she was able to encourage positive development by emphasizing the use of community assets—that is, the entire range of individuals in a given community—to build a structured and meaningful learning environment. The entire community—whether family members, church leaders, college students, corporate volunteers, school principals, or local shopkeepers—participated in the program and collectively worked towards the goal of improving participants’ math and science skills. The wide range of community members in the program provided participating students with a variety of learning approaches and perspectives. Students in the program also developed socially and academically, showing improved confidence and motivation in the classroom. Additionally, students strengthened ties with their families and community members, improving their relationships and enabling them to advance socially. On the whole, Project Interface was successful in providing students with mechanisms and opportunities that enhanced their social development and strengthened their relationships.

Meredith Cosden et al. (2004) have stressed the important ways nonacademic aspects of afterschool programs can also positively impact student development (Cosden, Morrison, Gutierrez, & Brown 2004). For example, through a study of 400 elementary schools, James Ross et al. (2004) observed that activities and exercises that increase a child’s self esteem, encourage school bonding, and help teachers to adapt and relate to each student were directly associated

with the success of both student and the program (Ross, Saavedra, Shur, Winters, & Felner, 2004).

Enrichment Programs.

Enrichment programs can also positively affect student growth. Though enrichment programs usually feature a variety of activities, within the context of this study I focus exclusively on programs that have both academic and recreational components. Some researchers have found that that summer enrichment programs can positively affect student growth, though such research has been limited.

The University of Alabama started a summer enrichment program in 2002, with a curriculum that focuses on literacy, math, science, social studies, and the arts (Kirkland, 2006). The program includes socially and economically diverse students, providing financial assistance and transportation to students. In terms of curriculum, students were able to choose their nonacademic classes, which gave them the opportunity to prioritize their interests (Gardener, 2006). The students had either two hours of enrichment in the morning and two hours of academics in the afternoon, or vice versa (Kirkland, 2006). Teachers, who taught a variety of specialized workshops, were required to attend professional development days and workshops held at the Lincoln Center in New York City, where the role of culture and diversity in the learning process was stressed. In addition, the program was racially diverse: 37% of the students were white, 28% African American, 27% Hispanic, and 8% Asian.

The program involved many stakeholders, such as parents, school administrations, university students, and community contributors, which helped to promote a sense of goodwill and commitment among all participants. On the whole, the diverse offerings and variety of personnel significantly affected the students. Students were exposed to new experiences and

supportive networks, which allowed them to become more confident and outgoing. These skills were shown to carryover into the subsequent academic year and had positive effects in the long run (Kirkland, 2006).

Another summer enrichment program has been offered at Baylor University. Aimed towards low-income gifted youth, the program was held for 4 weeks, five days a week from 9am to 4pm and included breakfast and lunch. Before the program commenced, students were placed in peer groups with a mentor, attended pre-summer meetings and were asked to participate in both a weekend interdisciplinary Creative Problem Solving Conference and a monthly Super Saturdays Activities Day that was intended to familiarize the students with the inner workings of the program (Johnsen, Witte, & Robins, 2006).

On the whole, students loved the opportunities to participate in innovative and engaging classes that incorporated technology, the visual arts, and performing. They loved the challenges the program presented them and felt that they had developed in ways they would not have been able to during the regular school year because of their socioeconomic status. Additionally, it was found students were positively affected not just academically, but also socially (Johnsen, Witte, & Robins, 2006). As one student noted: “I also made many friends that attend Baylor or attended and when I need help, they will help me” (p.5). Participants enjoyed the camaraderie of the program, making friends who shared similar interests and goals, and felt that the program offered them the hope that they would one day successfully overcome the hardships that they faced.

In large part, researchers have evaluated summer enrichment programs that incorporate art and academics, arguing that arts-integrated curricula provide meaningful and powerful learning experiences for students of all ages and capabilities (Strand, 2006). Two such programs have been thoroughly analyzed, the Theater Company and the Elementary School and Summer

Enrichment for Gifted and Talented Students. While these programs were differently structured, both included art and non-art teachers in their curricula and featured philosophies that stressed that students understand the importance of “process over product.” They valued students expressing themselves through different mediums. This motivation created an environment that promoted “a community of learners” (p.34): students were able to share, work in groups, and laugh and play together. The programs also encouraged students to become active citizens, supporting collaboration between the students and community organizations, parades, and city parks. Students developed a new sense of self and community and broadened their thinking (Strand, 2006).

For all of the research already conducted on the relationship between educational programs and their effects on students, there remain significant voids in the current literature that I hope my research can help fill. While there is a wealth of information on the effects of summer schools and afterschool programs on student growth, less research has been conducted on the role of summer enrichment programs. Additionally, most scholars have focused on academic instead of social gains. While I believe a number of methods and data from the aforementioned studies can be applied to summer enrichment programs, further research should evaluate the factors within these programs that relate to the social growth of students. Moreover, by studying two summer programs, I have been able to compare and evaluate the program structures and factors (i.e. teachers, curricula, etc.) that influence students. Finally, by including programs that focus on drastically different demographics, one urban and one suburban setting, I have been able to consider a diverse socioeconomic body of students as well as the range of and rationale behind program participation, which may be important factors to consider when examining student growth and that may add valuable findings to preexisting research. Though it may be

difficult to generalize from my research because it involves a purposive sample, I nonetheless suspect that my findings and data will add to our current understanding of the effects of education on student development.

Chapter II. Methodology

Methodology

Defining Project Scope

The first step in this project was to delimit its scope, which I was able to do in consultation with my advisor Doug McAdam. I chose to focus on summer enrichment programs because they include both academic and recreational components, which would allow me to evaluate students on multiple levels. After searching “summer enrichment programs in the tri-state area” on the Internet, I received a plethora of hits and soon realized that conducting this kind of research was plausible. I wrote up a generic email to send to program directors explaining my research interests, outlining my motivation for conducting this research, and asking permission to work with their program.

In late April, I sent emails to approximately one hundred programs in a fifty-mile radius from my house in Riverside, Connecticut. I selected programs based on location and the descriptions of their programs offered online. Initially, I wanted to find one enrichment program and one solely academic program, because I thought a study of this nature would produce interesting comparative results. Despite my broad search, I received responses from only four programs: Raven Hill Summer Program (Weston, CT), NEP (Norwalk, CT), BSYI (Brooklyn, NY), and 72nd Street Academics (Manhattan, NY).

Identifying Research Sites

After studying the programs further, I selected the NEP and Raven Hill programs because of the differences in their program structures. NEP included both academic and recreational

components, while Raven Hill only included academic programming, which I thought would offer an interest perspective on student behavior.

I received permission from the two respective program directors, Tammy Willow and John Rust, and remained in contact with them throughout May and June to keep them up to date with my research. I sent them updated teacher surveys and parent permission forms and set up tentative observations times for conducting research. After receiving approval from the IRB in mid-June, I started preparing for the programs to start.

Before starting my observations, I met with the program directors to acclimate myself to the research sites and gain a better understanding of the programs' philosophies and goals. I met with Tammy Willow, director of NEP in Norwalk, during the last week in June. I again explained the scope of my project, showed her my most recent surveys and permission slip drafts, and asked her advice regarding logistics (i.e. choosing participants, ideal times to distribute surveys, etc.). She drove me to Johnson Elementary School, the site of the summer program, and showed me the classrooms, playgrounds, and gym, which gave me a sense of the layout and helped me prepare for conducting research.

Ideally I wanted to set up an appointment with Jeff Rust, director of Raven Hill in Weston, before the program started, but he told me he was unavailable until June 28, the first day of the program. During our first meeting, however, he gave me a tour of the facilities and we talked about scheduling. While I was talking, he interrupted me and said, "Sorry, Annie, I don't think we can help you here." I tried to negotiate with him, suggesting that I eliminate the parent survey or call the parents to gain permission. Unfortunately, no matter what I suggested, I was unable to conduct research at the site.

Despite this setback, I was determined to find another program. I got in touch with the Brooklyn Youth Summer Institute and explained my situation. Fortunately, Sam Low, the program director, granted me permission to conduct research at his program. After completing this step, I finalized the logistics of my project. I decided to spend two days a week at each program: Mondays and Wednesdays at BSYI and Tuesdays and Thursdays at NEP. I kept Fridays free so that I could have time to conduct interviews and attend field trips when they were offered.

Program Background

Though both the NEP program and the BSYI program last six weeks, they are very different in terms of geographical location and program structure. These differences may have played a role in student behavior and influenced social growth and development. Understanding background information is important to comprehending the full scope of the study. In both of the programs, the participants enrolled in the programs are referred to as “students,” uncertified instructors are referred to as “counselors” at NEP and as “TAs” at BSYI, and certified instructors, who holding a teaching certificate, are referred to as “teachers.”

NEP.

Norwalk, the site of the NEP program, is often referred to as a “working-class suburb” of New York City (The City of Norwalk Official Website). The 2000 census described the racial breakdown of the city as 73.9% white, 15.3% black, 3.3% Asian, and 15.6% Hispanic/Latino. The estimated average household income in 2007 was \$70,672, which is above the national median, but below the Connecticut average. Of the people in Norwalk, 26.8% speak a language

other than English at home. Hence, the city is somewhat diverse, though the majority of the population is white and English speaking (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

NEP, a nonprofit organization short for the Norwalk Enrichment Program, hosts a six-week program that includes both academic and recreational activities starting in early July and ending mid-August. The program runs five days a week from 8:30am to 5pm. In addition to running a summer program, the organization also runs afterschool programs throughout the year. The cost per student is \$900 for the entire summer, not including field trips. Academic classes are run three days a week with certified teachers who work in the Norwalk Public School System. During academic activities, students are placed in a classroom with about 25 other students. The recreational components of the program include Gym, Zumba/Spanish, Movie and Arts and Crafts. During these classes, students are divided into two equal groups by grade, Group A and Group B. The students are split into groups alphabetically: Ms. Willow, the program director, goes down the class roster, putting one student in Group A and then the next in Group B, etc. In addition to providing activities by grade level, the program also host a number of events, including barbeques, talent shows and performances, and field trips that the camp does collectively.

BSYL.

Brooklyn, NY, a borough of New York City, is home to over 2.5 million residents and has a very different population from Norwalk, CT. Brooklyn spans across a few zip codes, which varies from very affluent neighborhoods to extremely destitute ones. According to Brooklyn City Data, which discusses several neighborhoods in Brooklyn, “The most expensive homes I’ve seen are located in Old Mill Basin and Dyker Heights and range from 2 million to 5 million dollars. The lowest home prices and household incomes might be in Brownsville or East New York,

where the prices of homes are probably around \$20,000” (Brooklyn City Data, 2010). Census data reports that 41.2% of Brooklyn residents are classified as white, 36.4% as black, 7.5% as Asian, and 19.8% as Hispanic/Latino. The median household income in 2009 was \$42,894, which was approximately \$30,000 less than that of Norwalk. Among Brooklyn residents, 47.6% reported that they speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000). Obviously, according to census data, Brooklyn and Norwalk serve markedly different populations.

The BSYI is hosted on a college campus in Brooklyn. The program serves students entering the first through eight grades, four days a week, from 10am to 3pm. Like NEP, this program offers both academic and recreational components. The students have one academic period in the morning, lunch, and two recreational periods in the afternoon. During academic sessions, students are divided into classrooms and are instructed by certified NYC public school teachers. BSYI students have academics everyday as well as homework every night. Additionally, teachers send weekly reports and assessments home to parents, keeping them up to date on their child’s progress.

During recreational periods, students are split into two groups containing both first and second grade students. Classes are run by either certified teachers or “experts.” Experts are individuals with specialized real-world experiences, such as an individual who has worked at a private equity firm and who is able to teach a business class in the program. The recreational components of the program include theater and media, fitness, arts and crafts, and music. Every class, whether academic or recreational, contains roughly ten students. In addition to the teacher, or “expert” in some cases, there are two teaching assistants who are college students.

Conducting Research

Observations.

During the second week of July, I began observing. I went to NEP on the second day of the program, July 7. I sat at the back of the classroom and made notes during the students' academic period. I made a seating chart that listed the characteristics of each student. For instance, for #7 I wrote: Hispanic, blue shirt, grey shorts, red shoes. I thought this numbering system would be an effective way to take notes anonymously in case one of the students approached me and asked about the contents of my journal. In fact, this method actually complicated my field notes as I had a difficult time tracking students on my second day of observation, when they were wearing different clothes. After this realization, I learned the students' names and organized findings by using their initials.

When recording behaviors, I was interesting to discover the contexts in which the students talked to one another, how active they were in class, how willing they were to help other students, and how focused they were. I recorded student-to-teacher interactions, noting how many times students raised their hands, raised their hands and were called on, and were picked out (which I defined as a teacher calling on a student without any prompting from the student). Throughout my field notes, I tried to record verbatim student-teacher conversations and interactions.

Having observed the students in both programs and developed a general understanding of the two programs, I had to choose participants. I distributed parent permission forms to both program directors a week before the programs began and asked them to distribute the forms to the parents of the second graders.

Parent Permission Forms.

Each program director handled the distribution process differently. Sam Low, the BSYI program director, visited the second grade classroom on the first day of the program and explained the objectives of my study. He sent home permission slips with an attached letter signed by him to the students and told them to bring the form back as soon as possible. Mr. Low emailed me the next day and told me that he had received four permission slips from the students. Tammy Willow, the NEP program director, did not end up distributing the forms until the second week of the program, which made tracking students very difficult, especially because there were twenty-four second graders enrolled in the program.

To select the students at BSYI I would follow, I wrote the names of the four students on pieces of paper and randomly selected three of them. The students I chose were Ben James, Natalie Scout, and Greg Terman. I distributed surveys to the BSYI teachers during the second week.

As noted earlier, finding participants at NEP was a little more challenging than at BSYI, because of parents' slow response time in returning permission forms. To counter this, and to ensure pre-reads of the students before it was too late into the summer, I decided to ask the teachers and counselors to fill the surveys out for all of the students. I chose two counselors in each group (2A and 2B) based on who worked most often, as I felt they would be more familiar with student behavior.

Teacher Surveys.

Teacher survey questions spanned a wide variety of topics and issues (Appendix A). They considered student interactions, discipline, and academic engagement. Survey questions

were adapted from a 2004 report from the Public Agenda located in New York (Duffet, Johnson, & Farkas, 1994).

Interaction.

When considering interaction, I evaluated how and where students interacted with one another. What did they do together during free time, recreational activities, lunch, and in the classroom? I asked a few other questions: Does this student fit in with the whole class? When does the student interact the most with his/her peers? Does this student make an effort to help out other students?

Discipline.

In evaluating how student discipline shifted over the course of the summer, I observed the extent to which they listened to their teachers, respected their peers, and exhibited general behavioral problems. I also recorded the frequency with which the teachers and TA/counselors scolded the student: Are they generally well behaved or disruptive? How often is this student out of his/her seat? How often do you discipline this student?

Academic Engagement.

Lastly, I considered academic engagement. In order to assess growth, I considered whether or not students were more or less focused on and excited about academics at the beginning of the summer. Survey questions covered a range of academic factors, including completion of classroom assignments, attentiveness, and learning energy. I focused on several questions: Does this student complete his/her classroom assignments? How often does this student complete his/her homework assignments? How would you evaluate this student's learning energy?

Survey Scale.

Survey questions were based two scales: 1. “Always (2-3 times a day)”, “Sometimes (2-3 times a week)”, “Rarely (0-1 times throughout the program)”, and “Don’t know” and 2. “Too High” (always active, raises hand as often as possible), “Medium” (relatively active), and “Low” (not active, does not raise hand), and “Don’t know.” In addition to having counselors and teachers completing the surveys, I also filled out the surveys to see if my opinions differed from the teachers’ opinions. While this was simple to do for the BSYI students, it was very difficult for the NEP students because I had to do twenty-two surveys for NEP students and only four for BSYI.

Teacher Interviews.

In addition to distributing surveys, I also interviewed the teachers. I started these interviews during the fifth week, and continued them till the end of the two programs. I interviewed Porter (TA), Lauren (TA), and Ms. Trape (teacher) from BSYI and Ben (counselor), Amy (counselor), Kira (counselor), Lauren (counselor), and Ms. Heart (teacher) from NEP. During the interviews, I focused on two main objectives: their opinion of the structure of the programs and their perception of student behavior. Questions included: What are your motivations behind working at this program? What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? Where do you think this student interacts the most with peers? In addition to questioning teachers, I also conducted interviews with the program directors.

Parent Surveys.

In addition to surveying the students internally—in a classroom setting, by interviewing their teachers, counselors and TAs—I also wanted to gain an external perspective of them. In order to accomplish this, I decided to include parent surveys in my data set. I wanted to gain their

opinion of the program. Did they like the program structure? Were they satisfied? What activities that the program offers do they think are important for student social growth? I distributed these surveys to the six participants during the fifth week of the program and, fortunately, received all of the surveys back.

For the final stage of data collection, I redistributed the survey from the beginning of the summer and collected the final observations during the sixth week of the program. Through three means of data collection—parent and teacher surveys, field note observations, and interviews—I was able to gather information that directly pertained to my research questions.

Chapter III. Results

Results

In this section, I outline the two survey results collected throughout the study. The first is the pre-/post survey completed at both NEP, by teachers, counselors, and me (whom I refer to as AR), and BSYI, by teachers, teaching assistants, and me. The second is the parent survey, which was distributed to the parents of the six participants during the fifth week of the program.

Organizing Results

As mentioned above, data was collected through parent and teacher surveys, field observation, and teacher and director interviews. When considering the data on the aggregate, I found that students enrolled in structured programs that had access to strong resources, such as diverse curricula and positive mentorship, exhibited the most growth because they were provided with opportunities that enhanced communication, teamwork, and cooperation skills.

In the results section, I further detail the findings through a compilation of perceptions, which I divide into three subsections: “Teachers,” “AR,” and “Combination (AR and Teachers).” In order to measure statistically student social skills, whether there was positive or negative growth, I averaged the three surveys from the beginning of the summer and compared those results to the average from the end of the summer for each program. When there was a pre-survey result of “Don’t know”, I did not incorporate it into the averages because there was no way to compare the before and after results. Thus, I compiled three surveys at both assessment periods for each student. Two teachers, be they teachers, teaching assistants or counselors, also completed a pre- and post-survey assessment for each student. In total, there were six pre- and post reads for each participant.

In the charts integrated below, the blue charts represent the “combined” response. Within the charts, “+” more, “-“ indicates less, “=” indicates no significant change. The grey and white charts compare “teachers” and “AR.” In the “results” column, “↑” demonstrates more, “↓” demonstrates less, and “=” demonstrates no significant change. In addition, when there is a “Don’t know” for the pre-survey read and then an evaluation, I listed the result as “=”. It is important to keep in mind that in the discipline component, that a green arrow indicates an increase in problematic behavior.

Pre/Post Surveys

NEP.

Interaction.

Teachers.

As a whole, counselors at NEP reported declines in student interaction across the measured components. When considering “fitting in,” counselors’ responses shifted from “Yes” (83.3%) to “Sometimes” (83.3%). When asked about students helping one another, teachers believed that students were less willing to assist peers, as survey results showed a decline from “Sometimes” (50%) to “Rarely” (83.3%). Additionally, teachers felt student volunteering diminished by the end of the summer, shifting from “Rarely” (66.7%) to “Rarely” (80%).

INTERACTION QUESTION:	TEACHER	AR
1. Does this student fit in with the class?	Pre: "Yes" (83.3%) Post: "Sometimes" (83.3%) ↓	Pre: "Yes" (66.7%) Post: "Sometimes" (66.7%) ↓
2. How often does this student help out others?	Pre: "Sometimes" (50%) Post: "Rarely" (83.3%) ↓	Pre: "Rarely" (66.7%) Post: "Sometimes" (66.7%) ↑
3. This student volunteers to lead during group activities:	Pre: "Rarely" (66.67%) Post: "Rarely" (80%) ↓	Pre: "Often/Rarely" (50%) Post: "Rarely" (66.7%) ↓
RESULT:	↓	↓

AR.

In two of the three survey questions considering interaction, my answers exhibited negative growth: "fitting in" went from "Yes" (66.7%) to "Sometimes" (66.7%) and "willingness to lead" from "Often/Rarely" (50%) to "Rarely" (66.7%). On the contrary, as the summer progressed I thought students were more likely to help out one another, and gave them an average of "Sometimes" (66.7%), though I had initially given them "Rarely" (66.7%).

Combined (AR and Teachers).

As a whole, the teachers and myself averaged negative changes in regard to interaction—we judged that students fit in less, helped one another out less, and volunteered to lead less. We noted that that students fit in less, recording a fall from "Yes" (77.8%) to "Sometimes" (77.7%). As well, we thought students made an effort to help out children less, with "Sometimes" (33.3%) dropping to "Rarely" (66.7%). In our eyes, students also volunteered to lead less, going from "Rarely" (44%) to "Rarely" (67%) (Appendix H, Table 1).

Discipline.***Teachers.***

Teachers believed that student discipline had mixed results over the course of the summer. When asked about student discipline, teachers thought that students were out of their seats less, averaging “Always” (50%) to “Sometimes” (50%). On the other hand, they also believed that students were being disciplined more, answering “Too often/Rarely” (33.3%) at the beginning of the summer and “Too Often” (44.4%) at the end of the summer (Appendix F, Table 2).

AR.

My perception of student discipline was negative. I felt that students were out of their seats more often, moving from “Always/Rarely” (50%) to “Always” (66.7%). I also observed that students were being disciplined more often—“Too Often” (66.7%) was my view by the end of the summer (Appendix H, Table 2).

Combined (AR and Teachers).

BEHAVIOR	Before	After	+/-/=
This student is up out of his/her seat?	Always-44.4%	Always-44.4%	=
How often do you discipline this student?	Too often/Rarely-33.3%	Too Often-44.4%	+
			Result: +

Considering these two components together—how often students were disciplined and how often they were out of their seats—one notes that student disciplinary issues increased slightly. When asked, “This student is up out of his/her seat”, the NEP students showed the same results at the beginning of the summer as at the end of the summer, with 44.4% of the

respondents answering “Always.” NEP students also had to be disciplined more often: opinions shifted from “Too often/Rarely” (33.3%) to “Too often” (44.4%).

Academic Engagement.

Teachers.

Teacher evaluations suggest that student academic engagement positively and negatively affected over the course of the summer. When asked about how often children completed classroom assignments, teachers believed that students were improving: their perception went from “Often” (50%) to “Often” (66.7%). That being said, teachers also believed that student learning energy declined as the summer progress, moving their energy from “Low” (66.7%) to “Low” (83.3%) (Appendix F, Table 3).

AR.

At NEP, I also noted that academic engagement was low. My assessments showed their classroom assignments were completed “Rarely” (66.7%) and that learning energy was “Low” (100%). These assessments were lower than my initial perception: at the beginning of the summer, I thought students completed their homework assignments “Often/Rarely” (50%) and had “Medium/Low” (50%) learning energy (Appendix H, Table 3).

Combined (AR and Teachers).

As a whole, results indicated that student academic engagement increased in regard to completing classroom assignments and decreased in regard to student’s learning energy. Thus, there were gains and loses.

ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT	Before	After	+/-/=
This student completes his/her classroom assignments:	Often-44.4%	Often-55.6%	+
This student completes his/her homework:	N/A	N/A	N/A
How would you evaluate this student's learning energy during classroom activities?	Medium/Low-44.4%	Low-88.9%	-
Result:			=

When asked whether “This student completes his/her classroom assignments” at the beginning of the summer, the most common response was “Often” (44.4%). At the end of the summer, the most common result was “Often” (55.6%). While this showed positive growth, when asked, “How would you evaluate the student’s learning energy during classroom activities,” a negative shift was observed, as surveys in the beginning of the summer averaged, “Medium/Low” (44.4%) while those at the end of the summer averaged “Low” (88.9%).

BSYI.

Interaction.

INTERACTION QUESTION:	TEACHER	AR
1. Does this student fit in with the class?	Pre: “Yes” (55.6%) Post: “Yes” (66.7%) ↑	Pre: “Yes” (66.7%) Post: “Yes” (66.7%) =
2. How often does this student help out others?	Pre: “Rarely” (44.4%) Post: “Sometimes” (55.6%) ↑	Pre: “Don’t know” (100%) Post: “Rarely” (66.7%) =
3. This student volunteers to lead:	Pre: “Rarely” (44.4%) Post: “Sometimes/Rarely” (44.4%) ↑	Pre: “Sometimes/Rarely” (50%) Post: “Sometimes” (66.7%) ↑
RESULT:	↑	↑

Teachers.

As the chart above demonstrates, teachers at BSYI believed that students showed positive growth in all measured areas. They believed students “fit in” more, from “Yes” (55.6%) to “Yes” (66.7%). They believed that students helped each other out more, from “Rarely” (44.4%) to “Sometimes” (55.5%), and that they volunteered to lead more, which positively shifted from “Rarely” (44.4%) to “Sometimes/Rarely” (44.4%).

AR.

I found that students performed well in both assessments, circling “Yes” (66.7%) for both pre- and post surveys. I felt students helped peers sparingly, rating them as “Rarely” (66.6%) on the post survey. I thought students volunteered to lead more, noting a growth from “Sometimes/Rarely” (50%) to “Sometimes” (66.7%).

Combined (AR and Teachers).

INTERACTION	Before	After	+/-/=
Does this student fit in with the whole class?	Yes-55.6%	Yes-66.7%	+
This student makes an effort to help out other children:	Rarely-44.4%	Sometimes-55.6%	+
This student volunteers to lead during group activities:	Rarely-44.4%	Sometimes/Rarely- 44.4%	+
			Result: +

On the average, students showed positive growth over the course of the summer. The survey results highlight the extent to which students became more outgoing and more willing to assist one another. When asked whether “This student makes an effort to help out other children,” teachers and I averaged “Rarely” (44.4%) at the start of the summer, and “Sometimes” (55.6%) at the conclusion of the summer. Students also had a positive shift in “fitting in”: results

shifted from “Yes” (55.6%) to “Yes” (66.7%). Finally, students were slightly more likely to lead during group activities.

Discipline.

Teachers.

Over the course of the summer, teacher survey results demonstrated that student behavior had a slight positive growth. Surveys showed that students were out of their seats less often, answers moving from “Rarely” (44%) to “Rarely” (66.7%). Teachers also believed that they were required to discipline students the same amount: on both the pre- and post survey, they answered “Rarely” (44.4%).

AR.

I rated students more positively at the conclusion of the summer, observing that students “were up out of their seat” “Sometimes” (66.7%) at the beginning of the summer, though “Rarely” (66.7%) at the end. Likewise, disciplinary issues dropped from “Too Often” (66.7%) to “Too Often/When needed and appropriately/Rarely” (33.3%).

DISCIPLINE QUESTION:	TEACHER	AR
1. How often is this student up of his/her seat?	Pre: “Rarely” (44.4%) Post: “Rarely” (66.7%) ↓	Pre: “Sometimes” (66.7%) Post: “Rarely” (66.7%) ↓
2. How often do you discipline this student?	Pre: “Rarely” (44.4%) Post: “Rarely” (44.4%) =	Pre: “Too often” (66.7%) Post: “Too often/When needed and appropriately/Rarely” (33.3%) ↓
RESULT:	↓	↓

Combined (AR and Teachers).

The combination of AR survey and teacher survey responses demonstrated that students over the course of the summer exhibited more positive behavior and had fewer disciplinary issues. We believed students were “up out of their seat” less, rating them from “Rarely” (44.4%) to “Rarely” (66.7%). We noted that students’ discipline issues remained constant, averaging “Rarely” (44.4%) on both the pre and post surveys (Appendix H, Table 4).

Academic Engagement.

Teachers.

Teachers at BSYI believed that student academic engagement declined in two of the three components considered for this measurement. They thought that students completed their classroom assignments less frequently, noting a decline from “Often” (55.6%) to “Sometimes” (50%). Additionally, teachers believe that students had less learning energy at the end of the summer, noting a decline on the aggregate from “Medium” (77.8%) to “Low” (55.6%). However, teachers also believed that students completed their homework more often.

ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT QUESTION:	TEACHER	AR
1. How often does this student complete his/her classroom assignments?	Pre: “Often” (55.6%) Post: “Sometimes” (50%) ↓	Pre: “Often/Sometimes” (50%) Post: “Often/Sometimes/Rarely” (33.3%) ↓
2. How often does this student complete his/her homework?	Pre: “Often” (44.4%) Post: “Often” (66.7%) ↑	Pre: “Rarely” (33.3%) Post: “Often” (66.7%) ↑
3. How would you evaluate this student’s learning energy?	Pre: “Medium” (77.8%) Post: “Low” (55.6%) ↓	Pre: “Medium” (66.7%) Post: “Medium” (100%) ↑
RESULT:	↓	↑

AR.

Over the course of the summer, I felt students had become more academically engaged. I believed students had more learning energy, recording an incline from “Medium” (66.7%) to “Medium” (100%), and noticed an improvement in student homework completion, from “Rarely” (33.3%) to “Often”(66.7%). However, I also noted that students completed their classroom assignments less often, recording a decline from “Often/Sometimes” (50%) to “Often/Sometimes” (33.3%). Thus, in my view, students positively improved in two of the three components.

Combined (AR and Teachers).

As a whole, teacher and survey averages showed that student academic engagement at BSYI declined. When asked whether “This student completes his/her classroom assignments,” a negative trend was recorded, from “Often” (55.6%) to “Sometimes” (50%). Student learning energy also declined from “Medium,” which was thought of as relatively active, at (77.8%) to “Medium” at (56.5%). However, we believed that students grew in one academic aspect— homework completion, which rose from “Often” (44.4%) at the beginning of the summer to “Often” (66.6%) at its end (Appendix H, Table 5).

General Findings

A few notable trends emerged from an analysis of the pre- and post-survey results. There were various shifts and stagnations in various behaviors, which might be attributed to factors and mechanisms within the program (which I discuss in greater detail below). To offer a comparative summary, students at BYSI interacted more while those at NEP interacted less; those at BYSI had less behavioral problems, while those at NEP increased, and, finally, students at BSYI were

less academically engaged while the academic engagement of students at NEP remained constant (having gains and losses).

Parent Survey Results

NEP.

The parents of the students at the NEP program listed an array of reasons for enrolling their children in the program. When asked, “Other than safety, which of these do you think is the best reason for your child to be in an enrichment program this summer,” 66.7% of parents listed “to make friends and develop social skills” and “to have fun.” When asked about choosing the program, 100% of parents listed “affordability.” In terms of income, two of three respondents indicated “\$50,000-\$75,000” per annum and one selected “\$25,000 to \$50,000.” Overall, parents rated the program favorably, 100% of them claiming that they were “generally satisfied” (NEP Parent Survey). At the same time, 66.7% of parents were somewhat concerned that their child would fall behind on academics over the summer. 66.7% of parents said their children were “eager and willing to go! (can’t wait!).” Overall, the “Indoor/Outdoor Recreation” was the activity that they collectively believed their children appeared to be most excited about.

BSYI.

Parent survey data showed that BSYI parents valued the importance of academics: 66.7% of parents answered that they enrolled their child in the program “to improve how well he/she does in school.” Despite such motivation, 66.7% of parents said that they were “not too concerned” about their children falling behind academically. Additionally, 66.7% of parents said that they chose the program because of “affordability/program reputation” (BYSI Parent Survey). When asked about how excited their children were about coming to the program, 66.7%

of parents described their children as “somewhere in the middle” and said that “theater” and “arts and crafts” were the two classes that students talked about the most.

Economically, the average household income of respondents was over \$100,000. 66.7% of parents said they were “Generally satisfied” with the program, but wished there was a stronger academic focus. One parent said, “I would like to see a strong academic program—perhaps 1 period less of the creative classes of for the program to begin an hour earlier...instead of just phonics, I would have like to see reading and writing added or have a writing component added to media or theater” (BYSI Parent Survey). Thus, evidence listed above shows that BSYI parents fell in a similar financial bracket and wanted their children to improve academically.

Chapter V. Discussion

Discussion

Overview

The overall averaging of the pre- and post surveys completed by both the teachers and me show many shifts and variations within the three measured components: interaction, discipline, and academic engagement. As outlined in the methodology chapter, the components were defined as the following. For *Interaction*, assessments considered how students fit in with one another, how willing they were to help each other, and how willing they were to lead. For *Discipline*, assessments considered how often students were up out of their seats and how often they were disciplined. For *Academic engagement*, assessments considered learning energy and completion of classroom assignment and homework. The following analysis details possible explanations for these findings by program and by measured component. I narrate my experience and outline the behavior of specific students over the course of the summer, noting various patterns and observations relating to the aforementioned criteria.

NEP.

Interaction.

When I first arrived at NEP I felt a strong connection among the students, which translated into both my and the teachers' perceptions in pre-survey results: for "fitting in," we gave the students a rating of "Yes" (87%). All of the counselors and directors knew the students' names, while even older students knew the names of the second graders. This was apparent in the cafeteria during lunch—I noticed the cohesion among counselors and students. People were

constantly conversing, telling jokes, and playing games with one another. Thus, lunch became an environment where all of the students could interact, regardless of age group.

Though students interacted at lunch, they interacted most widely during the recreational components of the program. The recreational periods—gym, Zumba/Spanish, arts and crafts, and board games—also enhanced social-behavioral development. In the survey question “Where does the student interact the most with his/her peers” both teachers and myself answered “Indoor/Recreation” (88.9%) at the conclusion of the summer. During gym, students participated in activities that promoted teamwork and allowed them to collaborate in a competitive, fun environment. This correlated with my own observations: I found students were most excited and enthusiastic during this period (NEP Journal). Students integrated into diverse teams despite preexisting friendships and social circles that were apparent throughout the day; gym class provided a means by which everyone could feel included, which was apparent throughout the day, as students constantly asked counselors when it was time for class and talked about games and activities well after class was dismissed.

During Zumba/Spanish class, where students learn Spanish for half the class and Zumba dance for the other half of the class, students constantly collaborated and communicated. During Spanish, students were put into small groups and worked on projects to present to the class. Even though the activity was structured academically, and students often misbehaved and were unfocused, they were also engaged because of class content and opportunities to interact with one another. Ms. Willow agreed with this observation, stating “This year we introduced Zumba which the students were very fond of. Some of the teachers were glad she (Ms. Bush) did Spanish with the kids...They don’t offer foreign language in Norwalk Public Schools until middle school” (Willow Interview). They loved learning new Spanish words and demonstrating

new knowledge to classmates (NEP Journal). Including Spanish in the curriculum excited the students because it was not something that the majority of them were exposed to during the year, thus allowing them to develop new skills. On the whole, this different type of learning interested and excited them.

In addition to recreational activities offered at the program site, NEP provided other opportunities for students to interact, such as field trips and all-camp events. Regardless of race, age, or gender these provided students with opportunities to belong to the NEP community. All of the students attended field trips to the Simsbury Suns Game and Six Flags as a group. Additionally, NEP's all-camp barbeque and field day, which was held during the last week of the program, was also successful in enhancing positive communication and team-building skills. Students were placed on teams and competed for prizes in various races and competitions, such as tug-of-war or potato-sack races.

NEP's cohesion was most apparent during the talent show, in which each grade performed a dance or skit. Throughout the show, students cheered for one another and were supportive of one another's talents. One highlight of the show was when the fourth graders, one of the older groups, performed a Zumba dance with Ms. Bush. Because every student was enrolled in Ms. Bush's Zumba/Spanish class, all of the students recognized the song they performed and began singing and dancing. By the end of the act, all of the students were up on their feet—I could feel a strong energy in the room and unity among the students.

Nonetheless, student interaction appears to have declined over the course of the summer, possibly because the students were given too much free time with one another. As a result, friend groups became more exclusive and cliques started to form, creating less social networking and fewer opportunities for students to form new relationships. Because a normal day was about

eight hours in length, students became less excited and interested as the summer progressed, especially those who were enrolled in the program year round and exposed to the same activities and similar staff. This lack of novelty may have led to students feeling as if they already knew the other students, which might have affected interaction. Students might not have wanted to make an effort to branch out because they had already established social networks and friend groups.

Program curriculum could have also played a factor in student disengagement and attention. Amy, one of the counselors, highlighted how repeating activities might not give students the necessary means for interaction: “I think they need more variety. We are told to be creative, but we also don’t have a lot of things to be creative with. So I think there should be more options, more activities” (Amy Interview).

Though Zumba/Spanish gave students a setting to practice and develop sharing skills and to take on leadership roles, as the summer progressed students volunteered to lead less. The combined teacher/researcher ratings averaged a negative shift in the survey results, displaying that students volunteered to lead less. The evaluation went from “Rarely” (44.4%) in the beginning of the summer to “Rarely” (75%) at the end of the summer. This shift could have been because Spanish/Zumba was the only enrichment period in which students could share.

While “free time”, which occurred between periods and during lunch, when there was spare time, offered ideal opportunities for interaction at the beginning of the program, because counselors had creative ideas for activities and games, over time students became less interested in connecting with one another. While it should have been the responsibility of the counselor to think of engaging and innovative programming, the deeper fault lies within the program structure. Throughout my field notes, I noted numerous times in which counselors complained

that they had “no idea what the students were suppose to do” (NEP Journal) and lamented the schedule, or lack there of. When asked about the structured of the program, one counselor stated “I think it’s a little unorganized, but it does have a set schedule, even though we don’t know what it is everyday or follow it” (Lauren Interview). Counselors not knowing what to schedule contributed to the students having too much free time and created disorganization.

Though counselors sometimes lacked effective skills or methods to promote interaction, at the same time there appeared to be too many counselors, a major structural issue. For example, during Zumba/Spanish class, often four or five counselors were in the room in addition to Ms. Bush. As a result, the counselors were lazy and were often at the edges of the room, chatting with one other or text messaging on their cell phones, instead of engaging with the students. Such missed opportunities may have thwarted opportunities for students to develop strong relationships and bonds. Each counselor should have been assigned a group of students to follow and track throughout classroom sessions, which would have allowed him or her to better connect and assist students.

Interaction on an individual level remained relatively constant. Arthur and Austin, two of the students, were outgoing throughout the summer. They loved communicating with peers at the beginning of the summer and at the end of the summer, especially during gym and field trips and used “free time.” Uno®, a commercial card game, was one of the students’ favorite activities during free time, especially when the whole class became involved.

Austin was a leader when his classmates wanted to play trivia. He organized social opportunities for others, asking for cards from counselors when his classmates wanted to play. “Austin got up to get Uno® cards out of his bag. All of the students saw him get out his cards

and immediately wanted to play” (NEP Journal, Day 6). It was intriguing to see how attentive and enthusiastic students became when they played games with one another.

John, the third student I observed, was the most introverted student in the study. His counselors referred to him as “shy” and “reserved” (Amy Interview). One of the counselors noted, “He’s a very quiet student. I know he has maybe one or two friends that I’ve seen him talk to or go up to. He’ll get involved in gym class and everything, but quiet is the first word that comes to mind” (Amy Interview). At the beginning of the summer, I barely noticed John. On the pre-survey distributed at the beginning of the summer, I put “Don’t know” for every response. Throughout my field notes, I could not find a recording for him until my sixth day of observation. I noted his quiet behavior. “John was very quiet... John was not really participating, he did some dancing, but a lot more standing around” (NEP Journal, Day 6).

Though his social behavior did not shift very much over the course of the summer, I did notice that he became more comfortable with his peers and more willing to volunteer to lead. As the summer progressed, John gained more confidence around his peers.

“John sat at a full table with one counselor... There was a clump of students that followed the ball. Initially, John was on the outer edge of the clump and wasn’t really involved. However, after a few minutes, I realized he was very involved and was constantly touching the ball...John scored a goal and gets very excited. He goes and gives Andrew a high five. I think that John was one of the better soccer players in the class and was one of the most involved. He was still playing while most students had lost interest and were sitting out.” (NEP Journal, Day 7)

John began sitting with different groups of peers at lunch, played board games with students during free time, volunteered to share in Zumba/Spanish, and raised his hand to be a group leader during Gym. Additionally, he was also one of the more active students on the trip to Cocco Park, an indoor water park.

On the whole, survey responses, field notes, and interviews demonstrate that students were less unified and bonded with each other by the end of the summer. I noticed that many students in the class didn't venture far from their groups of friends, and interacted with the same group of people, as demonstrated through Arthur and Austin's friendship. In their free time, I noticed they were often together and not interacting with other students (NEP Journal). While this is just one example of students pairing off in the class, I noticed that this was a general trend, recognizing that students had established friends groups, which ultimately polarized the class. Students often sat and clustered with their friends during free time, lunch, and structured activities. Because counselors did not enforce intermixing, the class became segregated. This could have been due to certain ineffective structural components of the program, such as repetitive activities and inexperienced counselors.

Discipline.

Though program structure can provide students with opportunities and frameworks within which to develop, student behaviors can also play a formidable role in the growth process, impacting the overall effectiveness of certain activities. At NEP, discipline problems were apparent in the classrooms and commonly noted as a recurring issue by teachers, program directors, and me. The combined responses were mixed to the question "How often do you discipline the student," at the beginning of the summer, producing "Too Often/Rarely" (33.3%). However, by the end of the summer, our answers had moved closer together, to "Too Often" (44.4%).

Behavioral issues were particularly prevalent during academic classes (NEP Journal). Most days, Ms. Heart, the students' academic teacher, only got through one or two activities in a 90-minute period. She complained about student behavior, told the students to "pay

attention,” and sent some out of the classroom (NEP Journal). Ms. Heart exerted so much energy disciplining students that, on multiple occasions, she often murmured under her breath, “Lord help me through this day” or “have mercy” (NEP Journal). While she often integrated a hint of sarcasm into these statements, the recurrence of the comments implied how frustrated she was by the students’ behavior. Ms. Bush, also became aggravated, often emphasizing how behavior affected her class and saying, “I can’t get through anything without people talking. Right now it’s learning time, I need you all to listen” (NEP Journal, Day 9).

Behavioral problems were most problematic during academics: frequently I recorded students talking out of turn and talking when the teachers were speaking. There were also numerous problems throughout the day (NEP Journal). During academic and nonacademic periods, students were regularly out of their seats, a problem reflected in both the pre- and post surveys at “Always” (44.4%). Throughout enrichment periods, students were punished for inattentiveness and an inability to follow instructions. When behavior was exceptionally bad, students sat in a classroom with the lights out and had a “time out” period in which they were forbidden to speak and had to sit quietly (NEP Journal, Day 9). Another common punishment was making students sit out of gym class, which seemed to be the students’ favorite activity.

At an individual level, two of the three students I observed had an increase in behavioral problems over the span of the program. Arthur Aruffo was one of these students. He was commonly restless in his seat, which negatively impacted his performance in class. One teacher characterized his behavior: “He’s a little antsy, he’ll wiggle around a lot, he’ll sit on his knees and lean forward” (Amy Interview). That being said, when he was not distracted or negatively influenced by peers, he was attentive and well behaved (NEP Journal). For the most part, he’d follow directions. As the same teacher put it, “I think overall he’s a pretty good kid” (Amy

Interview). The staff also alluded to Arthur's good behavior during free time, noting that, while they occasionally had to speak to him, they recognized that he is seven years old and that a child his age would often act in that manner (Amy Interview). Arthur's parents said his behavior at home was "Good on the average" (NEP Parent Survey).

Austin, who often interacted with Arthur, also had increased disciplinary issues. Though Austin's parents said that his behavior was "Good on the average," he was disciplined quite often and noticeably more than other students during the duration of the program.

"He does not listen. He needs direction and redirection every five minutes. You have to tell him at least three times for him to even notice that you are even saying anything. And you can go right up to him in his face, he won't even notice you're even saying anything. I feel bad because I'm constantly singling him out and yelling at him, but I have to because he's always not following directions. And then most of the time he doesn't think he's doing anything. He doesn't even realize." (Amy Interview)

Austin's behavioral problems were high at the beginning and end of the summer. When asked whether "This student is up out of his/her seat," teachers and I responded "Always" (66.7%) at the beginning of the summer and "Always" (50%) at the end. When asked about student discipline, survey results reported "Too Often" (100%), both before and after. Comparing his behavior from last summer to this summer, Amy, one of the second grade counselors, responded "He's a little more misbehaved this year. I don't know if it was because I had smaller group last year. I only had seven or eight kids opposed to the twenty-two that were in the classroom this year, so that could be a part of it" (Amy Interview). There were multiple occasions on which Austin talked behind the teachers' backs and would not listen. Of the three observed students, Austin was most frequently yelled at for not following directions (NEP Journal).

John, the quietest of the students whom I included in this study, showed few signs of resistance against rules throughout the summer. He never spoke out of turn, was rarely disciplined, and rarely out of his seat. John had the fewest number of recorded behavioral problems throughout the duration of the program, in comparison with Austin and Arthur (NEP Journal). Though he had minimal behavioral issues during the program, his parents gave him the lowest behavioral rating of the three students, saying “Good on the average (camp), Needs discipline Often (home)” (NEP Parent Survey). John was barely mentioned in the teacher interviews as disruptive. Amy, his counselor, said “He’s a very quiet student so I can’t really say because we tend to focus on the students who are out of control and he seemed to never really cause a problem so I can’t really say for sure if he was focused on his academics or not” (Amy Interview).

Interestingly enough, I thought student disciplinary issues increased over the course of the summer, while teachers felt they had increased problems in one area and decreased problems in another. This could have been because the teachers are accustomed to student behavior, as most are enrolled throughout the year. Thus, they might not have noticed much of a difference.

Despite the number of behavioral issues, the counselors focused on helping the students change instead of harshly disciplining them. “We try to redirect unless it’s really bad” (Willow Interview). Though teachers and counselors recognized summer as students’ reprieve from strict boundaries and policies, they strived to have students follow basic rules and be respectful.

“I try to get them to understand the basic rules and understand the difference between you know listening to their counselors. It’s frustrating though because a lot of them, you know it’s summer so you want to be lenient with them too, but at the same time if you give them an instruction you have to follow through with it so you know, I don’t want to make a big deal about picking a pencil off the floor, but it’s the principal behind it.” (Amy Interview)

Overall, staff at NEP tried to ensure that students were aware of policies within the classroom and how to treat others properly.

Academic Engagement.

As a whole, combined survey results indicated there were gains and losses related to academic engagement throughout the summer. Student disciplinary problems during academics were a common complaint; students were not able to make large academic gains because they barely completed any work during class. I often noted that students were unfocused during academics and Zumba/Spanish, the two structured periods within the classroom setting. “Arthur Aruffo was not really listening and playing with the cars. He was not answering any questions. The students were told to start singing a color song, but Arthur was not singing and was unfocused” (NEP Journal, Day 6). This could have affected productivity. Ms. Heart could often only get through the daily “journal” assignment and one or two other assignments in 90 minutes.

This problem was in part exacerbated by the structure of the program: NEP held academic sessions only three days a week for the first four weeks of the program.

When asked about the rationale behind having academics three days a week, Ms. Willow said:

“This year in particular, and most years, we don’t want to overwhelm them with the academics. It’s still their summer too so we figure at least four weeks of the summer we’ll get them something to stand on in terms of the fall but the last two weeks we just want them to have fun.... don’t want to go three days, that’s enough for them we think. We’ve done more in the past and they aren’t retaining it because they’re bored and don’t want to do it. This is what has worked.” (Willow Interview)

Despite such minimal academic demands, students’ learning energy was found to decline drastically from “Medium/Low” (44.4%) to “Low” (88.9%) over the course of the summer, showing that students became less focused and less engaged over time.

Program philosophies could also have affected student stagnation. Staff at the program want the students to have fun and be exposed to a diverse range of activities and did not want to making learning too rigorous and demanding. Ms. Heart's views echoed Ms. Willows': the program is designed to familiarize students with information that they will revisit once they are back in school (Heart Interview). Though parents who enrolled their children in the program want them to be prepared for school, they also wanted their children to have fun during their break from the rigorous academic year.

Teachers held limited academic expectations, and their sometimes apathetic behavior might have prevented students from making gains. Some of the counselors were inattentive during academics and were often on their phones or talking to other counselors. They seemed to be unaware of student progress and left Ms. Heart, the teacher, to deal with the students alone. Most days, when I looked around at the students' work, the majority had only one or two sentences written on their page when it was time to share answers. More often, students spent their time talking with their peers, drawing, or staring into space. As mentioned earlier, counselors did not strictly monitor the students nor did they help them complete classroom assignments very often.

Teachers believed that student were likely to complete classroom assignments: over the course of the summer, their perception moved from "Often" (50%) to "Often" (66.7%). On the contrary, I thought that students were less productive and completed less work, with my observations moving from "Often/Rarely" (50%) to "Rarely" (50%). Though I might have been biased, having simultaneously observed students in BSYI's more rigorous academic program, I still felt that students were more inefficient by the end of the summer.

On an individual level, student academic engagement varied. Arthur Aruffo and John Eisenberg's academic engagement had mixed results while Austin Vale's academic engagement decreased. With Arthur, teachers and I responded to the question "How often does this student complete his/her classroom assignments" first with "Often" (100%), then "Often" (66.7%). At the beginning of the summer, he was often academically ahead of his classmates. During my first day taking field notes, I recorded: "He had about half of a page written on his worksheet, while most of the other kids only had about a quarter of a page" (NEP Journal, Day 3). However, his work ethic was not consistent over the course of the summer, as he became more complacent about completing his assignments and frequently inattentive. However, though his motivation declined, when asked, "How often does this student ask for your help on classroom assignments," his results increased from "Rarely" (66.7%) to "When needed and appropriately" (66.7%). Arthur was willing to ask counselors for help and tried to understand what was being taught.

John Eisenberg's academic focus and drive remained generally consistent. Though Ms. Heart praised him—she was "very impressed by his work" (Heart Interview)—and he improved assignment completion, he also showed a decline in "learning energy." Kira, John's Counselor, noted how focused he was, but also observed his shyness, which might have affected this measure (Kira Interview). Austin also showed a decline in academic engagement. Like John, he completed more class assignments, but decreased in the other two measures.

A few factors might have influenced academic engagement. Most obviously, staff behavior and a lack of academic accountability had adverse effects. Though staff was clearly concerned that students were learning, they also felt that students should enjoy themselves and not become burnt out before the school year started. Thus, students should be exposed to a

regime that intermixes academics with other components so that they can stay engaged and motivated over the course of the summer.

BSYI.

Interaction.

Overall, students at BSYI became more sociable as the summer progressed: the surveys showed positive shifts in all three of the measured components, “fitting in,” “willingness to help out others,” and “volunteering to lead.” This unity among students and growth might be attributed to the structure of enrichment classes (which I discuss below).

Unlike NEP, BSYI recreational classes were run like academic classes. Experienced teachers taught classes and had set curricula and for each class that stressed fun educational themes. In art class, students read books about Van Gogh and were told to paint watercolors “as if you were Van Gogh” (BSYI Journal, Day 9). This gave the students a chance to think outside of the box; they talked in small groups and worked together to create paintings that emulated Van Gogh’s style. Having different foci for each class and opportunities to learn through a variety of means and contexts allowed students to expand their academic framework. Students were excited about topics in class and loved to share ideas with peers, which became more evident over time. Students showed a positive shift in “volunteering to lead” from “Rarely” (44.4%) to “Sometimes/Rarely” (44.4%). Additionally, these recreational activities promoted social skills, as 66.6% of the surveys showed these classes were the most common place for interaction. More specifically, “Theater/Media” was cited as the most interactive and engaging period for students (BSYI Parent Survey).

During theater/media, students were constantly interacting and collaborating, which enhanced their understanding of how to work with others and be productive members in group

situations. The students had to do daily activities in small groups and practice improvisational exercises. Ms. Rose, the teacher, randomly paired students during different activities, which allowed students to socialize with everyone, so that every student knew the others on an individual level. Students were more willing to help one another as they became closer, which both the teachers and I noticed: the surveys indicated a positive growth from “Rarely” (44.4%) to “Sometimes” (55.6%). These skills were highlighted during the students’ final performances. Students worked collaboratively on the show, creating scripts, costumes and songs. The production was a huge success, a tribute to the students’ hard work, and highlighted how the students were able to work together to reach a common goal. On the whole, students were able to make gains and develop as individuals because of the environment of the class.

During lunch, the students were very social and talkative. This was the lone hour of non-structured activity during the day, when students could collectively initiate their own social gatherings. The students took advantage of these opportunities—all of the second graders sat at a table together and chatted or played games with one another. The students played a hand game together, which included all of the students putting a hand in the middle of the circle and seeing who could keep his or her hand in the circle the longest. Lunch gave the students an opportunity to interact in a non-structured, informal environment, and this environment allowed them to relax and socialize with friends. “The students were pretty calm and in their seats for the most part. I noticed a lot of people huddled around Brandon at one point and that George was on the outer edge of this conversation,” (BSYI Journal, Day 7).

In addition to the social hub that occurred during lunch, gym was another way students really connected. In gym, the students played games that promoted teamwork and sportsmanship. The relay races in which boys competed against girls, gave the students a chance to compete in a

friendly, competitive environment. Despite winning or losing, all of the students shook hands and congratulated each other on their efforts (BSYI Journal, Day 6). Student responses showed that the activity was more than the races and their results —it was about the lessons and values that the activity instilled within the students.

While lunch provided a means for intra-grade interaction, there was not much total camp interaction. Other than the grades being spilt for recreational periods (i.e. second and first grade broken in half and then put in groups), there were not any all-camp events or activities. This could have been due to the fact that the program was on a college campus in the middle of a city. Logistically, it would have been very hard for BSYI to organize a large-scale field trip. When I asked teachers for their opinions regarding such a field trip, they all agreed that it would be difficult to figure out the logistics for executing a large-scale field trip and that a field trip would increase BSYI's potential legal liability. While BSYI could have enhanced unity between grades by including more inter-group interactions during lunch and field trips, the class structures within the program compensated for this and allowed students to make gains.

On the student level, interaction increased over the course of the summer. Initial observations found Greg and Natalie to be very quiet and introverted and Ben to be more outgoing and social. Over time, my perceptions of the students evolved.

I saw Natalie develop into a classroom leader, she became willing to help other students, always participated, and led conversations during lunch. Her academic teacher, Ms. Trape, described her as “extremely talkative and eager to participate” (Trape Interview). In addition to being a social leader, Natalie was also a supportive classmate and friend. When other students shared in class, she always cheered for them and listened attentively, and as a result she was very well-liked by her classmates (BSYI Journal, Day 5). I noticed her confidence also grew. I could

track this positive growth by her teachers' responses to the survey question, "This students makes an effort to help out other children:" In the beginning of the summer, our combined results showed "Rarely" (66.7%) in the beginning of the summer and "Sometimes" (66.7%) at the end of the summer. Ms. Trape, her teacher said, "Natalie is extremely talkative. She is very chatty and playful," (Trape Interview). Natalie socially developed and become more of a presence and influence within the classroom.

Greg's interactions with others were easiest to observe during recreational periods and arts and crafts. During my observations, I noted Greg's focus during arts and crafts. Natalie and Greg followed directions compared to the other students (BSYI Journal). Ms. Trape commended Greg for his "good behavior and attentiveness" (Trape Interview). Structured class periods allowed Greg to be more productive and focused.

Ben's social interactions remained generally constant. From the beginning of the summer to the end, he was always quiet during academics and outgoing during recreational periods, especially media/theater. He loved being the class clown and the center of attention (BYSI Journal). He often sat with different groups of students during lunch and free time; he was well integrated into the class. Ben enjoyed chatting with his friends and being surrounded by others. Ms. Trape described him as "energetic" and "talkative" (Trape Interview). I noted his enthusiasm in my field notes: "Ben was dancing with another male student a lot. They were acting out a ballroom dance, which attracted the attention of the whole class and made everyone laugh. Ms. Rose jumped in and danced with Ben...Some of the students started a conga line. Ben was in the front of the line leading the crew" (BYSI Journal, Day 3). Ms. Rose had created an opportunity that allowed Ben to have fun and take the lead.

BSYI student interaction improved over the course of the summer and students integrated well. Program structure likely influenced this component, just as it had at NEP. Whether the students liked it or not, during enrichment periods at BSYI, they were forced to interact with one another and were exposed to a diverse group of peers. While students came from similar income brackets, they came from all over Brooklyn and, in most cases, from different elementary schools. The summer program was thus the only time that the program participants interacted with one another. Additionally, of the students I was observing, only one had participated in the program the summer earlier, allowing the students the opportunity to develop new friendships and social circles over the course of the summer.

Discipline.

Over the course of the summer, students had slightly fewer behavioral problems. As the program went on, students became more accustomed to rules and expectations, understanding their roles within the classroom. Students respected their teachers and peers, creating an environment that allowed them to learn and grow over time.

Though averaged survey results demonstrated positive growth, teachers assessed students at the program negatively and were constantly frustrated by their behavior (BSYI Journal). The program's structure and philosophy might have affected teachers' harsh perceptions of student behavior. For example, during academic periods, teachers felt that students often misbehaved and were difficult to deal with. Any student who was unfocused was scolded on the spot (BSYI Journal). This left students with little room to misbehave or act up. Thus, teachers felt that students were disciplined the same amount and were out of their seats less as the summer went on.

I was impressed by the students' focus and good behavior over the course of the program. Rarely did students talk out of turn, for instance. While CUB had high behavioral and academic expectations, I observed that the students understood what was expected and performed in accordance with BSYI's standards. As a whole, the students seemed to be well-rounded and acted in manner that allowed them to be productive. My post-survey evaluations showed that the students were "Rarely" (66.7%) out of their seats. Mr. Low, the director of the program, agreed with this notion. "You know, I don't know if I notice any changes in behavior. I think we basically have a good group of kids" (Low Interview).

On an individual level, Ben's behavior became more destructive over the course of the program. At the start of the program, when asked, "How often was this student out of his/her seat?" both teachers and I responded "Never" (100%). However, when asked at the end of the summer, the majority response was "Sometimes" (66.7%). Ben spoke out the most during theater/media and was constantly asked to sit down and pay attention. In this class, he was often out of place and making noise (BSYI Journal). He tried to be the center of attention, talking when teachers were talking, which disrupted productivity and flow of enrichment periods (BSYI Journal). Ben was asked to "keep himself under control" and was physically moved away from the students he tried to distract (BSYI Journal). Survey responses reflected a negative shift over the course of the summer, from "When needed and appropriately/Rarely" (50%) to "Often" (66.7%). Ms. Trape, the student's academic teacher, said, "He gets easily distracted by a fellow classmates and fools around a little too much" (Trape Interview).

Of the three students, Greg's shift toward problematic behavior was the most dramatic. This change became apparent through teacher responses and observations as the program progressed. When asked, "How often do you discipline this student?" survey results showed a

shift from “Rarely” (66.7%) to “Too Often” (66.7%). “Most of the time he is unfocused and not following along with the class at all...he is distracted at times during his enrichment periods” (Porter Interview). Additionally, teachers recorded more incidents of Greg’s poor behavior than they recorded for any other student (BSYI Journal). Ms. Trape constantly singled him out for his behavior and even had him step outside to talk to him during class (BSYI Journal). Interestingly enough, Greg’s parents had a different opinion of his behavior, indicating that his behavior was “Good on the average” (Parent Survey). Conversely, Lauren, one of Greg’s counselors who knew Greg from his participation in the program last year, noted a positive shift, saying “He was very talkative last year, but you can tell with the maturity of being in a classroom he has grown” (Lauren Interview).

Natalie’s behavior remained constant over the course of the summer. Her results to the aforementioned behavioral survey questions, “How often do you discipline this child?” and “How often is this child out of his/her seat,” averaged “Rarely” (66.7%) at both assessments (second and sixth weeks). Although she exhibited a few behavioral issues in the beginning of the summer—i.e. she was constantly told to stop talking and had to sit out of fitness for getting into a fight (BSYI Journal, Day 2)—she did not have a multitude of negative behavioral field note recordings throughout the duration of the program and she appeared to follow directions (BSYI Journal).

Although some of the BSYI students exhibited more problematic behavior than others, collectively the students were attentive and compliant throughout the summer. They raised their hands when they wanted to speak, listened to their teachers, and were respectful to other students. I was impressed to see such well-behaved seven- and eight-year-olds during the summer and believe that their productivity and development stemmed from their good behavior.

Academics.

I was very impressed by the BSYI students' academic drive and work ethic. In my assessments, I found that students' enthusiasm for learning increased during the program and they became more likely to complete homework assignments. However, they became less likely to complete classroom assignments. The students were very focused during academics and when teachers presented them with challenges, the students rose to meet them. They participated in approximately ten activities a day, were given homework to complete every night, and had to be constantly alert in class as the teacher could call on one of them at any time. As students became acclimated to the routine of the program, they had a better understanding of the teachers' expectations and the consequences of not finishing homework. They realized that their failure to complete homework thwarted their participation in class and affected their comprehension of the material.

While the students did not always provide the right answer, I was amazed by their tenacity and effort. It was invigorating to see how much material the students covered over the summer, and to see students become more confident learners. Initially, I perceived Natalie to be a quiet, disinterested student but over the summer I saw her flourish and develop into a classroom leader.

Nonetheless, it is hard to fault the students at BSYI for their supposed decline and wavering academic focus. Students were left with little room for error or mistakes and held to a high expectation throughout the six-week period. Teachers evaluated students somewhat harshly, arguing that by the end of the summer the students completed their classroom and homework assignments less often and had less energy in the classroom. In fact, teachers rated the students' energy for learning as "Medium" (77.8%) in the beginning of the summer and "Low" (55.6%) at

the end of the summer. Students became burnt out and unfocused in the face of high academic and disciplinary demands, which would most likely happen to any child that was seven- or eight-years-old during the summer. Differences in the teachers' qualifications and experiences and my own qualifications and experiences could possibly account for the disparity in our evaluations. While I have volunteered and been present in classrooms, I have not ever run my own class and I do not have a teaching certification. Teachers rated student learning energy as "Low" (55.6%) at the end of the summer and I rated them as "Medium" (100%). In addition, when considering the disparity in results between two programs, most BSYI teachers and counselors have higher qualifications than NEP staff, as most of them were certified teachers in the New York City Public School System. Therefore, the BSYI teachers likely rated the students more harshly than the students would have been rated by NEP staff.

The students' academic engagement ratings varied. Ben's declined, Greg's were static, and Natalie's exhibited positive growth.

Ben declined in two of the three academic components that the surveys measured. When asked, "How often does this student complete his/her classroom assignments?" respondents answered "Often" (100%) in the beginning of the summer, but only answered "Often" (66.7%) at the end of the summer. I also observed Ben growing disinterested in classroom activities (BSYI Journal, Day 3). "Ben was not paying attention at all. Ms. T told him to close his book...he often seems lost and does not follow directions" (BSYI Journal, Day 6). By the end of the program he no longer made an effort to do assignments and he sat for the majority of the class with his workbook closed (BSYI Journal, Day 4). As the summer progressed, Ben's desire to learn declined and his learning energy shifted from "Medium" (100%) to "Low" (66.7%).

Greg had mixed results in his academic engagement. When BSYI staff members were asked about classroom assignment completion, survey results showed an increase from “Sometimes/Rarely” (50%) to “Sometimes” (66.7%). While he had showed a positive increase in this aspect of his academic engagement, my observations and interviews revealed a lack of attention and focus during academics. There were numerous instances in which he was reading another book under his desk or playing with toys (BSYI Journal, Day 4). “He’s really inattentive, he seems to pay more attention to his Lego magazine and things like that rather than schoolwork” (Trape Interview). Often times, Greg did not have a header on his page and Ms. Trape had to take him aside to speak to him about this (BSYI Journal, Day 6). Ratings of his learning energy slightly decreased, shifting from “Medium” (100%) to “Medium” (66.7%). However, in terms of homework completion, Greg’s ratings showed positive improvement, moving from “Rarely” (66.7%) to “Sometimes” (66.7%). These slight increases and decreases in Greg’s academic engagement demonstrate that his engagement was largely static throughout the program.

Natalie demonstrated positive academic engagement over the course of the summer. She completed classroom assignments more regularly. Ratings of her completion of classroom assignments, shifted from “Sometimes” (66.7%) to “Often” (66.7%). I also noted her growth in my observations. “I have been surprised by Natalie’s behavior in the last two academic classes. The first two classes she was very quiet and now she is participating a lot and is very active in class. She is probably one of the more active participants” (BSYI Journal, Day 7). Natalie loved sharing stories in class and was often the first one to finish assignments. When the class went over assignments, she cheered for her fellow students when they got a right answer and was willing to assist them (BSYI Journal, Day 8). Her learning energy ratings increased as well,

shifting from “Low” (66.7%) to “Medium” (66.7%). Her homework completion remained constant as she received perfect ratings both measurements: “Often” (100%).

The survey results showed that, overall, the students’ academic engagement declined over the course of the summer. Yet the student’s energy and efforts over the six-week period was impressive and perhaps this decline should be attributed to the program’s design rather than the students’ intentions. BSYI students were expected to be scholars and to push themselves academically, while many of their classmates from the school year were enrolled in sports camps or playing all day. Although the program was intended to help students maintain their academic skills, it may have achieved mixed results. The staff and programs might have incorporated more relaxed activities and more ways for students to let loose, as it seems that concentrating solely on academics was too demanding for some of the students. Teachers and counselors told me that they wished the students could sometimes go outside and play (BSYI Journal). While BSYI staff believes academics are important and that students should maintain their academic skills, it felt that students at this age should also be given opportunities to enjoy their summers so that they are not over-stressed before the next academic year begins. Additionally, allowing the students additional breaks outside of the classroom may have increased student attention when inside the classroom, and may have positively impacted student engagement during academic endeavors and learning activities.

Chapter VI. Recommendations

Recommendations

Throughout the study, I was exposed to a variety of teaching methods, program structures, and philosophies. I have gained insight into which practices are effective in promoting interaction and communications with peers through my own analysis of literature and my execution of this study. My analysis has demonstrated that many students respond better to varied mechanisms and program structures, which ultimately influence behavior and performance in a manner that encourages positive behavioral growth.

My analysis suggests that the following features contribute to effective programs: a variety of academics and recreation, philosophies that emphasize preparation, having a committed and organized administration and staff, and support from parents and the community. Not every program can feasibly include all of these components, but it is essential that all of these components—as well as the ideologies for inclusion of these components—should be considered when creating summer enrichment programs.

Combination of Academics and Recreation

It is important for students to have opportunities for enhancing their social and academic skills, such as exposure and access to a variety of learning environments and activities. Prior research, and this study, has shown that a combination of academic and recreational offerings is the best method for creating and reinforcing such skills. Counselors, TAs, and Program Directors at NEP and BSYI stressed the importance of including both academic and recreational components within their curriculums, arguing that the inclusion of both greatly enhances student

development. When asked about such a two-prong approach, Amy, an NEP counselor, said “I don’t know if I can say that one is more important than another because academics keep up their skills over the summer, but you know gym promotes teamwork and working with each other. Arts and crafts promote creativeness, which I’m a big fan of, so I don’t think I can say one is more important than another” (Amy Interview). Overall, students responded positively to different teaching styles and were engaged by various activities. Therefore, programs must offer a wide array of components.

BSYI counselors agree with the NEP’s philosophy regarding the importance of exposing students to both academic and social activities.

“They have to learn how to get along in a structured setting as far as sitting at a desk, focusing on the teacher, and focusing on the task at hand. And when we switched to the afternoon, they have to know how to get along in a social setting. I think it works. It has worked for us in previous years...I think the mix is good for social development. You are taking two complete opposite ends of the spectrum and you are putting the same kids in and they learn how to get along, they learn how to rely on one another, they learn how to help each other. At least that’s what you hope for at the end of the day.” (Willow Interview)

Throughout their lives, students are expected to adapt to many different situations, so developing their skills on multiple levels is important, and better prepares them for problems they will encounter outside the classroom. Additionally, participation in non-academic programs allows students to enhance their relationships, build friendships, and gain social awareness. Students should have a range of experiences and opportunities.

“We’ve been doing it for years. For us, it’s a proven program...my husband runs an all-day basketball camp in Darien and when you play basketball all day, you lose them by noon, so I think the mix is good for social development. You are taking two opposite ends of the spectrum and they are learning how to get along, rely on each other—at least that’s what you hope for at the end of the day.” (Willow Interview)

Program directors recognize that opportunities to enhance academic skills are important, but they also recognize that summer should be a time when students can have fun. The last thing they want is for students to be worn out and unengaged by the time school starts. Many of the counselors within the two programs emphasized that they don't want to overwhelm students (Amy Interview). Thus, summer programs should include a "fun" aspect in some regard. "A lot of camps don't do academics. That's always a big selling point because you know what, they tend to lose it over the summer. So even though they aren't getting homework, it's not full-blown school, it helps with retention so they aren't starting over in September which happens" (Willow Interview). In order to avoid overwhelming the students, programs should offer special enrichment activities for their participants, such as field trips, theme days, and special events. Variety helps keep students engaged and focused.

Hosting unique classes that are both fun and educational can retain a student's interest. Ms. Willow described one class called Kids in the Kitchen, in which students cook and participate in activities in the kitchen. She said, "It doesn't actually involve any cooking. The kids are actually doing math—they measure, they are doing math, they are doing all of that. Again my motivation, they don't realize they are doing work, they are doing math, they are having a good time" (Willow Interview). When students are having fun and enjoying themselves, they are more eager to participate and learn, which gives them a more positive experience.

As noted in the literature review, interventions and programming that include artistic components can benefit student growth. Art activities, for instance, can foster development: high quality art lessons have been found to impact character development (Brouillette, 2010). Artistic outlets provide students with the opportunity to step into someone else's shoes and look at things from different perspectives. BSYI's art class provided students with these types of opportunities,

which excited and motivated the students. They learned about Picasso and Van Gogh and were able to simulate their styles and understand the world through different perspectives. Teachers also brought students to ponds and nature sites on campus and asked them to create watercolors. By diversifying the types of activities and settings, students were exposed to a broader environment through which they could learn and grow. These teaching methods translated into positive student growth: students were excited to go to class and often talked about the class days after completing a lesson.

Philosophies that Emphasize Preparation

Students frequently participate in summer programs and educational institutions to expose themselves to resources that will prepare them for the future. Most of what children learn in school is directed towards outward application, especially in social settings (Efland, 2004). Programs can expose children to increasingly complex interactions, teach them to develop worthwhile relationships and show them the value of being involved in group activities (Brouillette, 2010). Research suggests that children who are able to navigate successfully early social environments in school get off to a better start, and continue to profit from their social knowledge and experience. They also reap benefits from the social support networks that they build (Hamre, 2001).

Academics is the other factor in this equation. The Connecticut Mastery Test, a test that is administered in the fall to students in third through eighth grade, highly influences a student's future success. The test assesses mathematics, writing, and science (Connecticut State Department of Education, 2008). This test is used for tracking and for monitoring entrance into certain high schools. Because the test plays such an influential role in student placement,

students need to be prepared for it and to retain skills from the school year throughout the summer. In this sense, NEP can play a crucial role in students obtaining optimal results. As an educator, Ms. Willow understood the importance of these skills, stating that curriculum used in her program is geared toward preparing students for the test (Willow Interview).

Thus, it is important that basic skills are reinforced and engrained in a student's repertoire. One teacher summarizes: "I feel that mathematics and writing are the most important subjects to include in during this program, especially in the age group I teach. Children going into second grade have the most difficulty in these two areas during the summer program will definitely benefit their success in the upcoming school year" (Trape Interview). Because students come from many different types of schools, they have exposure to different academic and social environments. As a result, they may not have access to the same resources and preparation. Therefore, being involved in a strong summer program could give them opportunities that their schools may lack.

In addition to students being prepared academically for the next grade, it is important that students are socialized for the real world. Within curricula, lessons are needed that help children learn how to combine and sequence behaviors that make up various social skills. In that way, they can translate these skills into their repertoires (Durlak, Weissburg, & Schellinger, 2011). One way this can be emphasized is through attention to diversity. As students mature and start to explore different neighborhoods and communities, they will begin to see that the world is comprised of many different socioeconomic groups and races. As a result, students must learn to tolerate and accept others regardless of their race, economic status, or background. Being exposed to an eclectic group of peers can allow them to have a better understanding of the real world and of various socioeconomic demographics.

“Our program is so diverse. Racially, it’s evenly spilt. A lot of our parents like it that way because it is more of a representation of the real world. Everyone is not loaded and not everyone is dirt poor either, you know they just work with each other, they get to know each other, and they learn not to care about where you come from or how much money you have. They are just kids—they are having a great time.” (Willow Interview)

Sam Low echoes these ideas, noting that BSYI participants are given opportunities to interact with students who they might not normally interact with during the academic year. Students in the program are from public schools, private schools, and schools located out of state; thus, students can develop relationships with a large array of students, and can diversify their base.

Additionally, summer programs can expose students to different types of learning environments. Mr. Low stressed that different types of classrooms and a unique setting, such as college campus, enhance student development and add an element of excitement to the days. These types of environments improved student visual learning and broadened their understandings.

Committed and Organized Staff and Administration

As demonstrated in earlier research, it is absolutely essential that those involved in educating youth are committed to helping students excel to the best of their abilities. Summer program staff and administrations need to be dedicated and committed.

“If you don’t like working with kids, you don’t need to be here. They come in all different shapes and sizes, mannerisms, attitudes, you know, you just have to roll with the punches as far as the kids are concerned. No two days are ever the same. They are never the same, so you know you have to be patient and you have to be kind. You have to be nurturing. Every day they need something different and we just need our staff to be flexible enough to be able to deal with whatever happens that day. Because again, they are never the same.” (Willow Interview)

Students look to teachers as role models and are significantly influenced by their actions. As a result, teachers are expected to act in ways that positively influence their students and to

develop emotional connections with them. This study has shown that teachers who exhibited such skills had a more positive effect on and more beneficial relationships with students.

Teacher behavior is also often associated with optimal social levels in the classroom: teachers often act as mediators for regulating activity level, communication, and contact with the students (Hamre, 2001). Staff should have relationships with learners that are affirming, nurturing, reciprocal, and marked by shared responsibility (Barnett, 2002). By doing this, they develop foundations for better adjustment and academic performance, which, in turn, are reflected through positive, productive social behaviors. Because every student requires different types of mentorship and responds differently to different teaching styles, teachers must adapt to fit students' needs, constantly testing curricula to best accommodate students and provide them with the best resources to succeed. Teachers should be able to generate and coordinate flexible, adaptive responses to demands and to generate and create various opportunities for the students in the environment (Durlak, Weissburg, & Schellinger, 2011).

Additionally, there needs to be strong support and organization from staff and administration. Devaney and O'Brien (2006), for instance, found that effective leadership promotes quality program implementation by ensuring adequate financial, personnel, and administrative support while providing professional development and technical assistance (Devaney & O'Brien, 2006). BSYI was especially involved in creating a supportive structure. Mr. Low constantly referred to the ways in which he implemented new curricula and introduced new classes to improve student experiences. For example, every January, Mr. Low gathers a committee of staff members to make recommendations for classes the program should offer and eliminate. They assess which classes were successful and unsuccessful (Low Interview). Mr.

Low also noted teacher involvement in the process, saying that he always asks for teacher input about books and ways to diversify offerings.

Such a forum creates a positive relationship between teachers and administrators, which helps to strengthen the program, opening up room for positive feedback and discussion. BSYI is never static and is constantly thinking of ways to improve and to encourage student development. Ultimately, the program hopes to benefit the student as much as possible.

Support From Parents, Peers, and Community

Collaboration with parents and members of the community is considered another important factor in the creation of effective programs. Program directors must incorporate parent feedback, allowing parents a voice in program development. They are the ones that know their children the best, and can thus offer valuable opinions.

As noted earlier, in addition to parents and teachers, peers can influence each other's social development and engagement. Children who have more positive peer relationships tend to be more optimistic about school, participate more in classroom activities, and achieve more in the classroom (Buhs, Ladd, & Herald, 2006). Thus, by being in an enrichment program, students have opportunities to gain an extended network of peers who can provide intellectual and social support (Oslzeski-Kubilius & Grant, 1994).

Having support from external sources distant from an institutional setting, such as the community, can add dimensions to student growth and allow them to become more involved in the community. Opportunities within the community can enhance student growth: students can help out neighbors, become involved in local issues, and feel a sense of belonging and pride. Communities that have the means to promote growth provide institutions and organizations that

can offer support, such as educational programs, youth groups, and psychological services (Oslzeski-Kubilius & Grant, 1994).

Students should not only understand their roles as individuals, but as members of a larger group. For example, because NEP is sponsored by many local organizations, funded by federal grants and is supported by the community, it enables students not only to be a member of their group, but also to feel as though they belong to something greater. Volunteers from local organizations and businesses, such as GE, offered interactive presentations with the students, giving them an appreciation for various services within the community. For example, when the Norwalk Fire Department visited, volunteers taught the students about fire safety by using a trailer home that stimulated dangerous situations. By participating in this situation, students gained a real-life perspective on what to do in an emergency.

Not only did such exercises have very practical applications; the students had fun doing it! Reporters from the local newspaper came and wrote articles about the program, which helped to broaden community awareness and to raise awareness about the program, highlighting the camp's diverse offerings and opportunities for students: "The camp hired four certified teachers from Norwalk Public Schools to teach math, reading, and writing before kids bounded off to play board games, dance Zumba, practice culinary arts or learn Spanish" (Capalbo, 2011).

Future Research and Limitations

While this research considers a wide variety of program structures, engagements and interactions relating to student growth, future studies might consider different elements that could not be included within this study. Research should compare programs that are in similar environments while using a group. Also, parents and educators could have been less informed:

throughout the study, teachers, parents, and directors were aware that I was conducting a study, which might have affected their evaluations of those students.

It might also be interesting to consider students from the same elementary schools with similar social and academic profiles to see how different summer programs affect them over time—How would the effects of each program differ? Do students make the most gains from an enrichment program or would they grow more in a solely academic or recreational program? Is it better for them to be in programming the whole summer or have a reprieve before the academic year begins? Are there significant findings for students who have been exposed to summer programming over five years? Ten years?

In addition to coordinating participants that attend the same elementary schools during the academic year, it might also be helpful to ask about prior interventions or enrichment, such as afterschool programs or summer programs. Educators make and implement responsible, informed decisions about which types of programs and curricula to retain, restructure, and eliminate. Thus, it is important that they consider which types of curricula and structures have proven effective and which would be best to include within their program. Throughout the program's duration, staff should actively communicate with parents and students to gain feedback.

This study has shown how important factors, such as combining academics and recreation, philosophies that emphasize preparation, committed and organization staff, and support from parents and the community, relate to positive student social growth. Certain program features should be maintained that ensure that all students, regardless of background and socioeconomic status, are given opportunities to succeed and excel in well-structured and balanced summer programs that will help them socially and academically. As demonstrated by

this study, attending summer enrichment programs is one way in which students can enhance their skill sets and be better prepared for school during the academic year. Therefore, educators should work to incorporate mechanisms that have proven successful in promoting growth: a variety of academics and recreation, philosophies that emphasize preparation, a committed and organized administration and staff, and support from parents and the community. It is essential that educators and program directors understand the importance of the influences that affect students throughout their development.

Bibliography

- Adams, M., Womack, S., & Shatzer, R. (2010). Parent involvement in school-wide social skills instruction: Perceptions of a home note program. *Education*, 130 (3), 513-528.
- Allington, R. (2006). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research based Programs*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Armstrong, S.W., & McPherson, A. (1991). Homework as a critical component in social skills instruction. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 24 (1), 45-47.
- Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Wilson, N. (2003). Effects of an elementary school intervention on students' 'connectedness' to school and social adjustment during middle school. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 23 (3), 243-261.
- Barnett, T., O'Loughlin, J., & Paradis, G. (2002). One and two-year predictors of decline in physical activity among inner-city schoolchildren. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 5 (3), 253-265.
- Bouie, A. (2007). *After-school success: Academic enrichment strategies with urban youth*. New York: Teachers College.
- Bond, H. (2004). Taking stock and putting stock in primary prevention: Characteristics of effective programs. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 24, 3, 199-217.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London: Sage Publication.
- Brooklyn City Data. (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.city-data.com/forum/new-york-city/785453-what-rich-poor-areas-brooklyn.html>.
- Brouillette, L. (2010). How the arts help children to create healthy social scripts: Exploring the perceptions of elementary teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111 (1), 16-24.
- Buhs, E., Ladd, G., & Herald, S. (2006). Peer exclusion and victimization: Processes that mediate the relation between peer group rejection and children's classroom engagement and achievement? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98 (1), 1-13.
- Campbell, F., & Ramey, C. (1994). Effect of early intervention on intellectual and academic achievement: A follow-up study of children from low-income families. *Children Development*, 65 (2), 684-689.
- Capalbo, D. (2010, August 13). *Ending days of summer*. Norwalk Hour. Retrieved from <http://www.thehour.com/search2.php?q=achieve>.
- Carter, L. (1984). The sustaining effects study of compensatory and elementary education. *Educational Researcher*, 13 (7), 4-13.

- Catalano, R., Mazza, J., & Harachi, T. (2003). Raising healthy children through enhancing social development in elementary school: Results after 1.5 years. *Journal of School Psychology*, 41 (2), 143-164.
- Chaplin, D., & Capizzano, J. (2006) Impacts of a summer learning program: a random assignment study of Building Educated Leaders for Life (BELL): A report for The Urban Institute. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411350_bell_impacts.pdf?RSSFeed=UI_Education.xml.
- Cohen, E., Lotan, R., Scarloss, B., & Arelleno, A. (1999). Complex instruction: equity in cooperative learning classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 38 (2), 80-86.
- Comer, J. (2001). Schools that develop children. *The American Prospect*, 12 (7), 33-35.
- Connecticut State Department of Education (2008). The Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) and The Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT). Retrieved from <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2609&q=319486>.
- Cooper, H., Charlton, K., Valentine, K., Muhlenbruck, L., & Borman, G. (2000). Making the most of summer school: A meta-analytic and narrative review. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 65 (1): 1-99.
- Cosden, M., Morrison, G., Gutierrez, L., & Brown, M. (2004). The effects of homework programs and after-school activities on school success. *Theory into Practice*, 23 (2), 220-226.
- Denton, D. (2004). Summer school: unfulfilled promise. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov:80/PDFS/ED467662.pdf>.
- Devaney, E. O'Brien, M., Resnik, H, Keister, S, & Weissberg, E.P. (2006). Sustainable school wide social and emotional learning: Implementation guide and toolkit. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov:80/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED505364&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED505364.
- Dictionary MSN Encarta (2010). *Enrichment Definition*. Retrieved February 6, 2011, from <http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?lextype=3&search=enrichment>.
- Duffet, A., Johnson, J., & Farkas, S. (2004). All work no play? Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov:80/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED505364&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED505364.
- Durkheim, E. (1956). *Education and sociology*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Durlak, J., Wessiburg, R., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., & Schellinger, K. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82 (1), 405-432.
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., Murphy, B., Shepard, S., Gurthrie, I., Mazsk, P., Poulin, R., & Jones, S. (1999). Prediction of elementary school children's socially appropriately and problem behavior from anger reactions of age 4-6 years. *Journal of Applied Developmental*, 20, 1, 119-142.
- Elias, M. & Haynes, N. (2008). Social competence, social support, and academic achievement in minority, low-income, urban elementary school children. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23 (4): 474-495.
- Elfand, A. (2004). *Arts education as imaginative cognition. Handbook of research and policy in art education*. Muhway, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Furman, W. (1989). *The development of children's social networks. Children social network and social supports*. San Francisco: Wiley and Sons.
- Gardener, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizon in theory and practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gest, S., Welsh, J., & Domitrovich, C. (2005). Behavioral predictors of changes in society relatedness and linking school of elementary school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43 (4), 291- 301.
- Hamre, B. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72 (2), 625-638.
- Hallam, S. (2011). An evaluation of Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) Programme: promoting positive behaviour, effective learning and well-being in primary school children. *Oxford Review of Education*. 35 (3), 313-330.
- Hartup, W. (1983). *Peer relations. Handbook of child psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hayes, D. & Grether, J. (1969). The school year and vacations: where do students learn? Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1984-21716-001>.
- Hepler, J. (1997). Social development of children: The role of peers. *Social Work in Education*, 19 (4), 1-19.
- Howe, F. (1993). The child in elementary school. *Child Study Journal*, 23 (4): 227-245.

- James, H. (1969). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov:80/PDFS/ED316506.pdf>.
- Jennings, J. & DiPrete, T. (2009). Teacher effects on social behavior and behavioral skills in early elementary school. Retrieved from <http://rer.sagepub.com/content/79/1/491.full>.
- Jennings, P. & Greenberg, M. (2008) The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79 (1), 491-525.
- Johnsen, S., Witte, M., & Robbins, J. (2006). Through their eyes: students' perspectives of a university based enrichment program—The university for young people project. *Gifted Child Today*, 29 (3), 2-6.
- Johnson, P. (2004). Building effective programs for summer learning” Retrieved from http://nationalserviceresources.org/files/legacy/filemanager/download/summer_learning_pjohnson.pdf.
- Kerns, K., & Seibert, A. (2009). Attachment figures in middle childhood. *Educational Journal of Behavioral Developmental*, 33 (4), 347-355.
- Kirkland, L., Camp, D., & Manning, M. (2006). Changing the face of summer programs. *Childhood Education*, 85 (2), 96-101.
- Lareau, A. (2002). Invisible inequality: social class and childrearing in black families and white families. *American Sociological Review*, 67 (5), 747-776.
- Larau, A. (2003). Unequal childhoods-class, race, and family life. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levitt, M., Guacci-Franco, N., & Levitt, J. (1993). Convoys of social support in childhood and early adolescence: structure and function. *Development Psychology*, 29 (5), 811-818.
- Lewis, M., Feiring, C., McGuffoy, C., & Jarkir, J. (1984). Predicting psychopathology in six-year olds From early social relations. *Childhood Development*, 55 (1), 123-136.
- Little, P. (2009). Supporting student outcomes through expanded learning opportunities. *The Evaluation Exchange*, 12 (1 & 2), 2–6.
- McArthur, J. (2002). The why, what, and how of teaching children social skills. *The Social Studies*, 93 (4), 183-185.
- Miller, B. (2007). The learning season: The untapped power of student achievement. Retrieved from http://www.nmefdn.org/uploads/Learning_Season_ES.pdf.

- Nokali, N., Bachman, H., & Votruba-Drzal, E. (2010). Parent involvement and children's academic and social development in elementary school. *Child Development*, 81 (3), 988-1005.
- Oslzewski-Kubilius, P. & Grant, B. (1994). Social support systems and the disadvantaged gifted: a framework for developing programs and services. *Roeper Review*, 17 (1), 1-16.
- Pierce, K., Hamm, J., & Vandell, D. (1999). Experiences in after-school programs and children's adjustment in first-grade classrooms. *Child Development*, 70 (3), 756-767.
- Piaget, J. (1971). *The Theory of States in Cognitive Development Measurement and Piaget*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Protheroe, N. (2007). Alternatives to retention in grade. Retrieved December 3, 2010, from www.nasep.org.
- Rawson, H. (1973). Academic remediation and behavior modification in a summer-school camp. *The Elementary School Journal*, 74 (1), 34-43.
- Resnick, D. (1996). Jekyll and Hyde in the classroom: a comparative case study in educational failure. *International Review of Education*, 42 (13), 227-241.
- Rones, M. & Hoagwood, K. (2001). School based mental health services: a research review. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 3 (4), 223-241.
- Ross, J., Saavedra, P., Schur, G., Winters, F., & Felner, R. (1992). The effectiveness of an after-school program for primary grade latchkey students on precursors of substance abuse. *Journal of Community Psychology*, OSAP Special Issue, 22-38.
- Seibert, A. & Kerns, K. (2000) Attachment figures in middle childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33 (4), 347-355.
- Schutte, N., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D...Cooper, J. (1998). Developmental and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25 (2), 167-177.
- Strand, K. (2006). The heart and the journey: case studies of collaboration for arts integrated curricula. *Heldref Publications*, 108 (1), 29-40.
- Tach, L., & Farkas, G. (2006). Learning-related behaviors, cognitive skills, and ability grouping when schooling begins. *Social Research*, 35 (4), 1048-1079.
- Terzian, M., Anderson, K., & Hamilton, K. (2009). Effective and promising summer learning programs and approaches for economically-disadvantaged children and youth. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreasofFocus/Out-Of-SchoolLearning/Documents/Effective-and-Promising-Summer-Learning-Programs.pdf>.

- The City of Norwalk Connecticut. "Norwalk, CT—Official Website". Retrieved August 10, 2010, from <http://www.norwalkct.org/>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Profile of selected social characteristics: Brooklyn, NY*. Retrieved November 23, 2010, from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ACSSAFFacts?_event=ChangeGeoContext&_geo_id=06000US3604710022&_geoContext=01000US%7C04000US09%7C16000US0955990&_street=&_county=Brooklyn%2C+NY&_cityTown=Brooklyn%2C+NY&_state=&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&_ActiveGeoDiv=geoSelect&_useEV=&_pctxt=fph&_pgsl=010&_submenuId=factsheet_1&_ds_name=ACS_2009_5YR_SAFF&_ci_nbr=null&_qr_name=null&_reg=null%3Anull&_keyword=&_industry.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *Profile of selected social characteristics: Norwalk, CT*. Retrieved November 23, 2010, from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ACSSAFFacts?_event=ChangeGeoContext&_geo_id=16000US0955990&_geoContext=&_street=&_county=Norwalk%2C+CT&_cityTown=Norwalk%2C+CT&_state=&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&_ActiveGeoDiv=&_useEV=&_pctxt=fph&_pgsl=010&_submenuId=factsheet_1&_ds_name=ACS_2009_5YR_SAFF&_ci_nbr=null&_qr_name=null&_reg=null%3Anull&_keyword=&_industry.
- Vandell, D., & Corasaniti, M. (1998). The relation between third graders' after-school care and social, academic, and emotional functioning. *Child Development*, 59 (4), 868-875.
- Wagner, J. (1999). Administrators as ethnographers: school as context for inquiry and action. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 21 (3), 195-221.
- Zemelman, S., Daniels, O., & Hyde, A. (2005). *Best practice. Today's standard for teaching and learning in America's schools*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Appendices

Appendix A: Example of Teacher Survey

The Brooklyn Summer Youth Initiative Teacher Survey

Student's Name: _____

Please answer the following questions regarding this student's behavior:

Does the student fit in with the whole class?

- a. Yes (friends with everyone, different groups of students)
- b. Sometimes (has 2-3 close friends)
- c. No (often by him/herself)
- d. Don't know

When does the student interact the most with his/her peers?

- a. Recreational Activities (Theater, Media, Fitness, Arts and Crafts)
- b. Academic Classes (Mathematics, Reading)
- c. Free Time (Breaks, Before/After Sessions)
- d. Lunch
- e. Don't know

This student is up and out of his/her seat:

- a. Always (2-3 times a day)
- b. Sometimes (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know
- e. Never

This student makes an effort to help out other children:

- a. Often (2-3 times a day)
- b. Sometimes (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know

This student volunteers to lead during group activities:

- a. Often (2-3 times a day)
- b. Sometimes (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know

This student completes his/her classroom assignments and tasks:

- a. Often (2-3 times a day)

- b. Sometimes (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know

This student asks for your help on classroom assignments:

- a. Too Often (2-3 time a day)
- b. When needed and appropriately (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know

This student completes his/her homework:

- a. Often (everyday)
- b. Sometimes (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know

This student seems most attentive and focused during:

- a. Math
- b. Reading
- c. Writing
- d. Don't know

How often do you discipline this child?

- a. Too Often (2-3 times a day)
- b. When needed and appropriately (2-3 times a week)
- c. Rarely (0-1 times throughout program)
- d. Don't know

How would you evaluate the student's learning energy during classroom activities?

- a. Too High (always active, raises hand as often as possible)
- b. Medium (relatively active, raises hand once or twice a day)
- c. Low (not active, does not raise hand)
- d. Don't know

During which activity is the student's overall energy the highest?

- a. Recreational Activities (Theater, Media, Fitness, Arts and Crafts)
- b. Academic Classes (Mathematics, Language Arts)
- c. Free Time (Breaks, Before/After Sessions)
- d. One on one instruction (Tutorial Sessions)
- e. Don't know

Additional comments about the student (if any):

Appendix B: Example of Parent Survey

NEP -Parent Survey

Please consider your child's behavior since starting the NEP program this summer. All of your answers are anonymous and your child's name will not be used in the study.

Which aspect of NEP does your child often seem most excited to talk to you about?

- a. Academic Classes
- b. Indoor/Outdoor Recreation
- c. Arts and Crafts
- d. Board Games
- e. Zumba/Spanish
- f. Field Trips
- g. Free Time (Breaks, Before/After Sessions)
- h. Lunch
- i. Don't know

Generally speaking, when it comes to coming to the program everyday, is your child usually:

- a. Unwilling and reluctant (doesn't want to go)
- b. Eager and willing (can't wait to go!)
- c. Somewhere in the middle
- d. Don't know

While doing homework/academics, your child seems most attentive and focused during:

- e. Math
- f. Reading
- g. Writing
- h. Don't know

How would you evaluate the student's learning energy?

- a. High (always wants to complete school work, doing extra academics as often as possible)
- b. Medium (relatively active, often/sometimes completes school work)
- c. Low (never wants to do school work, reluctant)
- d. Don't know

Your child's behavior is:

- a. Excellent-no problems
- b. Good on the average
- c. Needs discipline often
- d. Needs discipline occasionally
- e. Don't know

Which aspect of the NEP program do you think is most important to your child's development of social skills (interaction with others, participation, willingness to help others):

- a. Academic Classes
- b. Indoor/Outdoor Recreation
- c. Arts and Crafts
- d. Board Games
- e. Zumba/Spanish
- f. Field Trips
- g. Free Time (Breaks, Before/After Sessions)
- h. Lunch
- i. Don't know

Please circle your total household income level for 2009:

- a. Under \$25,000
- b. \$25,000-\$50,000
- c. \$50,000-\$75,000
- d. Over \$100,000
- e. Don't know

What is the most important factor for you when choosing a summer program for your child?

- a. Affordability
- b. Safety
- c. Program Reputation
- d. Location
- e. Child care/Staff
- f. Other _____

Why did you choose the NEP program for your child?

- a. Affordability
- b. Safety
- c. Program Reputation
- d. Location
- e. Child care/Staff
- f. Other _____

Other than safety, which of these do you think is the best reason for your child to be enrolled in an enrichment program this summer?

- a. To develop his/her interests and hobbies
- b. To improve how well he/she does in school
- c. To make friends and develop social skills
- d. To have fun
- e. Don't know
- f. Other _____

Are you generally satisfied with the NEP Program?

- a. Generally satisfied (great staff, strong academics and enrichment)
- b. Could use improvement

c. Don't know

Are you concerned that your child will fall behind on academics over the summer?

- a. Very concerned
- b. Somewhat concerned
- c. Not too concerned
- d. Don't know

Has your child done this program in previous summers: Yes No

If so, how many years: _____

Child's school during the academic year: _____

What town/city do you live in? _____

Additional Comments (if any):

Appendix C: Example of Teacher Interview

NEP-Teacher Interview

1. What is your background in education?
2. How many years have you been working with NEP?
3. Which grade have you typically taught?
4. How would you describe a typical day? Do you have a set curriculum or a schedule that you are suppose to follow?
5. What role do you think you play in helping students? What are your motivations behind working at this program?
6. How do you assess and measure student growth academically and socially over the course of the summer?
7. Which activities are the most important to include in the curriculum and why?
8. Which activities do you think promote the most student interaction?
9. What part of the day do you think students enjoy the most? Which activities seem most appealing to the students?
10. How would you describe the students as a whole during academics?
11. What are your personal goals for helping students grow over the course of the summer?
12. What is your opinion on the structure of the program?
13. What are NEP's strengths and weakness? What aspects do you think could be improved?
14. Please answer the following questions regarding the behaviors of John Eisenberg.
 - a. Have you taught this student before?
 - b. Describe this student's behavior during academics.
 - c. Describe this student's behavior during enrichment periods.
 - d. Describe this student's behavior during free time (lunch, breaks, in between classes).
 - e. Where do you think this student interacts the most with peers?
15. Please answer the following questions regarding the behaviors of Arthur Aruffo.
 - a. Have you taught this student before?
 - b. Describe this student's behavior during academics.
 - c. Describe this student's behavior during enrichment periods.
 - d. Describe this student's behavior during free time (lunch, breaks, in between classes).
 - e. Where do you think this student interacts the most with peers?
16. Please answer the following questions regarding the behaviors of Austin Vale.
 - a. Have you taught this student before?
 - b. Describe this student's behavior during academics.
 - c. Describe this student's behavior during enrichment periods.
 - d. Describe this student's behavior during free time (lunch, breaks, in between classes).
 - e. Where do you think this student interacts the most with peers?

Appendix D: Example of Director Interview

NEP- Director Interview:

1. How long have you been running this program? What were your motivations for starting the program?
2. What is your background in education?
3. What are the overall goals of your program?
4. How would you describe the general makeup/demographics of your students-race, socioeconomic status, home location, etc.
5. What is your selection process for hiring teachers? Counselors? What traits and characteristics do you look for?
6. What is your student to teacher/counselor ratio?
7. What do you think are the most appealing aspects of your program to parents? To students?
8. How do the goals of your program relate to the students' growth? Do you often notice changes in student behavior over the course of the summer? If so, in what ways?
9. Which activities do you think students enjoy the most?
10. Which activities do you think foster the most student interaction?
11. How do you think the combination of academics and enrichment relates to social development?
12. How often do you discipline students? What is the procedure for suspending/expelling students from the program?
13. How would you compare your program run during the school year to your program run over the summer?
14. How would you compare students that participate in your program all year long to the students at are only enrolled in your summer program?
What are your program's strengths and weakness? What aspects could be improved?
15. How do you think the teachers/counselors in your program influence and impact student development?
16. Do parents play a significant role in the program? Is there community involvement?
17. What is your rationale for running your program from 8:30am-5:30pm five days a week?
18. What is your rationale for having academics for 3 days a week in July, and not for the duration of the program?
19. Do you receive any external funding (federal, state, private, etc)?
20. How often do you receive parent feedback and how do you implement feedback into your program?

Appendix E: Parent Permission Form**Parent or Legally Authorized Representative
Permission Form****STUDY TITLE: Student Development in Summer Enrichment Programs****PROTOCOL DIRECTOR:** Annie Read and Shelley Goldman**DESCRIPTION:**

Your child is invited to participate in a research study on student social development in summer enrichment programs. To measure social growth I will see where students interact, where they interact in proximity to other students, how often they talk in class, how often they interact with the teachers, and what types of activities they participate in. I will examine 1st-3rd graders in two different types of summer programs enrichment programs (a program that include both academics and recreation). With your permission, I will ask your child to sign an assent form. If he/she agrees to participate, I will simply observe him/her as he/she goes about the usual routines of the program. My research will not involve directly interacting with your child or asking him/her to perform any tasks.

RISKS AND BENEFITS:

There are no risks or benefits associated with this study. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that your child will receive any benefits from this study. Your decision whether or not to allow your child to participate in this study will not affect your child's grades or participation in school.

TIME INVOLVEMENT:

Your child's participation in this study will last for the duration of the program.

PAYMENTS:

Your child will receive no payment for his/her participation.

SUBJECT'S RIGHTS:

If you have read this form and have decided to allow your child to participate in this study, please understand your child's participation is voluntary and your child has the right to withdraw his/her consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which he/she is otherwise entitled. Your child has the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your child's individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Questions, Concerns, or Complaints: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this **research study**, its procedures, risks and benefits, you should ask the Protocol Director, Annie Read, 203 554 7254.

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the Stanford Institutional Review Board (IRB) to speak to someone independent of the research team at (650)-723-2480 or toll free at 1-866-680-2906. You can also write to the Stanford IRB, Stanford University, MC 5579, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

Signature(s) of Parent(s), Guardian or Conservator

Date

The extra copy of this consent form is for you to keep.

Protocol Approval Date: 6/25/10 Protocol Expiration Date: 06/24/11

Appendix F: Survey Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

STUDY TITLE: Student Social Development in Summer School and Summer Enrichment Programs.

Protocol Director: Annie Read and Shelley Goldman.

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on student social development in summer enrichment programs. To measure social growth I will see where students interact, where they interact in proximity to other students, how often they talk in class, how often they interact with the teachers, and what types of activities they participate in. I will examine 1st-3rd graders in two different types of summer programs, one academic program and two enrichment programs (programs that include both academics and recreation). I hope to conduct interviews and distribute surveys to see if different types of enrichment programs impact outgoingness, interactions, social development, and confidence. To contribute to the study, you will be asked to complete the attached survey.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 5 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no risks associated with this study. There are no benefits, which may be reasonable to be expected to result from this study. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from participating in the study.

PAYMENTS: You will receive a gift card for your participation.

SUBJECT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The alternative is not to participate. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Protocol Director, Annie Read (203) 554-7254.

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the Stanford Institutional Review Board (IRB) to speak to someone independent of the research team at (650)-723-2480 or toll free at 1-866-680-2906. You can also write to the Stanford IRB, Stanford University, MC 5579, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

Your child's name (printed): _____

Your name (printed): _____

Signature: _____

Protocol Approval Date: 06/25/10

Protocol Expiration Date: 06/24/11

The IRB determined that the permission of one parent is sufficient for research to be conducted under 45 CFR 46.404, in accordance with 45 CFR 46.408(b).

Appendix G: Interview Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

STUDY TITLE: Student Social Development in Summer School and Summer Enrichment Programs.

Protocol Director: Annie Read and Shelley Goldman.

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on student social development in summer enrichment programs. To measure social growth I will see where students interact, where they interact in proximity to other students, how often they talk in class, how often they interact with the teachers, and what types of activities they participate in. I will examine 1st-3rd graders in two different types of summer programs, one academic program and two enrichment programs (programs that include both academics and recreation). I hope to conduct interviews and distribute surveys to see if different types of enrichment programs impact outgoingness, interactions, social development, and confidence. In order to contribute to this study, you will be asked to answer questions and be audiotaped. After transcribing the interview, the tapes will be thrown away.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 20 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no risks associated with this study. There are no benefits, which may be reasonable to be expected to result from this study. We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from this study.

PAYMENTS: You will receive no payment for your participation.

SUBJECT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The alternative is not to participate. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Protocol Director, Annie Read (203) 554-7254.

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the Stanford Institutional Review Board (IRB) to speak to someone independent of the research team at (650)-723-2480 or toll free at 1-866-680-2906. You can also write to the Stanford IRB, Stanford University, MC 5579, Palo Alto, CA 94304.

I give consent to be audiotaped during this study.

Please initial: ___Yes ___No

Your name (printed): _____

Signature: _____

Protocol Approval Date: 06//25/10

Protocol Expiration Date: 06/24/11

Appendix H: Tables

Table 1: NEP Interaction- Combined (Teachers and AR)

INTERACTION	Before	After	+/-/=
Does this student fit in with his/her peers?	Yes-87%	Sometimes-77.7%	—
This student makes an effort to help out other children:	Sometimes-33.3%	Rarely-66.7%	—
This student volunteers to lead during group activities:	Rarely-44.4%	Rarely-75%	—
			Result: —

Table 2: NEP Discipline- Comparison (Teachers vs. AR)

DISCIPLINE QUESTION:	TEACHER	ME
1. How often is this student up of his/her seat?	Pre: "Always" (50%) Post: "Sometimes" (50%) ↓	Pre: "Always/Rarely" (50%) Post: "Always" (66.7%) ↑
2. How often do you discipline this student?	Pre: "Too often/Rarely" (33.3%) Post: "Too often" (44.4%) ↑	Pre: "Too often/Rarely" (50%) Post: "Too often" (66.7%) ↑
RESULT:	=	↑

Table 3: NEP Academic Engagement-Comparison (Teachers vs. AR)

ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT QUESTION:	TEACHER	ME
1. How often does this student complete his/her classroom assignments?	Pre: "Often" (50%) Post: "Often" (66.7%) ↑	Pre: "Often/Rarely" (50%) Post: "Rarely" (66.7%) ↓
2. How often does this student complete his/her homework?	N/A	N/A
How would you evaluate this student's learning energy?	Pre: "Low" (66.7%) Post: "Low" (83.3%) ↓	Pre: "Medium/Low" (50%) Post: "Low" (100%) ↓
RESULT:	=	↓

Table 4: BSYI Discipline-Combined (Teachers and AR)

BEHAVIOR	Before	After	+/-/=
This student is up out of his/her seat?	Rarely-44.4%	Rarely-66.7%	-
How often do you discipline this student?	Rarely-44.4%	Rarely-44.4%	=
			Result: -

Table 5: BSYI Academic Engagement-Combined (Teachers and AR)

ACADEMIC ENGAGEMENT	Before +/-/=	After	
This student completes his/her classroom assignments:	Often-55.6%	Sometimes-50%	-
This student completes his/her homework:	Often-44.4%	Often-66.7%	+
How would you evaluate the student's learning energy during classroom activities?	Medium-77.8%	Medium-55.6%	-
			Result: -