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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine the intergenerational lived schooling experiences and self-reported attitudes toward schooling among street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington, Delaware. This study was informed by Critical Race Feminism (CRF) and the Sites of Resilience Theory’s (SOR) framing of resilience and employed an explanatory sequential mixed methods design using secondary data from the Street Participatory Action Research (PAR) Health Project. A sequential approach allowed for the examination of self-reported attitudes toward schooling and lived schooling experiences in separate methodological phases. Then, the findings from each phase were combined to understand how the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women helped explain their attitudes towards schooling. There were two primary rationales for implementing a mixed methods design which included: (1) expansion and (2) social justice.

The first phase, a quantitative phase, included analyzing self-reported attitudes toward schooling mean scores across four age cohorts of street-identified Black American girls and women (N = 276). The primary measure used was the Attitudes Toward Education scale, and from which three subscales were developed and three critical items were identified using the theoretical frameworks and foundations of Street PAR. Data were analyzed by conducting a series of one-way analysis of variance tests. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in mean scores on the subscales and critical items across age cohorts.

The second phase, a qualitative phase, involved analyzing interviews with two age cohorts of street-identified Black American girls and women about their lived
schooling experiences in their own voices (N = 20). Directed content analysis was used to center principles of CRF and SOR’s framing of resilience during the coding and theme development process. Themes from the 25-34 year old age cohort included (1) Violence in School, (2) Teachers and School Officials, and (3) Home and Family Life. Themes from the 45-54 year old age cohort included (1) Violence in School, (2) Teachers and School Officials, and (3) Desegregated Schooling. The similarities and differences across age cohorts were examined to highlight differences in their schooling trajectories and to describe areas of similarity and nuances within those similarities.

There was sufficient quantitative and qualitative data for two of the subscales and two of the critical items which suggested mixed methods integration was possible. Findings for two of the subscales demonstrated that the quantitative and qualitative findings were consistent with one another indicating an intergenerational trend that street-identified Black American girls and women experienced similar types of schooling conditions and interactions with teachers for generations. Findings from one of the critical items demonstrated complementary findings suggesting that street-identified Black American girls and women were attending schools in environments for generations where they witnessed fighting in high school and where they fought to protect themselves or a family member and as a form of resilience. Furthermore, findings from another critical item suggested complementary findings in that street-identified Black American girls and women cared about their grades in high school and that the women in the 25-34 year old age cohort also expressed that they cared about and valued furthering their education.
The findings from this study have implications for future research that centers street-identified Black American girls and women in this process. Implications and recommendations related to research, practice, and policy include the need to better prepare pre-service teachers to educate and support Black girls and to create an awareness and understanding of the systems and structures that create and perpetuate inequitable conditions for Black families among human service providers. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of understanding family dynamics in schools and the impact of intergenerational schooling experiences on intergenerational wealth, mobility, health, and well-being. This study also has implications for social justice and action through partnerships in the Wilmington community to advocate for educational policies and practices to support street-identified Black American girls and women.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In low-income urban communities in the United States, Black American\(^1\) boys and girls embrace street identities through engagement in various activities in school such as participating in school violence, dropping out of school, and selling drugs (Payne, 2008; Payne & Brown, 2010, 2017). “Street life,” “the streets,” or a “street” identity is a phenomenological term that speaks to an ideological code or behavior that centers on economic, social, and personal survival (Payne, 2008, 2011). As a way to cope with poverty and blocked educational and employment opportunities, Black students in school often embrace this street identity (Rios, 2011; Wilson, 1996). These blocked opportunities are reflective of larger systemic disinvestment in low-income Black communities (Massey & Denton, 1993; Richardson et al., 2019; Vojnovic et al., 2020). Communities that have been systemically disinvested often lack access to fresh and affordable food, safe and affordable housing, and high-quality health care, and often experience high rates of violent crime (Cannuscio et al., 2013; Desmond, 2018; Friedson & Sharkey, 2015; Hodgkinson et al., 2017; Treuhaft & Karpyn, 2010). The disinvestment in these communities can also be seen in schools. Research has shown that school districts that serve predominantly students of color receive approximately

---

\(^1\) The term Black American is used here to identify American Descendants of Slavery (ADOS) and serves to recognize that Black Americans have a unique lived experience that is distinctive from other Black people (e.g., Caribbean immigrants or Black African immigrants). I will also be using terms such as Black and African American when referring to others’ work.
$23 billion less in funding than predominately white school districts, despite serving the same number of students (EdBuild, 2019; Ushomirsky & Williams, 2015). This funding disparity often leaves low-income Black students in urban communities with limited access to high-quality books, computers, and curriculum (Hudley, 2013; Rogers et al., 2010).

Research has also found that these school-based inequities occur across generations (J. D. Anderson, 1988; Fultz, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 2006, 2013; Tyack, 2004). Intergenerational studies have afforded researchers a better understanding of how educational experiences differ based on age and how their experiences have changed across generations (Butterfield, 1995; Hucks, 2014; Payne, 2008; Span & Rivers, 2012; Yull, 2014). One intergenerational study demonstrated that street-identified Black men have more negative attitudes towards their educational experiences as compared to the street-identified Black boys, and further, Black men felt blocked from traditional sources of opportunity (Payne, 2008).

Previous research has examined the intergenerational transmission of values related to and the importance of schooling among Black grandmothers, mothers, and daughters (Carothers, 1990; J. L. Daniel & Effinger, 1996; Sealey-Ruiz, 2007; Willie & Reddick, 2003). However, little is known about the intergenerational schooling attitudes and experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women. Despite Black girls being the largest growing population in juvenile justice facilities and being disproportionately affected by exclusionary discipline compared to white girls (Crenshaw et al., 2015; Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020; M. W. Morris, 2016a; Sickmund et al., 2020), Black girls are often excluded from and rendered invisible in the education literature with Black boys being the emphasis of much of the
education scholarship (Chavous & Cogburn, 2007; Cooper, 2014; Neal-Jackson, 2018; Ricks, 2014).

Given the research regarding the intergenerational schooling experiences and attitudes toward schooling of Black boys and the invisibility of Black girls in educational spaces, it is imperative to examine schooling experiences and attitudes toward schooling in relation to race, class, and gender, recognizing that Black girls and women have unique experiences compared to white girls and women and Black boys and men. A nuanced understanding of schools through a raced, classed, and gendered lens is necessary to fully engage the many dynamics influencing and shaping the lived experiences and perceptions of street-identified Black American girls and women.

In addition, previous research employed quantitative and/or qualitative research methods to understand and explore the schooling experiences of street-identified community members (e.g., T. M. Brown, 2016; Conchas & Vigil, 2010; Payne et al., 2009; Payne & Brown, 2017; Rios, 2011). While both types of methods have been used in some of the research studies, I employed a mixed methods research approach to integrate the quantitative and qualitative data, a central feature of mixed methods research (Fetters et al., 2013). This approach allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of street-identified Black American girls and women’s attitudes toward schooling and schooling experiences than could have been achieved with quantitative or qualitative methods alone or without integrating the quantitative and qualitative data. Gaining an understanding of their intergenerational attitudes and experiences serves to inform education and family research, practice, and policy.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine the self-reported attitudes toward schooling and lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington, Delaware. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design was employed using secondary data from the Street Participatory Action Research (PAR) Health Project. This type of mixed methods design is a two-phase design. The first phase involves quantitative data collection and analysis and then the second phase involves following up on specific quantitative findings with qualitative data collection and analysis (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In the first phase, a quantitative phase, of the study, survey data was used to examine the self-reported attitudes toward schooling of street-identified Black American girls and women across four age cohorts. Then, in the second phase, a qualitative phase, of the study, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were explored to develop an in-depth understanding of the lived schooling experiences of a purposeful sample of street-identified Black American girls and women and to understand differences and similarities in their schooling experiences across age cohorts.

Research Questions

The following are research questions that guided this explanatory sequential mixed methods study:

Quantitative Research Question

1. What are the group mean differences in street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling based on the Attitudes Toward Education subscales and critical items by age cohort?
Qualitative Research Questions

2. In what ways do street-identified Black American girls and women describe their lived schooling experiences?

3. In what ways are street-identified Black American girls and women’s lived schooling experiences different and similar across age cohorts?

Mixed Methods Research Question

4. In what ways do the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women explain their self-reported attitudes towards schooling?

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the literature in two ways: (1) a focus on the intergenerational schooling experiences and attitudes of street-identified Black American girls and women and (2) a focus on the process of designing a mixed methods study using secondary data.

This study makes an important contribution to the literature on street-identified Black American girls and women by providing a better understanding of their intergenerational schooling experiences and attitudes. This research explored similarities and differences that have not been examined by past researchers, and centered the racialized, gendered, and classed schooling attitudes and experiences across generations that have and continue to impact street-identified Black American girls and women in schools. Understanding their experiences has important implications for developing, funding, and implementing effective policies and practices for this population in schools and communities. Furthermore, it provides an understanding of the ways in which their lived schooling experiences converge or diverge across generations.
In addition, this study makes an important methodological contribution to the field of mixed methods research by designing a mixed methods study using secondary data. The majority of resources available for mixed methods research are oriented towards primary data collection, and in particular how to design rigorous mixed methods research studies (Fetters, 2020; Schoonenboom, 2018). In this study, many critical decisions regarding the design and data collection methods (e.g., survey questions, interview protocol, and sampling procedures) were made for me by the Street PAR Health Project team as part of the original study. Given that these research design decisions were already made, I had to consider how to approach my own research inquiry within the preexisting study design. There is limited guidance in the field of mixed methods research on how to navigate the process and how to make critical decisions when designing a mixed methods research study using secondary data (Garcia & Mayorga, 2018). While not generalizable to all mixed methods designs and contexts, this study serves as an example of how I navigated the use of secondary data within the context of the Street PAR Health Project. This study also highlights the importance of and need for developing a participant-level connection between quantitative and qualitative data. Connecting the quantitative and qualitative data could have improved the secondary analysis potential of this data set. Therefore, future mixed methods research projects should connect the quantitative and qualitative data at the participant level to enhance secondary data analyses and the potential for drawing conclusions.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The following literature review will emphasize a comprehensive structural and intersectional analysis of the schooling experiences of Black American girls and women. It is imperative to examine their experiences in terms of race, class, and gender, recognizing that Black girls and women have experiences unique to that of white girls and women and Black boys and men. In order to capture the complexity of the girls and women’s experiences, this literature review is multi-disciplinary, drawing on literature from human development, education, psychology, and sociology. A nuanced understanding of K-12 public schools and society and the intersections of race, class, and gender are necessary to fully engage the many dynamics influencing and shaping the lived experiences and perceptions of the girls and women in this study.

Schooling Context

Purpose of Schooling

K-12 public schools in their current form were designed as “hierarchical, factory model institutions where teachers, treated as semi-skilled assembly line workers, process students for their slots in society” (Darling-Hammond, 1995, p. 153). As illustrated in the quotation, schools were designed to efficiently process a large number of students and support only a select few students for more advanced schoolwork. Strategies to track and sort students by ability were developed as a way to conserve the expert teachers and curriculum and to standardize the curriculum to enable teaching to be largely routine (Lucas, 1999). This enabled less of a reliance on
teacher’s professional skills, reflecting a nineteenth-century decision to design the teaching profession as semi-skilled labor (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Labaree, 2012). As a result of this design, the majority of students are not selected for advanced schoolwork and therefore are blocked from advanced educational and employment opportunities, exacerbating educational inequities (Giersch, 2018; Lucas & Berends, 2002; Oakes, 2005).

The purpose of school was to instill in large groups of students basic workplace skills and socialization needed to conduct tasks punctually and neatly while also following orders. These types of skills taught are still dominant in schools today and are evident in the standardized curriculum and high-stakes testing as well as in the underinvestment in teacher education (Au, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 1995; Hursh, 2008; Lubienski & Brewer, 2019). This school structure and design is also very impersonal where students move from one classroom and teacher to another from grade to grade with limited opportunities to get to know their teachers and for teachers to get to know their students. Students also tend to work alone while listening to lectures, memorizing facts, and working independently at their own desk (Darling-Hammond, 1995; Labaree, 2012).

This schooling context is exacerbated in some urban areas where “schools are huge warehouses, with three thousand or more students” (Darling-Hammond, 1995, p. 154), and schools and educators are hyper focused on control of behavior and discipline (M. W. Morris, 2016a; Noguera, 2008; Rios, 2011; Skiba, 2014; Wun, 2016a, 2016b, 2018). Students are generally cycled through a series of teachers who are overloaded with work and large class sizes and a counselor who is also overloaded and not able to meet the needs of all the hundreds of students (Darling-Hammond,
1995; Gagnon & Mattingly, 2016; Labaree, 2012). These schooling conditions are especially pertinent in the lives of low-income Black and Latina/o students, who are more likely to attend schools in urban areas, and therefore less likely to get their needs met by educators.

Schooling, Inequities, and Whiteness

As described by Lea and Sims (2008), whiteness is a “complex, hegemonic, and dynamic set of mainstream socio-economic processes, and ways of thinking, feeling, believing and acting (cultural scripts) that function to obscure the power, privilege, and practices of the dominant social elite” (p. 1-2). Whiteness represents an ideology and way of being in the world that was designed to maintain racial hierarchies and systems of oppression (Bush, 2004). Whiteness is more than one’s ancestry or genetic traits. It is a racialized system of domination (C. I. Harris, 1993; Lopez, 1997). Bush (2004) noted that whiteness “reveals the ways in which Whites benefit from a variety of institutional and social arrangements that often appear (to Whites) to have nothing to do with race” (p. 15). In this white supremacist society, whites experience many privileges that are unearned, invisible, and are generally not consciously acknowledged (Jenson, 2005).

In the U.S. public education system, schooling is a function of white supremacy (i.e., a social constructed system of domination that is often covert in which whites maintain control, power, wealth, resources, and a sense of imbued superiority; Ansley, 1989; hooks, 2004) and neoliberalism (i.e., an aggressive and expansive form of capitalism that emphasizes the free market; Apple, 2001; Keisch & Scott, 2015; T. Scott, 2011). This system is designed to reproduce dominant customs and belief systems (Keisch & Scott, 2015). In this context, schooling is a process that
perpetuates and maintains the existing societal power relations as well as the
institutional structures that support those relations (Apple, 2001; Shujaa, 1994). As
stated by Stovall (2018), “...‘school’ in its current form seeks to impose the assumed
beliefs and cultural values of white, Western European, protestant, heterosexual, able-
bodied cis-gendered males as the normative standard...” (p. 52). It is this
understanding of the school context that urges further exploration of how students that
do not fit and/or adhere to said values experience and navigate these school dynamics.

The “innocent” notion of color blindness undertaken by many white educators
contributes to the maintenance of white privilege in schools. Color blindness “is a set
of understandings—buttressed by law and the courts, and reinforcing racial patterns of
white dominance—that define how people comprehend, rationalize, and act on race”
(Lopez, 2006, para. 28). This blindness to race is a privilege exclusive to white people
and allows them to deny that skin color has any consequences in society. Furthermore,
it is a mechanism to dismiss complicity in this racialized system and shuts down any
need to discuss educational inequities, continuing to perpetuate whiteness and the
“normalcy” of white supremacy in schools (Gillborn, 2019; Leonardo, 2009;
Rosenberg, 2004).

Schooling is also a function of neoliberalism. Neoliberal reforms intend to
restructure education to serve the private, for-profit sector and relegate education
outside the public control (Lipman, 2011; T. Scott, 2011). This is evidenced by the
proliferation of charter schools and school resources, such as testing, curriculum, and
teacher training that are written and provided by private companies (Keisch & Scott,
2015; Lipman, 2005). These types of reform are commodifying education, which was
historically viewed as a public good. Furthermore, the children of the white elite,
including the children of those who are dictating education reform, often attend private schools that do not resemble what is occurring inside public schools (Keisch & Scott, 2015). For example, these children have small class sizes and engage in project-based learning, and they are not subjected to high-stakes testing or the permeation of law enforcement officers in their schools.

In the United States, white people and subsequently whiteness have played a significant role in determining access to education for Black people (J. D. Anderson, 1988; Donnor, 2013; Woodson, 1933). From outlawing the education of slaves to state-authorized racial segregation of public schools during Jim Crow to the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954, white people have and continue to shape the education of Black people through the maintenance of separate and unequal public school systems (J. D. Anderson, 1988; D. A. Bell, 1980). Kozol (2005) referred to the state of U.S. education as a nation of “apartheid schooling,” the extreme racial segregation of students in public schools in the U.S. (Kozol, 2005), which continues to be relevant and persist in U.S. schools (Billingham, 2019; Logan & Burdick-Will, 2017; Reardon & Owens, 2014). This extreme racial segregation reflects the systemic racial oppression imposed upon Black students and families which continues to occur in U.S. schools evidenced by practices such as standardized tests intended to measure learning and track students based on race, gender, and class (Brunn-Bevel & Byrd, 2015; Grissom & Redding, 2016).

Teachers and Whiteness

In U.S. public schools, teachers are disproportionately white resulting in the underrepresentation of Black teachers (Hussar et al., 2020; Taie & Goldring, 2017). In the 2017-18 school year, 79% of public school teachers were white, 9% were
Hispanic, 7% were Black, 2% were Asian, 2% were two or more races, and 1% were American Indian/Alaska Native while 48% of public school students were white, 27% were Hispanic, 15% were Black, 6% were Asian/Pacific Islander, 6% were two or more races, and 1% were American Indian/Alaska Native (Hussar et al., 2020). The disproportionate number of white teachers compared to Black teachers is a direct consequence of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision in 1954.

After the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) decision, desegregation was achieved by closing Black schools and busing Black students to predominantly white schools (Epps, 2002). As a result, many Black educators were displaced either by being demoted, reassigned, or fired (Ladson-Billings, 2004; V. S. Walker, 2000). It was estimated that before 1954 approximately 82,000 Black teachers were educating two million Black students in the public schools (Hudson & Holmes, 1994; Rosenthal, 1957). According to Epps (2002), between 1954 and 1965, 38,000 Black teachers and administrators lost their jobs in 17 states in the South. After desegregation began to be implemented, some school boards and state legislatures in the South began “a movement of economic reprisal and intimidation against black educators” (Hanley, 1978, p. 90). For example, in 1956, the Alabama legislature introduced a bill that would enable school boards the right to dismiss Black educators “with or without cause, and with or without a right to appeal” (as cited in Hanley, 1978, p. 90). By the 1965-1966 school year, in the eleven states of the former Confederacy, only 1.8% of the Black teachers taught in a desegregated school (Detweiler, 1967).

Since the 1960s, the displacement and dismissal of Black teachers has continued to occur (Caref, 2018; Milner & Howard, 2004). Some of the factors that have contributed to this decline include discrimination in teacher hiring processes,
budget cuts, layoffs, and closings of schools deemed “struggling” (Caref, 2018; D’amico et al., 2017). All of these factors disproportionately impact Black and Brown teachers, as well as Black and Brown students (Aviles & Heybach, 2017). For example, in 2013, the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) closed 49 schools, which was an unprecedented number (de la Torre et. Al., 2015). Since 2001, CPS lost 5,000 Black teachers, and specifically as a result of the school closings, they lost 1,000 Black teachers (Caref, 2018). The impact of these losses was profound. In 2001, there were nine schools in Chicago without a Black teacher, but in 2018, that number increased by almost 6.5 times that to 60 schools (Caref, 2018). This is just one example of the ways that Black teachers continue to be excluded and pushed out of the education system in large urban school districts (Buras, 2013, 2016).

The disproportionate number of white teachers is concerning because a growing body of research has demonstrated that Black students’ educational achievements improved when they have a teacher of the same race (Bristol & Martin-Fernandez, 2019; Clotfelter et al., 2007; Dee, 2004, 2005; Easton-Brooks et al., 2010; Eddy & Easton-Brooks, 2011; Egalite et al., 2015; Ehrenberg et al., 1995; Lindsay & Hart, 2017; Milner, 2006; Redding, 2019; Yarnell & Bohrnstedt, 2018). For example, a study conducted in Florida using state-level testing data from grades 3 through 10 found that Black and white students who were taught by a teacher of the same race scored significantly higher on reading and math tests (Egalite et al., 2015). The study also found that lower performing Black and white students saw increases in their reading and math scores after just one year with a teacher of the same race (Egalite et al., 2015). A review conducted by Redding (2019) found that Black students who were taught by a teacher of the same race had positive educational experiences, scored
higher on standardized tests, and received more favorable ratings of their academic performance. These benefits have also been shown to impact students’ future academic performance. Gershenson and colleagues (2017) examined the long-term impacts of having a same-race teacher among Black students in grades 3-5 using longitudinal administrative data in North Carolina. They found that Black male and female students were more likely to aspire to attend a four-year college if they had at least one Black teacher in grades 3-5.

There are a few theories that attempt to explain the mechanisms by which having a teacher of the same race may impact students’ academic achievements. One theory is that students who are being educated by a teacher of the same race may be more motivated and have higher personal expectations in order to reach the expectations set by the teacher (Clewell & Villegas, 1998; Egalite & Kisida, 2018; R. F. Ferguson, 2003; J. Stewart et al., 1989). Cherng and Halpin’s (2016) study demonstrated that when Black students had Black teachers, they reported feeling more motivated and more engaged in the course material as well as having a stronger relationship with their teacher as compared to a white teacher. Furthermore, teachers of the same race might reduce what is called “stereotype threat” (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Stereotype threat occurs when students from the nondominant group experience stress about being linked to negative stereotypes related to their race or ethnicity (Steele, 1997; Steele & Aronson, 1995). This stress can result in lower academic performance (Steele & Aronson, 1995).

In addition, students might also feel more comfortable reaching out to teachers of the same race because they feel like they understand their learning needs and because they share similar cultural values and beliefs (Kozlowski, 2015). When
students feel comfortable reaching out to their teacher, this can allow teachers the
opportunity to tailor their instruction and to better support the students’ learning needs. Students also benefit from shared cultural values and beliefs because their beliefs and values can translate into improved teaching, higher student expectations, and stronger student-teacher relationships (Gay, 2000). Teachers’ perceptions of their students have demonstrated to be related to a range of opportunities including assignment to higher ability groups and grade promotion (Ready & Wright, 2011). There is also a greater probability that the students will receive more favorable ratings of their classroom behavior and more positive behavioral outcomes (Redding, 2019).

While the benefits of having teachers of the same race have been documented, this is rarely the experience of Black students because of the disproportionate number of white teachers (Hussar et al., 2020). When students are not taught by a teacher of the same race, this represents a racial mismatch which can lead to negative impacts on students. One of the ways that this racial mismatch can negatively impact students is through lower academic expectations. Research has also shown that white teachers have lower expectations for their low-income students of color (Boser et al., 2014; Gershenson et al., 2016). For example, Gershenson and colleagues (2016) found that non-Black teachers had lower expectations for Black students than did Black teachers. When compared to Black teachers, non-Black teachers were significantly less likely to expect Black students, male and female, to complete a four-year college degree. In addition to being impacted by the disproportionate number of white teachers, students are also impacted by the white(ness) norms embedded in public school curriculum.
Curriculum, Teaching, and Whiteness

As noted by Sleeter (2010), “traditional school curricula teach the values, beliefs, and knowledge systems that support colonization” (p. 194). This Eurocentric education model depicts white people as the central figures in U.S. history and primary contributors to knowledge (DeGury, 2005; Gillborn, 2005; J. E. King et al., 2013). Specifically, “the typical curriculum is tied up in the production, valuation, and distribution of structural, or scientific, knowledge in ways that privilege whiteness” (R. L. Allen, 2004, p. 131). Eurocentric education miseducates Black students by purposefully omitting the contributions of Black people to history, rendering Black people invisible (Du Bois, 1903; Griffin & James, 2018; Hopson et al., 2010; L. J. King, 2014; Shockley & Frederick, 2010).

A number of practices have been developed that seek to affirm the experiences of Black students in the classroom such as culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 2006, 2014), culturally responsive teaching (Gay, 1975, 1980, 2000, 2002, 2010, 2013), and culturally sustaining pedagogies (Alim & Paris, 2017; Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2014). Two of the earlier practices, CRP and culturally responsive teaching, will be discussed below. The first is CRP, which focuses on teacher paradigm and posture (Ladson-Billings, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, 2006, 2014), and the second is culturally responsive teaching, which focuses on teacher practices (Gay, 1975, 1980, 2000, 2002, 2010, 2013). A common thread through CRP and culturally responsive teaching is the acknowledgement that classrooms are sites for social change (B. Aronson & Laughter, 2016). Previous research has shown that teachers and their teaching practices can be the most powerful predictor of student success (Barton, 2003; Gay, 2010; Howard, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2009).
Despite these best practices and positive impacts on Black students (Byrd, 2016; Martell, 2013), CRP and culturally responsive teaching are often not implemented by white teachers and in turn can continue harming Black students (L. A. Bell, 2002; Hayes & Juárez, 2012; Hyland, 2005). For example, Hyland (2005) conducted an ethnographic study over the course of 3 years about the roles adopted by four white teachers in a predominantly Black neighborhood school. This research was conducted both before and after the teachers participated in an anti-racist teaching seminar with their colleagues. Hyland found that while the students all identified these four white teachers as good teachers, they all fell short in implementing and embodying culturally responsive teaching.

Hyland analyzed the ways in which these teachers perpetuated and operated to support a racist status quo while also understanding the ways these teachers believed they were working against racism. One of the teachers self-identified as a “helper.” She described how “helpful” she was to her students by giving them food and clothes while also just describing how she fills a void in their lives by showing them that someone cares about them and by giving them the attention they deserve. Her self-identified role perpetuated a racist status quo by her implied sense of superiority above her students and their families and by how she viewed them as being quite needy and overall incapable. Her beliefs that students and families were unable to take care of themselves is in direct opposition to one of the central themes of culturally relevant teaching, respecting and valuing the students and their home communities (Gay, 2000). Furthermore, this teacher also believed that “she didn’t see color” (i.e., color blindness; Hyland, 2005, p. 441) and viewed testing and special education referrals as race neutral. Her color-blind beliefs or lack of understanding about race do not align...
with those who are culturally responsive and recognize institutional racism as central to their students’ lives and work to fight against racial injustices (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Furthermore, Matias and Zembylas (2014) argued that white teachers display and perform racialized emotions such as care, empathy, and love that are viewed as socially acceptable and politically correct. However, these emotions are not backed up by their actions and are better understood as forms of hidden disgust for students of color. Recognizing the manner in which teachers consciously or unconsciously perpetuate racial stereotypes, bias, and inequities is necessary to inform our understanding of the schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women.

**Structural Violence and Urban Environments**

Black girls and women in urban environments are often harmed by structural violence (Hitchens, 2020; Hitchens et al., 2022; Hitchens & Payne, 2017, forthcoming; Osler, 2006; Wun, 2018). Structural violence is a framework that was developed by Galtung (1969, 1971) and is used to describe how structural institutions and systems create policies, laws, and other forms of regulation that prevent individuals, families, and communities from meeting their basic needs (Galtung, 1969, 1971). This form of violence is largely invisible and unrecognizable, and it operates through cultural, economic, and political means that work together to marginalize groups of people (Gilligan, 1996). Structural violence has significantly impacted Black people who disproportionately suffer from poverty and blocked opportunity (i.e., limited access to educational and occupational opportunities; Cernkovich, 1978; Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979; Gilligan, 1996; Farmer, 2005). Research has demonstrated a strong link between urban areas, poverty, and race. In 2016, 15% of all
children in U.S. public schools under the age of 18 were living in poverty. Twenty-four percent of Black students were living in poverty, significantly above the national average (de Brey et al., 2019). Furthermore, of all public school students, Black students represented approximately 15% and therefore are disproportionately living in poverty (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2020). Research has shown that Black students are more likely to attend high poverty schools in urban areas (Saporito & Sohoni, 2007). A national-level study conducted by Logan and Burdick-Will (2017) found that 63% of students in urban area schools were eligible for free and reduced lunch.

One of the ways that structural violence manifests itself in urban environments is through inequitable access to educational resources. For example, a 2019 report by EdBuild showed that students in urban districts received on average $2,100 less per student than suburban students and $4,000 less per student than rural students. Within urban areas, districts that serve predominantly students of color receive $1,321 less per student than districts that serve predominantly white students (EdBuild, 2019). This lack of funding leaves these students with limited access to high-quality books, computers, and curriculum (Hudley, 2013; Rogers et al., 2010). These education funding disparities have and continue to disproportionately affect Black students.

Research about teacher quality has documented the inequitable distribution of teachers based on achievement, racial, and socioeconomic student-level indicators (Adamson & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Goldhaber et al., 2015; Kalogrides et al., 2013). For example, Goldhaber and colleagues (2015) found an inequitable distribution of teachers on virtually every measure of teacher quality (i.e., experience, licensure exam score, and value-added estimates of effectiveness) with Black students.
who are eligible for free and reduced lunch (a proxy for income) and living in urban areas are more likely to be exposed to the lowest quality teachers.

In addition, these urban area schools have lower test scores compared to suburban and rural area schools (Logan & Burdick-Will, 2017). These measures of poverty and test performance favor white students who are more likely to attend suburban schools while Black, Hispanic, and Asian students are much more likely to attend urban schools (Logan & Burdick-Will, 2017). Ladson-Billings (2006) argues that instead of focusing on the “achievement gap” in the United States, we should be focusing on the “education debt” that this nation owes to students of color and especially those living in poverty. She argues that instead of trying to understand why students of color do not have the same achievement rates as their white peers, we should be examining the historical, sociopolitical, moral, and economic debts that have contributed to students of colors’ inequitable access to education.

Similar to the achievement debt that Ladson-Billings (2006) identified, Welton and Martinez (2014) identified a “college readiness debt” among students of color in a large urban school district that the authors interviewed. The college readiness debt is related to inequities and structural challenges students face related to accessing higher education. Students indicated that enrolling in Advanced Placement (AP) and dual enrollment courses as well as opportunities at school increased college-readiness opportunities for only select students. Furthermore, research has shown that urban school districts often offer less college-preparatory opportunities (Anyon, 2014; Nowicki, 2018a). For example, many urban schools offer limited college counseling opportunities, and some students attending these schools often experience barriers to equitable access to advanced courses and have reported not feeling prepared for
Having provided the context of schooling—including of the purpose and function of schools, teacher demographics, teacher incongruence, and the manner in which schools enact structural violence—I now focus on a group of students often ignored, street-identified Black women and girls. It is also necessary to understand that while the literature reviewed above focused on Black students, it does not fully account for the experiences of street-identified Black students, a specific sub-group, and in this case street-identified Black American girls and women.

**Black Girls and Women in Education**

**Historical Perspectives of Black Girls and Women in Education**

Black women have long understood the importance and liberative power of education, which was (and still is) threatening for many white people (Ricks, 2014). Therefore as J. D. Anderson (1988) noted, “between 1800 and 1835, most of the southern states enacted legislation making it a crime to teach enslaved children to read or write” (p. 2). Learning how to read and write was a way to challenge the controlling and oppressive nature of slavery, and for many enslaved Black women, it was a way to hold on to a piece of their human dignity (Lerner, 1973; Ricks, 2014). Enslaved Black women taught others what they learned by organizing informal educational gatherings while others organized schools and taught other slaves during the night (Lerner, 1973). They risked at best incarceration and other punishments and at worse, death, to become educated and to educate others because they understood that education was a human right and was the foundation of opportunity (Lerner, 1973; Ricks, 2014).
Marginal and Invisible Status of Black Girls and Women in Education Scholarship

While there is a body of academic literature about these historical accounts related to Black girls and women’s education, there is a gap in research related to their more recent educational experiences. Black girls and women occupy a paradoxical position in the education literature. Chavous and Cogburn (2007) argued that Black girls and women in school spaces are often rendered “superinvisible” such that their gendered, racialized, and classed experiences are often excluded from the education literature and when Black girls are included it is generally in relation to Black boys.

In order to understand the extent to which Black girls and women in urban schools are rendered invisible in the education literature, Young (2020) conducted a quantitative content analysis of studies that were published between 2000 and 2015 in 30 high-impact journals. The author only identified 39 empirical studies that examined Black girls and women’s experiences in K-12 urban education. These studies represented less than 1% of the literature in the analysis. Results indicated that there were five times as many studies published about Black boys and men than about Black girls and women. The state of scholarship on Black girls and women in urban schools reflects their invisible and marginalized status in the U.S. (P. H. Collins, 1990; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; Reid & Comas-Diaz, 1990; Remedios & Snyder, 2018; Sesko & Biernat, 2010; Shorter-Gooden & Washington, 1996).

In the education literature, much of the emphasis has been on Black boys and men and their experiences in school and within society (e.g., Carey, 2020; Cunningham, 1999; J. E. Davis, 2003; Howard, 2013; Swanson et al., 2003; Wint et al., 2022). The education scholarship has focused on how schools often trap Black boys in the school-to-prison pipeline, adultify them at a young age, and continue to not meet their academic, social, and personal needs (Carey, 2019a; Dancy, 2014; J. E.
When Black girls and women are visible in the education scholarship, one way that they have been viewed has been in relation to Black boys and men in school (Chavous & Cogburn, 2007; V. G. Thomas & Jackson, 2007). Research in the past few decades has paid particular attention to the differences between Black men and women in their educational attainment, referred to as the “gender gap” (Garibaldi, 2014; McDaniel et al., 2011). Table 1 shows the educational attainment rates of Black men and Black women by year, from the earliest to the most current data available regarding these trends. The overall trend is that the educational attainment rates for both Black men and Black women have increased. However, these differences in educational attainment rates illustrates how Black women have much higher educational attainment rates compared to Black men. For example, in 2018, Black women made up 7.6% of the total U.S. population while Black men made up 6.7% of the total U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). This indicated that for most postsecondary degrees (i.e., associate’s and master’s) Black women’s attainment rates were higher than their percentage of the total population, and that for all postsecondary degrees, Black men’s attainment rates were lower than their percentage of the total population.
Table 1  Educational Attainment Percentage Rates by Year and Degree for Black Women and Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Associate’s Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Men</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Men</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data generated from U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2019d.

In addition to educational degree attainment in comparison to the total population, when examining the conferral rates of only Black men and Black women, Black women accounted for 66.7% of associate’s degrees, 63.9% of bachelor’s degrees, 69.8% of master’s degrees, and 65.2% of doctoral degrees among all Black graduates (U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2019d). This increased attention has focused on these gender disparities and in particular on how and why Black men fare worse than Black women (Frazier-Kouassi, 2002).

The emphasis in the literature on Black boys and men’s educational experiences and on the “gender gap” has led to a gap in funding for educational-related programs. Building off of Ladson-Billings’s (2006) concept of an “education debt” and Welton and Martinez’s (2014) “college readiness debt,” I argue that there is a “gender debt” that has contributed to Black girls and women’s inequitable access to education. For example, in 2014, former President Barack Obama launched his
initiative, My Brother’s Keeper, which provided more than $200 million philanthropic dollars over a 5-year period to programs that would support and mentor boys and young men of color. This initiative has been lauded as contributing to academic success as well as increased opportunities for Black boys and men. However, Black girls and women have not received comparable support (Lane-Steele, 2020; Sebastien, 2022). It was estimated that from 2004-2014 less than $1 million philanthropic dollars were spent to specifically support the educational success and opportunities of Black girls and women (Cooper, 2014).

Although Black women have made substantial progress in terms of degree attainment and have higher degree attainment rates compared to Black boys and men, these narratives of “young Black women’s school ‘success’ cannot continue to divert attention away from their needs and challenges” (Neal-Jackson, 2018, p. 509). Recent research about Black girls and women has shown a different narrative when examining Black girls and women’s experiences in school and when comparing their experiences to their white female peers. For example, research has shown that Black girls and women are disproportionately excluded from school (Lehmann & Meldrum, 2021; E. W. Morris & Perry, 2017; Paul & Araneo, 2019) and have lower educational attainment rates when compared to their white female peers (Ryan & Bauman, 2016). Table 2 shows the educational attainment rates of Black women and white women. As previously mentioned, in 2018, Black women made up 7.6% of the total U.S. population while white women made up 30.7% of the total U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2020). This indicated that for most postsecondary degrees (i.e., associate’s and master’s) Black women’s attainment rates were higher than their
percentage of the total population, and that for all postsecondary degrees, white women’s attainment rates were higher than their percentage of the total population.

Table 2  Educational Attainment Percentage Rates by Year and Degree for Black Women and White Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Associate’s Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Master’s Degree</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Women</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Women</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data generated from U.S. Department of Education, NCES, 2019a, 2019b, 2019c, 2019d.

The disparities between Black women’s and white women’s educational attainment warrants further exploration in terms of understanding Black girls and women’s schooling experiences. While this was not a comparative study, this research should be understood within the larger context of educational opportunity and attainment for Black girls and women.

**Black Girls and Exclusionary Discipline**

Exclusionary discipline that removes or excludes students from classrooms and schools has been the dominant policy orientation for years before and after the 1999 Columbine shooting (Addington, 2019). The first widely used form of exclusionary
discipline in the schools was zero-tolerance policies. Zero-tolerance policies are forms of school discipline that include mandatory removal of students from school (Losen & Skiba, 2010). Common forms of exclusionary discipline actions under zero-tolerance policies are referrals, out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, and arrests (Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020). Zero-tolerance policies were originally implemented in schools as a result of the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 (Addington, 2019). Passed by Congress and signed into law during the Clinton Administration, the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 was aimed at addressing a widely held belief that violence was overwhelming schools (Muschert & Peguero, 2010; Skiba, 2014). In the 1980s and 1990s there was concern for children in schools due to gun-related violence that was associated with the crack cocaine epidemic (Rich- Shea & Fox, 2014). The Guns-Free School Act of 1994 required schools to expel students for possession of a firearm at school (Rich- Shea & Fox, 2014). Schools expanded on this requirement to include mandatory expulsion and suspension for serious violence or possession of drugs or alcohol (Curran, 2019; Hirschfield, 2008). The core belief of zero-tolerance policies is that students will be deterred from engaging in potentially disruptive behaviors if the enforcement is strong and the consequences are severe (Skiba, 2014). By addressing these behaviors through removal, school districts believed that they were sending a strong message to all students that these behaviors would not be tolerated (Skiba, 2014).

Following the Columbine shooting in 1999, there was a dramatic increase in the implementation and an expansion of zero-tolerance policies in schools nationwide (Addington, 2019; Howard, 2016; Skiba, 2014). In addition, schools broadened their reliance on exclusionary discipline to address behavioral issues, nonviolent offenses,
and attendance policy violations (Advancement Project, 2010; Curran, 2019). For example, one study focusing on an urban school district found that 44% of suspended students were suspended for “disruptive behavior” and 22% of suspended students were suspended for truancy (as referenced in Addington, 2019). While these forms of exclusionary discipline are not considered mandatory like zero-tolerance policies, schools nationwide overly rely on these types of discipline in an effort to deter students from violating a broad range of school policies (Kupchik & Catlaw, 2014; Losen & Skiba, 2010). In the United States, exclusionary discipline in the form of suspensions has increased by 10% from 2000 to 2015 (Nelson & Lind, 2015). The Advancement Project (2010) found that suspensions increased 117% in Pennsylvania between 1999 and 2007. In addition to suspensions, expulsions in Pennsylvania increased by 30% in the same time period (Advancement Project, 2010).

In addition to an overreliance on exclusionary discipline after the Columbine school shooting, there was also an increased usage of security personnel in schools (Addington, 2009; Robers et al., 2015). While the Columbine school shooting increased the presence of security personnel, security personnel in schools can be traced back to the 1970s in urban high schools (Addington, 2009). Security personnel can be regular police officers, private guards, and school resource officers (SROs), which are specially trained law enforcement personnel (Addington, 2019). Prior to Columbine, federal legislation was enacted that employed police in schools (Mallett, 2016), and post Columbine, this increased reliance on security personnel was present in many more schools and grade levels throughout the United States with the greatest increase in primary schools (Addington, 2014; Musu-Gillette et al., 2018). One reason for this increased reliance on security personnel can be attributed to federal funds
promoting the use of SROs and in particular funding for SRO programs. These SRO programs received funding through policy initiatives as well as millions of dollars from the U.S. Department of Justice in Community Oriented Policing Services grants (P. Finn et al., 2005).

Although the Columbine shooting and most mass school shootings have been overwhelmingly carried out by white male students (Hobbs, 2018) in rural and suburban schools, Black girls in urban schools have been disproportionately affected by zero-tolerance policies (Addington, 2019; Crenshaw et al., 2015). The racialized and gendered outcomes from schools using zero-tolerance policies have been well documented (e.g., Crenshaw et al., 2015; Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020; Wallace et al., 2008). School discipline research has demonstrated that schools with predominantly students of color are more likely to rely on surveillance measures (i.e., law enforcement personnel and SROs) than schools serving predominantly white students (Nance, 2017), and students of color are more likely to be disciplined in school through removal methods (i.e., referrals, suspensions, and expulsions) and are more likely to be policed and arrested than their white peers (Losen & Gillespie, 2012; Losen & Skiba, 2010; Nocella et al., 2014; Skiba, 2015; Wallace et al., 2008). Research examining school discipline has primarily focused on Black boys who are subjected to these forms of discipline (e.g., Monroe, 2005; Noguera, 2008; Nowicki, 2018b; Wesley & Ellis, 2017).

While understanding Black boys’ experiences is important, by placing them at the forefront of this research, Black girls are often overlooked and/or excluded and an incomplete picture of school discipline is formed. In response to this exclusion, over the past decade, there has been particular attention on Black girls and their experience...
with forms of school discipline which has found there to be an overrepresentation of Black girls in school discipline data when compared to their same-gendered peers (Blake et al., 2011; Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020; Losen & Skiba, 2010; Nocella et al., 2014; Raffaele Mendez & Knoff, 2003). According to the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (2018), in the 2015-2016 school year, Black girls accounted for approximately 8% of all enrolled K-12 students. However, they accounted for approximately 14% of the students who received an out-of-school suspension and approximately 10% of the students who received expulsion. While white girls accounted for approximately 24% of all enrolled K-12 students, they only accounted for 8% of students who received an out-of-school suspension and approximately 10% of students who received expulsions.

Gibson and colleagues (2019) conducted a mixed methods study to explore the experiences of Black girls with out-of-school suspension. First, the authors conducted in-depth interviews with 10 Black girls in middle school who had been suspended from school. During the interviews, the girls described being disciplined more harshly than their white peers for the same behavior. Second, the authors examined quantitative state-level administrative data which found that Black girls were in fact disciplined more harshly than their white peers for the same behavior. In another study, T. M. Scott and colleagues (2019) collected observational data using systematic observation tools to examine student teacher relationships among 41 Black and White student-teacher dyads in elementary school and 41 in high school. While observing the dyads, they coded for the positive and negative feedback from the teacher to the student and coded for the percentage of time the student was off task and the number of disruptions to the classroom and/or teacher. The results demonstrated that
regardless of the behavior, Black students received more negative feedback from their teachers.

Even though zero-tolerance policies were designed to discipline students for violent offenses inside schools, researchers have found that Black girls are being disproportionately disciplined for a range of subjective, non-violent behaviors (Blake et al., 2011; E. W. Morris & Perry, 2017; Wun, 2016a, 2016b). E. W. Morris and Perry (2017) found that Black girls, as compared to white girls, were disciplined for more ambiguous and less serious offenses, such as aggressive behavior, disobedience, disruptive behavior, and dress code violations. It should be noted that research on Black boys shows similar discipline experiences (e.g., Monroe, 2005; Noguera, 2008; Nowicki, 2018b; Wesley & Ellis, 2017). This work is not intended to in any way negate or diminish Black boys’ experiences. However, given the limited research on Black girls’ experiences, this work seeks to focus on this population and complement the research conducted with Black boys.

Connie Wun’s research has been instrumental in advancing our understanding of Black girls’ school experiences with exclusion and the ways in which Black girls are positioned as “perpetually guilty.” Black girls being perceived as non-innocent stems from the notion that the Black juvenile is not considered childlike and is therefore scripted out of the protections and privileges associated with childhood (Bernstein, 2011; Carey, 2019a; Dumas & Nelson, 2016; A. A. Ferguson, 2000), making the idea of Black innocence a “structurally impossibility” (Wun, 2016b, p. 8). Wun (2016a) conducted a case study at a suburban high school where she conducted in-depth interviews with five Black girls who had experiences with school discipline and observed the girls in their classrooms. The girls described how they were
subjected to “constant surveillance” and were “perpetually disciplined.” They were disciplined for “disobedience,” “talking back,” and “defiance,” such as being disrespectful or having attitudes towards staff and teachers.

Wun (2016b) highlighted the anti-Black racism and anti-Black discipline in schools. Anti-Blackness “interrogates the psychic and material assault on Black flesh” (Dumas, 2016, p. 12) that seeks to deny Black humanity, to fuel surveillance, and to position Black people as a “problem.” Wun (2016b) showed how Black girls experience “unaccounted forms of policing and surveillance” (p. 744) that are not reflected in school discipline data. The Black girls made important distinctions between school discipline and informal punitive practices that directly affected them physically, emotionally, psychologically, and academically. They shared stories about being punished for “looking like they were talking,” “getting up to throw paper away,” “laughing,” “talking,” and “chewing gum.” They reported being sent out of the class for these behaviors and sometimes excluded for the entire class period. While the girls were not referred, suspended, expelled, or arrested for these behaviors, they were still negatively impacted. Wun’s (2016b) case study highlights the importance of understanding how the punishment of Black girls, in addition to more traditional forms of discipline, must be considered when examining the experiences of Black girls and exclusionary practices.

There are several possible explanations for why Black girls are disproportionately targeted for exclusionary discipline compared to white girls. In the past, researchers have focused on factors such as race, teacher inexperience, and lack of cultural understanding to explain this disproportionality (Skiba, 2015). More recent research has emphasized the importance of examining gender and incorporating an
intersectional perspective to understand Black girl’s experiences (Blake et al., 2011; Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020; E. W. Morris & Perry, 2017). By examining gender and incorporating an intersectional perspective, Addington (2019) identified three potential explanations for why Black girls are disproportionately affected by exclusionary discipline that are explored in the following three sections.

**Black Girls, Identity, Femininity, and Whiteness**

The first potential explanation for why Black girls are disproportionately targeted for exclusionary discipline compared to white girls centers around normative constructs of femininity, implicit bias, and subjective offenses. In the United States, normative constructs of femininity have been and are still associated with white girls and women. According to Deliovsky (2008), femininity was “founded on European imperialism and colonialism, [and] normative femininity is never signified outside a process of racial domination and negation” (p. 52). These traditional standards are based on white middle class culture that imply girls must be passive, modest, silent, and selfless as well as considered worth protecting (P. H. Collins, 2004; Deliovsky, 2008). These standards require girls to ignore their own emotions and not voice their opinions so that they can be viewed as nice, agreeable, and respectable (L. M. Brown & Gilligan, 1993). Deliovsky (2008) discusses the ways in which white women represent the “Benchmark woman” meaning “a hegemonic ideology and social location that define dominant and subordinated femininities” (p. 49). In other words, society deems white women aesthetic as the standard for femininity.

While white girls and women are encouraged to aspire to meet these traditional feminine standards, Black girls and women are subjected to a set of socially constructed stereotypes and controlling images. Many of these stereotypes and images
of Black girls and women date back to the slavery era (P. H. Collins, 1990). P. H. Collins (1990) stated that these “controlling images are designed to make racism, sexism, and poverty appear to be natural, normal, and an inevitable part of everyday life” (p. 68). Further, intersectionality describes how forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, and classism simultaneously interlock and intersect to affect the lived experiences of marginalized individuals (P. H. Collins, 2009, 2015; P. H. Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1991). This marginalization coupled with controlling images of Black girls and women work to maintain the interlocking systems of race, class, and gender oppression (P. H. Collins, 1990; Mullings, 1994).

Some examples of these dominant images of Black females are: (1) “Jezebel,” a sexually aggressive and seductive woman; (2) “Mammy,” an obedient and faithful domestic servant who is viewed as asexual; (3) “Matriarch,” (similar characteristics as “Sapphire”) an angry, loud, aggressive, and unfeminine single mother; (4) “Welfare Recipient/Queen,” a fertile, single mother with many children who lives off the government; and (5) “The Criminal” as assumed criminality that structures all of the other controlling images (Austin, 1989; P. H. Collins, 1990, 2000, 2004; Friedman & Hitchens, 2021; Mullings, 1994). P. H. Collins (2004) stated that “Black women, by definition, cannot achieve the idealized feminine ideal because the fact of Blackness excludes them” (p. 199). These narrow-scripted images of Black women end up being inscribed onto Black girl bodies as they are subjected to adultification that effectively erases their girlhood and status as children who are worthy of protection (R. N. Brown, 2013; Sharpe, 2016; A. L. Smith, 2019), and they continue to relegate Black women and girls to subjective positions in society, negatively shaping how society perceives and treats them.
Educators may subconsciously (or consciously) be affected by the stereotypical ways that Black females are portrayed (P. H. Collins, 2004). The images and stereotypes can underlie teacher’s implicit biases and affect their perceptions of Black girls. Implicit bias refers to schemas that can alter and distort perceptions of an outgroup member (Dovidio et al., 2002). These schemas arise without a person being consciously aware of them and can be in direct opposition to one’s stated beliefs and intentions (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006). Although implicit bias is discussed most frequently in the context of race, implicit bias intersects with race, gender, and class as well as other social identities (E. W. Morris & Perry, 2017).

Black girls are often viewed negatively by their white teachers for not meeting these traditional standards of white femininity (Blake et al., 2011). E. W. Morris (2007) discovered that the most common description and criticism of Black girls by white teachers is that they were “too loud” (p. 505). These teachers also talked about the Black girls having an attitude or being aggressive and confrontational in their classroom. These types of behaviors were interpreted by the teachers as the Black girls not behaving “like a lady.” They discussed disciplining Black girls for what was perceived as loudness and aggressiveness in an effort to curb these behaviors with the intention of molding them into being “ladies,” i.e., being quieter and more passive, both qualities of “traditional” white femininity.

Although many white teachers expect Black girls to meet these standards of white femininity, that is not Black girls’ expectations for themselves and how they express femininity. Instead of conforming to traditional white femininity, Black girls are independent, assertive, and emotionally resilient. They freely express their thoughts and emotions, all of which are contributing factors to their elevated
achievement (Blake et al., 2011; Evans-Winters, 2011; E. W. Morris, 2007; A. J. Thomas & King, 2007). While at school, they strive to be respected and heard and view school as a “site of resistance” (Murphy et al., 2013, p. 586) towards assimilation (Murphy et al., 2013; Stovall, 2018).

While conducting interviews with Black and mixed-race girls in a middle school that had majority Black students and over half of the students qualified for free or reduced lunch, Murphy and colleagues (2013) found that all of the Black girls who participated in the study had been suspended at least twice. When they were asked to share their educational experiences for each year they had attended the school, the researchers found that the Black girls rejected the notion that they should embody and uphold traditional views of femininity, which is consistent with other research (E. W. Morris, 2007; Waldron, 2010). In addition, the Black girls rejected pressures to conform by asserting their interests and voices (Murphy et al., 2013). According to M. W. Morris (2016a) “[f]or Black girls to be ‘loud’ is a demand to be heard. To have an ‘attitude’ is to reject a doctrine of invisibility and mistreatment” (p. 19). Teachers and others tend to view Black girl resistance as problematic rather than as an assertion of their identity and humanity.

Exacerbating the push to conform with traditional white femininity is an example of the adultification of Black girls (A. A. Ferguson, 2000). According to Epstein and colleagues (2017), one form of adultification is “a social or cultural stereotype that is based on how adults perceive children in the absence of knowledge of children’s behavior and verbalizations” (p. 4). Epstein and colleagues’ (2017) groundbreaking study examined the ways that race and gender, interlocking systems of oppression, influence adults’ perceptions of Black girlhood in the education system.
They found that Black girls were subjected to adultification. Educators and resource officers viewed Black girls ages 5 to 15 years old as behaving and seeming older, more independent, and more knowledgeable about adult topics (e.g., sex) than their white peers of the same age. They were also viewed as needing less nurturing, protection, support, and comforting.

**Black Girls, Fighting, and Victimization**

The second potential explanation for why Black girls are disproportionately targeted for exclusionary discipline compared to white girls centers on race, gender, and class and why Black girls may fight. According to Blake and colleagues (2015), fighting was one of the less subjective offenses for which Black girls were suspended at higher rates than their white female peers. Researchers have identified trauma and the impacts of structural inequities in their neighborhoods and communities as a potential underlying cause for this behavior (Castro & Landry, 2005; Miller, 2008; M. W. Morris, 2016b) while others have also argued that Black girls use fighting as means of survival and protection (L. M. Brown, 2003; Jones, 2009) as Black girls are more likely to experience and be exposed to physical and sexual violence in their daily lives (M. W. Morris, 2016b; Smith-Evans et al., 2014). Their behavior in school might be interpreted as being combative or aggressive but may instead be a way of coping (Crenshaw et al., 2015; Smith-Evans et al., 2014). Then, many of these girls are punished by teachers and school officials rather than being referred to school counselors (M. W. Morris, 2016b).

Black girls who are attending schools with predominantly students of color are more likely to have security staff in their school than mental health professionals and therefore less likely to receive the support they need compared to students in
predominantly white schools (Harper & Temkin, 2018; Smith-Evans et al., 2014). Furthermore, responding with punishment may further victimize and amplify their trauma (Nicholson-Bester, 2020; Smith-Evans et al., 2014). M. W. Morris (2016b) emphasizes that we should respond to girls who fight as victims, rather than as offenders, recognizing the need to provide them with the appropriate support, care, and services they deserve.

Black Girls and Cultural Expression

The third potential explanation for why Black girls are disproportionately targeted for exclusionary discipline compared to white girls focuses on the rules and policies themselves, such as rules and regulations regarding dress code, school uniforms, and hair styling (M. W. Morris, 2016a; Smith-Evans et al., 2014). Although many dress codes are written in race-neutral language and were enacted to promote uniform student presentation, in practice, these policies target Black girls’ cultural expression specifically by banning styles worn by Black girls and women such as hair wraps (M. W. Morris, 2016b; National Women’s Law Center, 2018). By dispossessing Black girls, as well as Black boys, of this cultural expression, schools are asserting anti-Black violence on their bodies (Carey, 2019a; Evans-Winters & Girls for Gender Equity, 2017).

Furthermore, these policies “reinforce internalized oppression about the quality of natural hairstyles on people of African descent” (M. W. Morris, 2016b, p. 92). For example, a 7-year-old Black girl, Tiana Parker, from Tulsa, OK was sent home from school because she had dreadlocks and her school dress code policy stated that “hairstyles such as dreadlocks, afros, mohawks, and other faddish styles are unacceptable” (as cited in Persch, 2013). In response, Tiana’s father requested
leniency from the school regarding this policy. He said that Tiana asked for the dreadlocks and that he always taught his children to be who they want to be. When the school indicated they would not be lenient about this policy, instead of getting rid of her dreadlocks, Tiana switched to another school that does not have this racialized and gendered dress code policy (Persch, 2013). Similar to Tiana and her parents, Black girls and their families are also resisting these forms of anti-Black violence in school and advocating for changes to dress code policies that target Black girls and boys (Gandhi, 2021; Schmidt, 2019). In these contexts, schools are systems of exclusion where rather than educating and supporting positive identity development, they usher low-income Black girls and women from school hallways into the juvenile and criminal justice systems.

Pushout and Criminalizing Black Girls

As a result of exclusionary discipline and the growing influence and placement of law enforcement in U.S. public schools, low-income students and students of color are disproportionately being pushed out of school (Black Girls Equity Alliance, 2020; T. M. Brown, 2007; Crenshaw et al., 2015; Mireles-Rios et al., 2020; M. W. Morris, 2016a). According to M. W. Morris (2016a), pushout is defined as a “collection of policies, practices, and consciousness that fosters their invisibility, marginalizes [Black girls] pain and opportunities, and facilitates their criminalization” (p. 24). Focus group research in New York City and Boston found that zero-tolerance policies created an environment that emphasized discipline over education. As a result, instead of being referred to counseling, conflict resolution, or in-school suspension, Black girls and young women were referred to the juvenile justice system (Crenshaw et al., 2015). Pushing Black girls out of school can negatively impact them across their
lifespan. It can impact their future employment opportunities and lifetime earnings, and it can increase their likelihood of engaging in street life activities as well as their likelihood of incarceration (National Women’s Law Center, 2007).

The relationship between schools and the juvenile and criminal justice systems is referred to as the school-to-prison pipeline. According to Archer (2009), the school-to-prison pipeline is “the collection of education and public safety policies and practices that push our nation’s school children out of the classroom and into the streets, the juvenile justice system, or the criminal justice system” (p. 868). The school-to-prison pipeline has three main pathways that usher students to the juvenile and criminal justice systems (Heitzeg, 2009). The first pathway and the most direct pathway is through school-related arrests and referrals as a result of school discipline. The second pathway is through suspensions, expulsions, and referrals to alternative schools. The third pathway is through a hostile learning environment inside the school and classroom (Heitzeg, 2009).

Similar to research that focuses on school discipline, the school-to-prison pipeline literature has focused primarily on Black boys (Q. Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Dancy, 2014; Grace & Nelson, 2019; Tuzzolo & Hewitt, 2006). However, there has been a growing interest in examining the school-to-prison pipeline experiences of Black girls and women and in particular how they are uniquely impacted based on race, class, and gender (Crenshaw et al., 2015; Hill, 2018; M. W. Morris, 2012, 2016a). Through this examination, researchers have found that there are disproportionate rates at which Black girls are arrested and referred to the juvenile justice system as well as rates at which they leave high school compared to white girls. For example, according to a report by the Black Girls Equity Alliance (2020), Black
girls in Pittsburgh and Allegheny County are 10 times more likely to be referred to the juvenile justice system compared to white girls. The disproportionate rates at which Black girls were referred could not be explained by differences in behavior. Furthermore, they found that the police in the Pittsburgh Public Schools were the largest source of referrals to the juvenile justice system for Black girls. These police referred more Black girls to the system than the City of Pittsburgh Police, other municipal police departments, or district magistrates. The majority of arrests made by Pittsburgh Public School police was for disorderly conduct, a “catch-all” and highly subjective offense that includes things such as obscene language or gestures and excessive noise. These were for minor offenses that were not related to safety (Black Girls Equity Alliance, 2020).

In addition to referrals and arrests, Black girls and women leave high school at higher rates compared to white girls and women. For example, de Brey and colleagues (2019) found that while the overall status dropout rate (i.e., the percentage of students ages 16 to 24 who have not earned a high school credential and are not enrolled in school) for females was 4.4% in 2016, and Black girls and women had a much higher rate at 5.2% compared to white girls and women at 3.7%.

Although the school-to-prison pipeline has been the dominant term and concept used to discuss the relationship between schools and prisons, scholars have argued that the school-to-prison pipeline does not address the root causes that are central to this relationship (Sojoyner, 2013). Sojoyner (2013) argues that what is needed is “a nuanced and historicized understanding of the racialized politics pertaining to the centrality of education to Black liberation struggles” (p. 241). Scholars have proposed reframing the pipeline as the school-prison nexus (Krueger,
Instead of viewing the relationship between schools and prison as a pipeline where schools are places leading students to prison, they argue that some schools operate as prisons (Krueger, 2010; Rodriguez, 2008; Stovall, 2018). For example, students in schools and individuals in prison are required to wear uniforms, subjected to random searches, and fined for being out of their uniform (Stovall, 2018). These two institutions work together to discipline and punish students, primarily students of color (Sojoyner, 2013). The main difference is that students are able to leave school every afternoon.

Through this examination, scholars have also realized that the school-to-prison pipeline/school-prison nexus may not be the most appropriate frameworks for examining the experiences of Black girls because many Black girls experience confinement beyond going to prison (M. W. Morris, 2012, 2016a). Instead, M. W. Morris (2016a) suggests scholars consider using the school-to-confinement pipeline in order to acknowledge that many Black girls have been confined through detention centers, electronic monitoring, house arrest, or other means of exclusion instead of prisons.

Black girls are the largest growing population in juvenile justice facilities (Sickmund et al., 2020). Between 1985 and 2018, the total number of cases handled by the juvenile courts has dropped, and during this time, the number of cases among Black youth has decreased. However, the total number of cases for Black girls has increased from 51,800 in 1985 to 70,1000 in 2018. In addition to the number of cases increasing, when examining the female data only, the share of cases for Black girls has increased from 31% in 1985 to 35% in 2018 (Sickmund et al., 2020).
According to Sawyer (2019), in 2019, there were approximately 43,000 youth in the United States confined in juvenile facilities away from their home. Of these juvenile facilities, the majority of youth were confined in detention centers (39%), then long-term secure facilities (25%), residential treatment (24%), and group homes (8%). Black youth are disproportionately represented in these facilities compared to white youth. For example, despite only making up 14% of the youth population, 35% of girls in juvenile facilities are Black (Sawyer, 2019).

Although there has been a movement towards understanding Black girls and women’s schooling experiences, there have been few studies that have focused on street-identified Black American girls and women. Similar to previous studies on Black students and education, research on street-identified Black students has centered on Black boys and men’s experiences. While research has sought to understand urban Black students’ experiences, this research fails to capture the unique experiences and trajectories of street-identified Black American girls and women.

**Street Life**

Low-income Black communities have been impacted by structural violence (i.e., how institutions and systems create policies, laws, and other forms of regulation that prevent individuals, families, and communities from meeting their basic needs; Galtung, 1969, 1971) for centuries, and this violence too often leads to developing a street identity. Street life emerges as a site of resilience in response to violence that permeates the experiences and lives of Black men and women (Hitchens & Payne, 2017, forthcoming; Payne, 2008, 2011). Street life or a street identity is a phenomenological term that refers to an ideological code or behavior that centers on economic, social, and personal survival (Hitchens & Payne, 2017; Payne, 2001, 2005,
2008, 2011). It is conceptualized by assessing the intersection of the following: (a) race/ethnicity (i.e., Black American, Jamaican American), (b) socioeconomic status, (c) gender (i.e., degree of femininity or masculinity), (d) primary hustle (i.e., dominant activity engaged in), (e) street status (i.e., position or rank), (f) geographic region (i.e., region in the country), and (g) developmental stage (i.e., preadolescence, adolescence, young adulthood, etc; Payne, 2011).

Street life is also passed down intergenerationally. Behaviors, attitudinal, and cultural practices are passed down from older to younger generations in the streets and are regulated through the “code of the streets,” informal rules that organize behaviors and interactions (E. Anderson, 1999; Hitchens & Payne, 2017; Jones, 2009; Payne, 2011). As compared to other scholars (e.g., E. Anderson, 1999), Payne’s (2008, 2011) conceptualization of street life does not use violence as an organizing factor in the “code of the streets,” but rather refers to a range of networking behaviors or activities that are exhibited through bonding as well as through legal and illegal activities. Street life illustrates the fluidity of behaviors and activities as well as the ways in which men and women choose to survive as a result of their oppression and make meaning around feeling accomplished, satisfied, and well (Hitchens & Payne, 2017; Payne, 2008, 2011). This intergenerational transmission of street life is largely in response to the structural oppression faced by Black families (Hitchens & Payne, 2017).

Street-identified Black American girls and women engage in multiple roles and participate in a variety of activities in the streets. They take part in a range of networking behaviors or activities that are exhibited through bonding (legal) as well as through illegal activities (Payne, 2008, 2011). For Black girls and women, bonding activities can include attending parties or group gatherings with friends, going to the
bar, participating in social clubs (e.g., car or motorcycle clubs), “hanging on the block” or street corner, and/or sponsoring and organizing local community events. They also engage in illegal activities as a way to confront the effects of poverty and structural violence. These activities include prostitution, interpersonal violence, gambling, preparing drugs for sale, selling or holding drugs (i.e., keeping in one’s possession drugs that are for sale), holding drug money for others (i.e., keeping in one’s possession money from selling drugs), and bookkeeping (Brunson & Stewart, 2006; Bush-Baskette, 2010; Hitchens, 2020; Jones, 2009). Street-identified Black American girls and women will also work in the underground marketplace by buying and selling stolen goods, “boosting” to local residents (McCurn, 2018). In addition, street-identified Black American girls and women actively support each other following tragedies in their communities. Hitchens and Payne (forthcoming) discuss how they:

Cultivate joy in times of sorrow by developing support groups for other women when tragedies like gun violence hit their communities, caring for the children of mothers who fall on hard times, and organizing social activities like barbeques, bookbag drives, and rent parties. (p. 6)

These are a few examples of the ways in which street-identified Black American girls and women demonstrate strength in the face of adversity. It is critical that teachers, researchers, and others identify and acknowledge the manner in which street-identified Black American girls and women create spaces of resistance, care, and resiliency.

Street Life and Schooling Experiences

In low-income urban communities in the United States, Black boys and girls embrace street identities to cope with blocked opportunities that result from systemic
educational inequities in their schools (Pyrooz, 2013; Rios, 2011; Wilson, 1996). One of the dominant arguments around street-identified youth and their schooling difficulties has framed the youth from a deficit perspective arguing that they do not place any value on formal education (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; E. A. Stewart & Simons, 2010). However, many researchers reject this dominant argument. Instead, they argue that street life is a response to the violent structural conditions that individuals face in their schools and communities and the ways in which they are pushed out of school and funneled into the school-to-prison or the school-to-confinement pipelines. Additionally, in contrast to the dominant argument, these researchers have found that street-identified Black youth value formal education and learning (Flores-González, 2002; Jones, 2009; Mateu-Gelabert & Lune, 2007; Payne & Brown, 2010; Payne et al., 2009; Rios, 2011). Despite valuing education and learning, researchers have found that street-identified youth often believe that the formal education that they receive at their schools is not worth their time and effort (Mateu-Gelabert & Lune, 2007; Payne & Brown, 2010).

For example, Payne and Brown (2010) collected surveys and conducted interviews with street-identified Black boys between the ages of 16 and 19. They found that the boys held positive views of learning and formal education, and they expressed a desire to attend college and pursue professional careers. Despite these views and desires, most of the boys did not view their schools, including school personnel, as supportive or nurturing. The boys discussed how they had insufficient resources and facilities (e.g., overcrowded classrooms and old computers). A few of the boys compared their school environments to that of jail acknowledging the ways that police officers and security guards were so prevalent in the school. The authors
also examined the ways in which street-identified Black boys conceptualize and use street life as a site of resilience inside school. The Black boys stated that they were more likely to engage in street life if they felt like they were not receiving a quality education and were not prepared for college or employment (Payne & Brown, 2010).

In addition to studies that have examined the experiences of street-identified Black boys and men, some studies have examined the educational experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in that they were included with street-identified Black boys and men (Payne & Brown, 2016, 2017). For example, Payne and Brown (2016) conducted interviews with street-identified Black men and women ages 18 to 35 in the Eastside and Southbridge neighborhoods in Wilmington, Delaware about their experiences with educational and employment opportunities. They found that even though the men and women held positive views of formal education, those views did not translate to educational attainment. Instead, they found that almost 50% of the participants did not earn a high school diploma, 42% of participants stated that their mother did not graduate from high school, and 60% reported that their father did not graduate from high school. These findings suggest that despite valuing education, educational inequities have been impacting Black communities and their families for generations.

Using interview data from the same study, Payne and Brown (2017) investigated how street-identified Black men and women are funneled into the school-to-prison pipeline and how their educational experiences are a function of institutional or structural racism. They found that students experienced racism created by this pipeline in five ways: "(1) negative interactions with teachers or school officials, (2) school violence, (3) institutional removal, (4) school-induced community crime, and
positive academic motivation” (Payne & Brown, 2017, p. 307). The majority of the men and women who were interviewed talked about how the school-to-prison pipeline is a complex structural phenomenon that was developed as a mechanism to undereducate low-income Black communities. The pipeline extended outside of school and impacted their families and communities by permanently situating them in poverty and juvenile and criminal justice systems (Payne & Brown, 2017).

One study in particular examined the intergenerational educational experiences of street-identified Black boys and men. Payne (2008) conducted an intergenerational study using quantitative survey and qualitative interview data with street-identified Black men and boys between the ages of 16 and 65. The sample was divided into three age groups: (1) 16 to 24 years old, (2) 25 to 44 years old, and (3) 45 to 65 years old. The purpose of the study was to examine attitudes towards education and opportunity. Results from the quantitative data demonstrated that street-identified Black men ages 45 to 65 held statistically significantly more negative attitudes towards their educational experiences as compared to the street-identified Black boys ages 16 to 24. The difference between street-identified Black men ages 45 to 65 and ages 25 to 44 was not statistically significant. However, there was no significant difference between Black boys and men ages 16 to 24 compared to ages 25 to 44. The older men felt blocked from traditional sources of opportunity and felt like they were not prepared for college and finding a quality job after high school. These results support an intergenerational trend across the sample indicating that as these men grow older, they have increasingly negative attitudes toward their education. These are important findings, providing a glimpse into intergenerational differences among Black boys and men. Building on previous research, this work seeks to use an intersectional
framework to explore the intergenerational schooling experiences and attitudes of street-identified Black American girls and women.

**Theoretical Framework**

Critical Race Feminism

This study utilizes critical race feminism (CRF) as a guiding theoretical framework to examine and explore the intergenerational schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women. CRF is rooted in intersectionality and is a theoretical extension of Black feminism (Few, 2007). Intersectionality, grounded in Black feminism and critical legal studies, was first introduced to the academy in 1989 by Kimberlé Crenshaw, a feminist legal scholar (Crenshaw, 1989). Intersectionality describes how forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, and classism simultaneously interlock and intersect to affect the lived experiences of marginalized individuals (P. H. Collins, 2009, 2015; P. H. Collins & Bilge, 2016; Crenshaw, 1991).

In Crenshaw’s 1989 piece, she analyzed why Black women’s experiences were not adequately accounted for in U.S. structures, such as the legal system. She discusses how the experiences of Black women have been excluded from feminist theory which is centered on white women and excluded from antiracist politics which is centered on Black men. She writes about how the multidimensionality of Black women has led to the “theoretical erasure” of their experiences (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 139). She states that “any analysis that does not take intersectionality into account cannot sufficiently address the particular manner in which Black women are subordinated” (Crenshaw, 1989, p. 140).
In 1991, Crenshaw built off her earlier work and identified three forms of intersectionality: (1) structural intersectionality, (2) political intersectionality, and (3) representational intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991). Structural intersectionality refers to the ways that systems and structures are connected in society and how these systems and structures do not account for the unique experiences of Black women (Crenshaw, 1991). Political intersectionality refers to ways that individuals may experience tensions when they are situated within two or more marginalized groups (Crenshaw, 1991). Crenshaw (1991) emphasized the ways that racial/ethnic minority women are situated within two marginalized groups (i.e., being a woman and being a woman of color) and frequently having to choose between two political agendas, and as a result, many women of color are often disempowered. This political split between two opposite agendas is one seldomly confronted or experienced by white women (Crenshaw, 1991). Representational intersectionality refers to how race, gender, and sexuality are linked and influence the ways minority women are represented in cultural imagery, such as through media, texts, and images (Crenshaw, 1991).

While Crenshaw is credited with first introducing the term, intersectionality, into the academic literature, the origins of intersectionality date back prior to her work. For example, the 1960s to the early 1980s were important decades for the expansion of the concepts of intersectionality (P. H. Collins & Bilge, 2016). In 1977, the Combahee River Collective released The Combahee River Collective Statement. The Collective was a community of Black lesbian feminists who discussed their historical struggle against multiple forms of oppression and also situated their struggle within social movements. In the statement, they wrote about intersectionality while not using the term. Their statement was critical to Black feminism because they wrote about how
“major systems of oppression are interlocking” (Combahee River Collective, 1977, p. 1). These systems of oppression being racism, capitalism, and patriarchy. They stated, “A combined anti-racist and anti-sexist position drew us together initially, and as we developed politically we addressed ourselves to heterosexism and economic oppression under capitalism” (Combahee River Collective, 1977, p. 3). They also discussed the concept of identity politics, their political agendas stemming directly from their own identities. They stated, “We also often find it difficult to separate race from class from sex oppression because in our lives they are most often experienced simultaneously” (Combahee River Collective, 1977, p. 3).

CRF emerged from Critical Race Theory (CRT) and feminist theory because of the exclusion of Black women within these theories and the disciplines in which they are situated (Wing, 1997). CRT stems from critical legal studies and officially emerged as a theory in 1989 (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). During this time, critical legal studies was dominated by white male legal academics who largely excluded the experiences and voices of people of color in their efforts, and these scholars engaged in class-based analyses, but excluded race (D. A. Bell, 1980; Crenshaw et al., 1995; Wing, 1997). Those scholars at the forefront of the CRT movement identified a need to examine and highlight the experiences and voices of people of color (Wing, 1997).

CRT was largely dominated by the experiences of Black males and largely excluded those of women of color. CRF emerged from CRT because of Black women feeling excluded by their male peers (Few, 2007). The basic tenets of CRT acknowledge: (1) that racism is ordinary and embedded into American society, (2) that race is socially and historically constructed, (3) the notion of interest convergence, (4) the concept of intersectionality, and (5) that people of color have a unique voice to tell
their own stories (D. A. Bell, 1976, 1980, 1992, 1995; Crenshaw, 1988; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). CRF draws upon the central tenets of CRT. However, CRF departs from CRT by rejecting essentialism. Essentialism is the idea that there is one unitary, “essential” experience of a group of people (A. P. Harris, 1990). The result of essentialism is that it can reduce the identities of individuals who experience multiple forms of oppression into an additive approach: Black + Woman + Lesbian (Bowleg, 2008). This is in sharp contrast to an intersectional approach: Black Woman Lesbian (Bowleg, 2008). According to A. P. Harris (1990), essentialism can be broken down into racial essentialism and gender essentialism. She states that racial essentialism is “the belief that there is a monolithic ‘Black Experience,’ or ‘Chicano Experience’” (A. P. Harris, 1990, p. 588). In terms of CRT, CRF rejects the concept of racial essentialism by acknowledging that Black women’s experiences are not the same as those of Black men (Wing, 2003). Further, it recognizes that there is not a singular Black female perspective and utilizing CRF for this research allows for a more nuanced examination of the experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women.

CRF also departs from feminist theory and the mainstream feminist movement by rejecting gender essentialism (Wing, 2003). Gender essentialism is the idea that there is a unitary woman experience that does not take into account race, sexual identification, or class (A. P. Harris, 1990). According to Evans-Winters and Esposito (2010), “any form of essentialism is harmful to theorizing and advocacy on behalf of Black girls, because it leaves analysis of their experiences void of richness, multiplicity and distinctiveness—all of which it means to be human” (p. 21).
Black women have also been excluded from feminist movements as well as feminist theory. Feminist theory has been used to understand, analyze, and change women’s subordination (White et al., 2015). The theory is rooted in the mainstream feminist movement, which has been conceptualized as three waves (Heywood & Drake, 1997). The first wave in the feminist movement in the United States was from the 1800s to the early 1900s. It was predominantly focused on equal rights for white women, especially related to voting rights (S. R. Smith & Hamon, 2012). The second wave was from the 1960s to the 1970s, during the civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam War protests (S. R. Smith & Hamon, 2012). This wave was focused on issues such as equal pay, working outside the home, reproductive choice, maternity leave, and ending sex discrimination (S. R. Smith & Hamon, 2012).

Black women were largely excluded from both the first and second waves. Since the beginning of the feminist movement, Black women have argued that the movement views women’s experiences as unitary (A. P. Harris, 1990). The movement highlighted the experiences of white, middle to upper class women, and the theories were based on the assumption that the experiences of white women and women of color were identical (Crenshaw, 1991; Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010; Wing, 1997). For example, white women excluded Black women from the suffrage movement. In response to the 1848 Seneca Falls conference that is credited with the beginning of the white women’s suffrage movement, Sojourner Truth’s “Ain’t I a Woman?” speech in 1852 highlighted the exclusion and disregard for the intersection of race and gender in the movement. She also emphasized white women’s privileges and the ways in which they were complicit in her oppression and bondage (De Reus et al., 2005).
The third wave of feminism began in the 1990s and ended in the early 2010s (S. R. Smith & Hamon, 2012). This third wave sought to be inclusive of diverse women’s voices and focused on the multiple forms of oppression that women may experience as a result of societal oppression. This could include oppression based on race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, and physical ability (Few-Demo & Allen, 2020; White et al., 2015). CRF was considered a prominent theory in the third wave (White et al., 2015). Although this wave emphasized inclusion of diverse women’s voices and not just white women, many Black feminists did not identify with the movement because of their exclusion from the movement for over a century (Few, 2007; Wing, 2003).

CRF has been described as one of the most useful frameworks for examining the schooling experiences of Black girls and women as it provides a lens to understand their experiences in a way that feminist theory and CRT used alone cannot address (Berry, 2009, 2010; Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010; Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2020). CRF acknowledges that the experiences of women of color are different from those of white women and men of color (i.e., anti-essentialism), and it acknowledges that women of color have multiple consciousnesses that women of color learn to embody to survive in systems steeped in whiteness (Berry, 2005; Crenshaw, 1993; Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010; A. P. Harris, 1990; Wing, 2003). CRF is focused on how legal and social policies such as welfare, healthcare, childcare and custodial rights, and education oppress women of color and their families (Crenshaw, 1993; De Reus et al., 2005). It is a useful theory to situate how various institutions that Black girls and women interact with reinforce social inequities (Few, 2007).
Furthermore, CRF emphasizes that women of color face multiple forms of discrimination based on the intersections of gender, race, and class, all while navigating within an oppressive system (Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010). It also calls for studies that “combat gender and racial oppression” simultaneously (Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010). Similar to CRT, critical race feminists use narrative or storytelling to highlight the voices of people of color and as a way to push back dominant ways of understanding, of knowing, and of power relations (Berry, 2010). It is multidisciplinary in nature and is informed by the writings of multicultural feminists and Black feminists such as bell hooks (1984, 1990), Toni Cade Bambara (1970), Patricia Hill Collins (1990, 1991, 1998), Audre Lorde (1980), Cherri Morága (1983; Morága & Anzáldua, 1983), Gloria Anzáldua (1987), M. Jacqui Alexander (1994), Joy James, (1999), Ange-Marie Hancock (2007), and Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1984).

Overall, CRF served as a theoretical framework to center street-identified Black American girls and women and their attitudes toward schooling and lived schooling experiences across generations. CRF was used to recognize and critically examine the multiple forms of discrimination they experienced as a result of their race, gender, and class as well as a framework to understand legal and social policies that seek to oppress street-identified Black American girls and women within the schooling context. Its principles guided all phases of this study, including as an analytical tool to analyze and understand the findings.

Resilience and Resiliency

This study centered and emphasized the resilience and resiliency of the street-identified Black American girls and women. It used Payne’s (2011) framing of resilience and resiliency as part of the Sites of Resilience (SOR) theory that
reconceptualizes traditional resilience models and argues that all individuals, groups, and/or local communities are resilient.

The concept of resilience was first studied in the context of stress, risk, and child psychopathology, and it was studied explicitly beginning in the 1970s (Masten, 2001; O’Leary & Ickovics, 1995). Some of the first resilience studies portrayed children as having extraordinary strength and being “invulnerable” or stress resistant (Garmezy & Nuechterlein, 1972). However, many of these early models have been regarded as grounded in risk and deficit assumptions (O’Leary & Ickovics, 1995). As argued by Payne (2011), traditional resilience models are: “(a) too value-laden, (b) place much of the onus on individuals to determine resilience, (c) lack a structural dimension, and (d) allow only “experts” to deem individuals as resilient or nonresilient” (p. 426).

Traditionally, the field of human development has centered on Masten’s concepts of resilience. Masten’s (2001) risk and resilience framework is presented as a strengths-based approach to understanding human development. Masten defines resilience as “patterns of positive adaptation during or following significant adversity or risk” (Masten et al., 2009, p. 118). The purpose of her research is to understand the processes through which individuals are able to persevere through severe adversity and trauma and achieve positive outcomes (Masten et al., 2009; Masten, 2018). According to Masten (2001), there are two major judgements that must be rendered about the resilience of an individual. The first judgment is whether an individual has been or is currently being exposed to risk (i.e., “an elevated probability of an undesirable outcome”; Masten et al., 2009, p. 119) that posed/poses a significant threat to the individual’s development. Based on this judgment, individuals are only
considered resilient if they have encountered a risk, such as poverty, over their life course (Masten, 2001). The second judgment is about the criteria or method that should be used to assess and identify whether an individual’s adaptation or developmental outcomes are considered “good” or “okay”, and is therefore considered resilient (Masten, 2014). The following are the two most common ways to determine positive adaptation: (1) success in age-salient developmental tasks, and (2) symptoms of psychopathology (Masten, 2014). A developmental task is defined as “major expectations of a given society or culture in historical context for the behavior of children in different age periods and situations, representing criteria by which progress in individual judgment is judged” (Masten et al., 2009, p. 119). In early adulthood, some common age-salient development tasks include external achievements, such as academic achievement, contributing to family livelihood, and establishing a romantic relationship as well as internal achievements, such as achieving a sense of self (Masten, 2014).

Although Masten’s risk and resilience framework has significantly contributed to the resilience literature within the field of human development, it is similar to other traditional models in that it is grounded in risk and deficit. This framework is too value-laden and allows Masten and colleagues to decide whether individuals are resilient or non-resilient based on criteria they deem to be adaptive. Just in the same way they have the power to deem someone resilient, they also have the power to deem outcomes “maladaptive” which are “outcomes not desired by parents, self, or society” (Masten, 2014, p. 172). Using this model, Black girls and women would be deemed resilient only if they “succeed” based on mainstream society. Furthermore, this framework places the onus on the individual to achieve their resilience. Although an
individual may significantly contribute to their resilience, they are not solely responsible. The framework fails to consider the impacts of structural dimensions (e.g., economy, government, education, family, and policing). By not taking into account these structures, it does not effectively account for the unique and multiple lived experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women, but rather homogenizes their experiences. The behavior of a woman selling drugs as a way to survive economically would be labeled “maladaptive.” However, using Payne’s (2011) resilience framing allows for the recognition of her resilience in this context, recognizing that despite the lack of opportunity due to structural conditions, she is able to generate income for her and her family.

Therefore, given the limitations of previous framings of resilience found in the field of human development, this study drew upon Payne’s (2011) theoretical conceptualization of resilience and resiliency as posited through SOR. The theory has been used almost exclusively with street-identified Black boys and men. In the context of Payne’s (2011) SOR, he defines resilience as “how street life-oriented Black men organize meaning around feeling well, satisfied, or accomplished and how men choose to survive in relation to adverse structural conditions” (p. 435). Resiliency is then achieved based on how men organize personal philosophies on survival. SOR of street-life oriented Black male resilience and resiliency consists of five dimensions: (1) phenomenology (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, and developmental stage), (2) relational coping (e.g., race/culture and key relationships), (3) historical patterns and trends, (4) structural systems (e.g., education, unemployment, and health care system), and (5) social injustice. These five dimensions allow for a more in-depth exploration
of the ways that individuals and structural conditions impact the lived experiences of the men (Payne, 2011).

For the purposes of this study, the theoretical framing of resilience and resiliency was of most importance. While “testing” the theory in its applicability to street-identified Black American girls and women, is needed, it was not the focus of this research. Instead, SOR was used in this study as an alternative framing of how street-identified Black American girls and women engage in resilience and demonstrate this resilience in schools and in response to the structural conditions faced in their communities.
Chapter 3

METHODS

This chapter describes the research methodology and procedures that were employed for the Street PAR Health Project and the secondary data analysis. The chapter begins with an overview of the research design and methods used for the Street PAR Health Project. Then, the chapter follows with a description of the research designs and methods used for the secondary data analysis.

The Street PAR Health Project

In this section, I describe the research process and methods of the Street PAR Health Project. First, I provide a description of the research design. Next, I situate this work within the Wilmington community, and then provide a description of Street PAR as a methodology. Then, I describe the quantitative and qualitative methods used as part of the project. The section concludes with ethical considerations addressed in this study.

Research Design

The Street PAR Health Project implemented a cross-sectional, convergent mixed methods street PAR design to examine and explore the relationship between health, violence, structural opportunity, and well-being among a large community sample of street-identified Black youth and adults ages 16 to 54 in the Northside and Westside neighborhoods of Wilmington. This study was supported by National Institutes of Health via the Department of Medicine at Christiana Care Hospital in Newark, Delaware.
In total, the Street PAR Health Project team collected community-level data in the following forms: (a) 770 surveys \((n = 276\) from girls and women, \(n = 494\) from boys and men), (b) 86 interview participants \((n = 50\) with girls and women, \(n = 36\) with boys and men), (c) 371 blood pressure tests, and (d) 22 months of ethnographic field observations. Additionally, the project implemented a robust “action” or activism agenda that ran concurrently with the empirical study.

The original purpose of the Street PAR Health Project was to collect data from street-identified Black boys and men ages 16 to 44. However, the study expanded to include collecting surveys and conducting interviews with a sample of street-identified Black American girls and women ages 16 to 54. The Co-Project Director, Dr. Brooklynn Hitchens, was also the Lead Researcher for this portion of the study and developed the design to supplement the larger project as part of her doctoral dissertation (Hitchens, 2020). For this study, I used the survey and interview data that was collected with the street-identified girls and women, which I will refer to as the secondary data set. Figure 1 provides a breakdown of these datasets.
Community Research Sites

The secondary data that was analyzed for this project was collected in Wilmington, Delaware. Based on data from the 2010 U.S. Census, the city of Wilmington had approximately 71,000 residents. In 2010, 58% of the Wilmington population was Black, 32.6% was white, 7.4% was “other”, and .07% was Asian. The unemployment rate among whites was 3.7%, while the unemployment rate among Blacks was approximately three times that at 9.3%. Among the families living below the poverty line, 71.4% of them are Black families, while 21.7% are white (City of Wilmington, 2010). Data collection occurred within two predominantly Black neighborhoods in Wilmington: (a) Westside and (b) Northside.
Westside

Within the Westside area in Wilmington, data was collected from the West Center City, Hilltop, and Hedgeville sub-communities, see Table 3. These sub-communities span across five census tracts. The Westside has approximately 14,624 residents. The median household income for the Westside was $26,017. The Black population in the Westside ranged from approximately 50% to 80%. It has the largest Latino population in Wilmington, particularly Dominicans, Puerto Ricans, and Mexicans, who reside primarily in the Hilltop community or surrounding neighborhoods. Unemployment rates varied from above 6% to over 16% (City of Wilmington, 2010).
Table 3  Demographic Characteristics of Westside Based on Sub-community and Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-community</th>
<th>West Center City</th>
<th>Westside/Hilltop</th>
<th>Hedgeville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Tract</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>3,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black [n (%)]</td>
<td>1,161 (46.6%)</td>
<td>1,464 (79.3%)</td>
<td>1,682 (51.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$24,189</td>
<td>$22,760</td>
<td>$23,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Below $25,000 among Black Households [n (%)]</td>
<td>463 (57.7%)</td>
<td>306 (62.1%)</td>
<td>234 (55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Population 16 Years and Over who are Unemployed [n (%)]</td>
<td>267 (16.2%)</td>
<td>58 (6.4%)</td>
<td>136 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 18 Years and Over with Less than High School Diploma [n (%)]</td>
<td>452 (21.9%)</td>
<td>353 (29.6%)</td>
<td>1,037 (44.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data was retrieved from the City of Wilmington Census 2010 Data (2010)

Northside

Within the Northside area in Wilmington, data was collected from the Boulevard, Price’s Run, and Riverside sub-communities, see Table 4. These sub-communities span across five census tracts. The Northside has approximately 15,675 residents. The median household income for the Northside was $36,961, which was on average $10,000 more than the median household income for the Westside. Across all
five census tracts, the percentage of the population that was Black ranged from roughly 78% to 89%. Unemployment rates varied from approximately 6% to over 13% (City of Wilmington, 2010). In the Northside, there is the Riverside Housing Projects, a large drug hotspot in Wilmington. Approximately 75% of residents are living in poverty and 49% of residents over the age of 25 do not have a high school diploma (Wilmington Public Safety Strategies Commission, 2015).

Table 4  
Demographic Characteristics of Northside Based on Sub-community and Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-community</th>
<th>Boulevard</th>
<th>Price’s Run</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Census Tract</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>3,647</td>
<td>2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black [n (%)]</td>
<td>2,539 (77.6%)</td>
<td>3,209 (85.9%)</td>
<td>2,602 (89.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$47,250</td>
<td>$49,338</td>
<td>$34,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Below $25,000 among Black Households [n (%)]</td>
<td>260 (29.8%)</td>
<td>253 (27%)</td>
<td>366 (39.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Population 16 Years and Over who are Unemployed [n (%)]</td>
<td>227 (11.5%)</td>
<td>200 (9.4%)</td>
<td>117 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 18 Years and Over with Less than High School Diploma [n (%)]</td>
<td>419 (17.3%)</td>
<td>560 (22.9%)</td>
<td>373 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Data was retrieved from the City of Wilmington Census 2010 Data (2010)*
Separate and Unequal: Education in Wilmington

Wilmington is a unique city to examine intergenerational schooling experiences of Black girls and women because of its history of educational inequities for Black students. In 1952, two legal cases, *Belton v. Gebhart* and *Bulah v. Gebhart*, received national attention through their inclusion in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). These cases involved inequities related to physical facilities and instructional resources between Black Wilmington schools and nearby white suburban schools (T. J. Davis, 2017). In 1954, the Supreme Court issued a decision stating that educational facilities that are separate are intrinsically unequal (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954). Despite this ruling, the state of Delaware was very slow in desegregating schools and moving towards an educational system that would provide equitable facilities and instructional resources (T. J. Davis, 2017). In the late 1970s, several northern schools formed the New Castle County School District and the only school district serving Wilmington was dismantled (T. J. Davis, 2017). In its place, a plan was implemented whereby students from Wilmington were bused to schools in the suburbs for Grades 1-5 and 9-12 while students from the suburbs would be bused to Wilmington for Grades 6-8 (T. J. Davis, 2017). In 1980, due to opposition to this plan from suburban white parents, the Delaware General Assembly passed a law that divided the New Castle County School District into four suburban districts (i.e., Brandywine, Christina, Colonial, and Red Clay), which remain in place today (T. J. Davis, 2017).

This redistribution, however, did not lead to equitable access to high-quality education for Wilmington’s Black students (Institute for Public Administration, University of Delaware [UD], 2020). According to a report prepared by the Institute for Public Administration at UD for the Redding Consortium for Educational Equity...
“Public education in Wilmington lacks coherent governance, struggles with inadequate school resources to meet student needs, and fails to provide and coordinate in- and out-of-school services and community resources needed to address the needs of students in poverty” (p. 1).

The educational inequities continue to negatively impact educational outcomes for students. Wilmington students perform at a lower level on virtually every educational indicator as compared to non-Wilmington students. During the 2017-2018 school year, 72% of the students in Wilmington identified as Black and 68% of students in Wilmington were from low-income families (Institute for Public Administration, UD, 2020). In 2017, approximately 83% of students in Wilmington failed to meet state standards in Mathematics and 74% failed to meet standards in English Language Arts (Institute for Public Administration, UD, 2018).

Approximately 4.7% of Wilmington students dropped out of high school in 2015 as compared to 2% of non-Wilmington students (Wilmington Education Improvement Commission [WEIC], 2016). In addition, high school graduation rates for Wilmington students are approximately 17% lower than non-Wilmington students (69% v. 86%, respectively; WEIC, 2016).

Examining the Street PAR Health Project data provides an opportunity to uncover the educational perspectives of street-identified Black American girls and women, and using a mixed method approach allows for the integration of the quantitative and qualitative data and a more comprehensive understanding of street-identified Black American girls and women’s schooling experiences than can be achieved with quantitative or qualitative methods alone or without integrating the quantitative and qualitative findings. Furthermore, Street PAR methodology
incorporates members of the population under study as part of the research team, focusing data collection that is designed to lead to change in communities (Baum et al., 2006; Payne, 2017). This research project is being undertaken to provide greater insight and understanding into the intergenerational experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in order to inform and affect change.

Background on PAR

As previously mentioned, the Street PAR Health Project used a convergent mixed methods Street PAR design. Street PAR is a methodological framework that is rooted in traditional PAR. PAR is a methodology where the researcher and members of the population under study are part of the research team and share power (Baum et al., 2006; T. M. Brown, 2010; Fine et al., 2004; Payne, 2008, 2013, 2017). The inclusion of the population as part of the research team is central to the fairness and credibility of the research process (Baum et al., 2006; Lykes & Mallona, 2008). PAR members are included throughout the research process including developing research questions, theoretical framing, data collection, data analysis, formal publications and presentations, and suggestions for action-based intervention (Baum et al., 2006; T. M. Brown, 2010; Brydon-Miller & Maguire, 2009; Payne, 2017). Utilizing PAR can lead to the empowerment of those being researched while also reducing inequalities present in social science research (Baum et al., 2006; Payne, 2017).

Social psychologist Kurt Lewin coined the term “action research” and is credited for the development of PAR (Lewin, 1946). Lewin wanted to impact social policies by developing a community-based research methodology that could improve relationships between marginalized and dominant groups (Lewin, 1946). PAR has been implemented globally. For example, one of the largest and most successful
literacy campaigns, the Cuban Literacy Campaign, was led by Ernesto “Ch’e” Guevara and Fidel Castro (Pérez, 1995). They empowered “literacy brigades” (i.e., PAR members) to teach rural citizens how to read and write using literature about the experiences of oppressed Cuban residents, while also building and revitalizing local schools (Payne, 2017). Prior to the campaign, the literacy rate in Cuba was between 50 and 70% and at the end it improved to 98% (Payne, 2017). In the United States, PAR is also used frequently in the fields of public health (e.g., D. R. Brown et al., 2008; Minkler, 2000) and education (e.g., T. M. Brown, 2010; Fine et al., 2004; McIntyre, 2000; Payne, 2008, 2013; Payne & Brown, 2010, 2016, 2017). Education-based PAR has generally been youth focused, feminist oriented, urban based, and organized for individuals involved with the street in either the community or in prison (Aviles & Grigalunas, 2018; Bryant & Payne, 2013; Payne & Bryant, 2018).

**Street PAR**

Street PAR is an extension of PAR and was created by social psychologist and street ethnographer, Dr. Yasser Payne, Principal Investigator (PI) of the Street PAR Health Project (Bryant & Payne, 2013; Hitchens, 2020; Hitchens & Payne, 2017; Payne, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2013; Payne & Brown, 2016). Payne’s (2011) SOR informs Street PAR designs by conceptualizing a street identity as a physical and psychological site of resilience. Street PAR organizes low-income people of color who are either closely or actively involved with the streets and the criminal justice system to empirically document the lived experiences of street-identified people of color in the context of their local communities, schools, and correctional facilities (Payne, 2006, 2013, 2017). The streets represent a social identity, tangible activities, and physical locations, and this language is used to understand and explain how street life,
a street identity, and/or crime are internalized as a social identity that is grounded in personal, economic, and social survival (Payne, 2011). Street PAR privileges the experience and worldviews of those involved in the streets as experts. The assumption is that those actively or formerly involved in the streets are best situated to examine the experiences of this population—a population that has been largely ignored by society. Furthermore, Street PAR requires action-based responses and a social justice lens through all phases of the research study (Payne, 2017, Payne & Bryant, 2018).

There are nine dimensions that have been identified to guide and evaluate Street PAR Projects (Payne & Bryant, 2018). These include the following: (1) project identity (i.e., purpose, goals, and operational structure of the project), (2) ethics (i.e., follows traditional ethics in terms of not harming participants and also follows non-traditional ethics by centering and mobilizing the needs and concerns of the community and Street PAR members), (3) resources and incentives (i.e., open discussions about the benefits of the project to the researchers and ways that projects attract funding and other resources as well as stating that incentivizing Street PAR Associates is mandatory), (4) project timeline (i.e., build a rapport between Street PAR Associates and researchers and clarity around the project’s timeline and in particular that the project will end), (5) methodological design (i.e., resources, project timeline, and institutional access will determine the project’s possibilities), (6) local history (i.e., must incorporate a historical component that seeks to trace the history of a topic relevant to the street-identified population), (7) target audiences (i.e., identification of target audiences that continually inform the Street PAR project), (8) the PEOPLE (i.e., identification of ways to assess how the community [beyond
participants views the study), and (9) action plan (i.e., “action” or social activism is a required component of Street PAR projects; Payne & Bryant, 2018).

**Organizing the Street PAR Health Project Team**

As previously mentioned, the Street PAR Health Project was a collaboration with ChristianaCare and UD. Dr. Yasser A. Payne, a Full Professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminology at UD, served as the Principal Investigator. Dr. Ann M. Aviles, an Associate Professor in the Department of Human Development and Family Sciences at UD, and Dr. LeRoi Hicks, ChristianaCare’s Chief Medical Officer and Physician Leader of ChristianaCare’s Value Institute, served as Co-Investigators. Dr. Brooklynn Hitchens, an Assistant Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Maryland (at the time of the project, Dr. Hitchens was a doctoral candidate at Rutgers University), served as a Co-Project Director and Lead Researcher for data collection with street-identified Black American girls and women. Darryl Chambers, a Research Associate at the Center for Drug and Health Studies at UD, also served as a Co-Project Director.

In addition, 11 street-identified Black men were selected as Street PAR Health Project Associates. Coley Harris, Co-Founder of Out of the Ashes, LLC., served as the Lead Street PAR Associate. See Appendix C for a comprehensive list of team members. Street PAR Associates were formerly incarcerated or had previous involvement with street life and were recruited from Wilmington, Delaware. Some of the Associates were members of the pilot project called the ‘Safe Communities’ Training and Employment Participatory Action Research Project that took place from 2009 to 2011 (Payne, 2013). The Associates were trained in research methods by attending six, 3-to-4-hour training sessions. Research methods training consisted of
activities and readings centered on theory, method, and analysis. All Associates were also required to complete Institutional Review Board (IRB) training through UD. Once Associates successfully completed the research methods training, their responsibilities included: (a) literature reviews, (b) data collection, I qualitative analysis, (d) writing contributions, and (e) professional presentations. All Street PAR Health Project Associates were monetarily compensated for all of their time contributed to the research process.

**Street PAR Girls and Women Primary Data Set**

This section describes the research process and methods used to collect the survey and interview data included in the Street PAR Girls and Women Data Set (reference Figure 1). I provide background on the data collection process for context and understanding of the survey and interview data collected for the female participants. This section includes a description of all aspects of the research process for the quantitative and qualitative data collection. The section concludes with ethical considerations that were addressed. As a reminder, this section only includes the primary data collected and analyzed for this project, not the full data set (i.e., Street PAR Health Project Data Set) collected for the larger Street PAR study.

**Quantitative Phase**

**Participants**

Inclusion criteria for participants was inclusive of the following: (1) be between the ages of 16 to 54, (2) self-identify as female, (3) self-identify as Black or African American, (4) live in the Westside or Northside neighborhoods of
Wilmington, and (5) self-identify as street-life oriented (i.e., involved with violence, crime, and/or formerly incarcerated).

The participants who completed the quantitative survey included 276 street-identified Black American girls and women ages 16 to 54. Girls and women between the ages 16 to 24 represent 31.2% \((n = 86)\) of the survey subsample, 25 to 34 represent 26.4% \((n = 73)\), 35 to 44 represent 24.3% \((n = 67)\), and 45 to 54 represent 18.1% \((n = 50)\). The mean age for this sample was 32.55 years old.

**Sampling and Recruitment**

Participants were recruited for the Street PAR Health Project using a combination of proportional quota sampling and snowball sampling. First, proportional quota sampling was used to specify how many street-identified Black American girls and women should be recruited. Quota sampling is a nonprobabilistic sampling technique in which a population is divided into subcategories (i.e., quotas) based on pre-specified variables such as demographic characteristics, attitudinal characteristics, or behavioral characteristics (J. Daniel, 2012). Then, participants are recruited for a study until the number of participants for each subcategory has been met (J. Daniel, 2012; Given, 2008). For this study, proportional quota sampling was used to ensure that the number of participants selected for each quota was based on the proportion of people in the target population (J. Daniel, 2012). The quotas were based on age cohorts from the 2010 U.S. Census. Age cohorts in the Census are broken down into the following groups: (a) 16 to 24 years old, (b) 25 to 34 years old, (c) 35 to 44 years old, and (d) 45 to 54 years old.

In order to figure out how many participants were needed to recruit in each age cohort, the research team first determined the number of Black girls and women in the
Westside and Northside neighbors in each age cohort. Then, the number of Black girls and women in both neighborhoods were summed together to determine the total number of Black girls and women, which is the target population. The team calculated the percentage of Black girls and women in each age cohort compared to the total in both neighborhoods. From this percentage, it was determined how many surveys were needed to ensure the same percentage of Black girls and women were included in the sample (i.e., a representative sample, see Table 5).

Then, snowball sampling was used to ensure adequate sampling of each age cohort because quota sampling determines the number of participants needed but does not account for where participants are located (Given, 2008). Snowball sampling is a sampling strategy that is generally used to recruit participants from hard-to-reach groups (Sadler et al., 2010). While it is unethical to ask participants directly if they are engaged in street life, instead participants were recruited through Street PAR Health Project Associates. Associates used their social networks to identify potential participants by providing information about their biological and extended family and friends who were street-identified as well as information about places where street-identified individuals might frequent in the Westside and Northside neighborhoods (e.g., barbershops, convenience stores, and street corners). After recruiting this initial group of participants, participants were asked if they knew additional individuals and locations to recruit and continued to expand the list.
Table 5  Quota Sampling for Black Girls and Women Based on Age Cohorts and Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th># Black girls and women in Westside neighborhood</th>
<th># Black girls and women in Northside neighborhood</th>
<th># Black girls and women in the total population of both neighborhoods</th>
<th>% of survey sample by population</th>
<th># of surveys needed</th>
<th># of surveys collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>6,903</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Source: U.S. Census Bureau; Census 2010, Summary File 1; generated by Dr. Brooklynn Hitchens (2020).*

**Survey Design**

The Street PAR Health Project team co-developed a 45-page comprehensive paper-based survey that focused on participant’s relationships with the following: (1) family, (2) violence, (3) employment and educational opportunity, (4) living/health conditions, (5) local leadership (e.g., religious leaders, policy makers, and service providers), (6) law enforcement, and (7) community re-entry from prison, see Appendix A for the entire survey.

**Data Collection**

Survey data collection occurred from April 2017 to October 2018. Surveys were primarily collected at one of the following research sites in Wilmington,
Delaware: (a) The Achievement Center, a nonprofit organization in the Northside; (b) Youth Empowerment Center, a community center in the Westside; (c) Kingswood Community Center, a community center in the Northside/Riverside; and (d) William “Hicks” Anderson Community Center, a community center in the Westside. These four locations were chosen because of their proximity to the Westside and Northside as well as their proximity to locations where crime, street activity, and violence frequently occurs, referred to as a “hot” site. In addition to these data collection sites, surveys were also collected in areas with low street activity (e.g., library or church), referred to as a “cool” sites, and collected in areas with moderate street activity (e.g., a corner store or barbershop), referred to as “warm” sites.

The survey took approximately an hour to an hour and a half to complete. In order to ensure accuracy and consistency, each participant’s survey was checked by one of the Street PAR Health Project members. They reviewed any missing data with participants to ensure that the participant did not miss any questions by accident. Each participant received $40 in cash for participating. They also received packets of information about employment opportunities, educational services, counseling, and physical health. In addition, healthy snacks and beverages were provided to all participants. All minors were required to sign a waiver to consent prior to answering the survey questions. All participants were covered by a Certificate of Confidentiality and were informed that their participation was strictly voluntary and that all responses would remain confidential. Research was approved by UD’s IRB.
Qualitative Phase

Participants

Inclusion criteria for participants was inclusive of the following: (1) be between the ages of 16 to 54, (2) self-identify as female, (3) self-identify as Black or African American, (4) live in the Westside or Northside neighborhoods of Wilmington, and (5) self-identify as street-life oriented (i.e., involved with violence, crime, and/or formerly incarcerated). Participants who participated in the interviews are a subset of the participants who completed the survey. In other words, the participants who participated in an interview also completed the survey.

A total of 50 street-identified Black American girls and women were interviewed for the Street PAR Health Project and therefore were included in the Street PAR Girls and Women Primary Data Set. Thirty-two individual interviews were conducted with street-identified Black American girls and women. In addition to individual interviews, eight dual interviews were conducted \( (n = 12) \). Four of these interviews were with women and four interviews were with a male and female participant. Furthermore, three group interviews were conducted \( (n = 8) \). One of the group Interviews was with all women and the other two were with men and women. It is important to note that one woman participated in an individual interview and a group interview with men and women, and another woman participated in a dual interview with a male and a group interview with men and women.

Black girls and women between the ages 16 and 24 represent 28.0% of the interview subsample \( (n = 14) \), 25 to 34 years old represent 24.0% \( (n = 12) \), 35 to 44 years old represent 26.0% \( (n = 13) \), and 45 to 54 years old represent 22% \( (n = 11) \). The average age of this sample is 35.8 years old. The Street PAR Health Project Co-
Project Director and Lead Researcher aimed to interview roughly 13 participants from each age cohort in order to achieve balance across the age groups. In addition, as proposed by Guest and colleagues (2006), saturation for interview data is often reached around 12 participants per group of interest.

**Sampling and Recruitment**

Participants were recruited for an interview using snowball sampling. The Street PAR Health Project Associates used their social networks to identify potential participants to complete the quantitative survey as well as a qualitative interview. After completing interviews with participants, they were also asked if they knew additional individuals who might want to be interviewed.

**Interview Protocol**

The structure of the interview included both open- and closed-ended questions regarding the following 12 themes: (1) demographic and community, (2) family, (3) street life and structural violence, (4) street masculinity and street femininity, (5) violence, (6) crime, (7) police, (8) education, (9) employment, (10) health, (11) political and civic leadership, and (12) religious leadership, see Appendix B for the entire interview protocol.

**Data Collection**

Interviews were conducted from April 2017 to October 2018. They were conducted primarily by the Street PAR Health Project Coordinator along with a Street PAR Health Project Associate, the PI, and/or one of the Co-Investigators. All interviews were video recorded, and the majority took place at one of the following research sites in Wilmington, Delaware: (a) The Achievement Center, a nonprofit
organization in the Northside; (b) Youth Empowerment Center, a community center in the Westside; (c) Kingswood Community Center, a community center in the Northside/Riverside; and (d) William “Hicks” Anderson Community Center, a community center in the Westside. In addition, interviews also took place in participants’ homes, workplaces, or other sites and spaces in the community based on the participants’ preferences. Interviews lasted approximately an hour to two and a half hours depending on the participant’s comfort and depth of knowledge.

Participants all provided consent to being interviewed and signed video release forms, and interviews were recorded using audio and video. After providing consent to be interviewed, the participants completed a brief questionnaire about their race, gender, age, marital status, housing, education, employment, criminal justice activity, and health. Girls and women who agreed to be interviewed received $25 cash or a $25 Visa gift card. All participants were covered by a Certificate of Confidentiality. Research was approved by UD’s IRB.

Ethical Considerations

It must be noted that while the quantitative surveys were anonymous, the interviews were not. At the start of the interview, participants were able to use the name of their choice, either their own name or a pseudonym, and the Street PAR Health Project team did not mask (i.e., distorting or hiding information that identifies individuals, organizations, and places; Murphy & Jerolmack, 2016) the names or pseudonyms of the participants in this study, which was approved by UD’s IRB. According to Murphy and Jerolmack (2016), masking has been practiced as a method to protect the privacy of participants and to ensure they are not harmed during the research process. However, they argue that masking provides a false sense of
anonymity and that instead, participants should be given the option to use their name or provide a pseudonym. As stated by Hitchens (2020), “sharing of everyday stories and perspectives of street-identified populations are valuable and part of our epistemological framework to balance the location of power between the researcher and ‘researched’” (p. 85). In this study, participants were provided the option and the majority of participants used their name because they wanted their name, life, experiences, and stories to be in print. They found doing so to be rewarding and something they were proud of (Hitchens, 2020; Murphy & Jerolmack, 2016). In addition to participants being able to use their name or a pseudonym, participants were also given the option to have their face appear on the video or they were able to have their image blurred, which was approved by UD’s IRB.

**Street PAR Secondary Data Set**

This section describes my research process and methods using secondary data from the Street PAR Health Project to investigate street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling. This section begins with the characteristics of mixed methods research and a justification for using mixed methods in this study. Then, all aspects of the research process are described for each phase of the explanatory sequential mixed methods research design. The section concludes with ethical considerations addressed in this study.

**Research Design Process**

In this section, I describe the research design process. First, I define mixed methods research and describe characteristics of mixed methods research designs. Then, I identify two primary rationales for using a mixed methods research design for
this study. Finally, I describe how I designed an explanatory sequential mixed methods study using secondary data from the Street PAR Health Project.

**Characteristics of Mixed Methods Research**

Over the past four decades, there have been a variety of characteristics and definitions of mixed methods research that incorporate elements of philosophy, methods, research purpose, and research processes (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Johnson et al., 2007). I define mixed methods research as a research methodology that intentionally incorporates elements of quantitative and qualitative research in order to discover and understand more about a phenomenon than would be possible using quantitative or qualitative methods alone (Johnson et al., 2007). This definition is derived from Johnson and colleagues (2007) study where they sought to better understand the ways that 21 highly published and cited mixed methods scholars defined mixed methods. Based on their responses, they developed a composite definition that included components of what to mix (e.g., types of research and methods), when to mix (e.g., data collection and data analysis), and the rationale for mixing (e.g., corroboration and breadth).

In terms of what to mix, there is a consensus that at least quantitative and qualitative research should be mixed (Johnson et al., 2007). Mixed methods research requires at least two strands, which is a component of a mixed methods study that includes collecting and analyzing quantitative or qualitative data within its research tradition (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Quantitative approaches employ strategies for inquiry like surveys and experiments and collect data on an instrument or test or gather information using a checklist. The data consists of predetermined measures that are numeric and include closed-ended questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In
contrast, qualitative approaches employ strategies for inquiry such as phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994) and grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006) and generally collect data through observations and interviews (Merriam, 1998). This is an emerging approach, without predetermined measures and questions, and the data are texts and images and include open-ended questions (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Mixing these strands can occur at different phases throughout the research process (Johnson et al., 2007). The process of mixing these strands is called integration. Integration is considered the defining feature of mixed methods research (Fetters et al., 2013; Fetters & Freshwater, 2015). According to Fetters and Molina-Azorin (2017), integration refers to “the linking of qualitative and quantitative approaches and dimensions together to create a new whole or more holistic understanding than achieved by either alone” (p. 293). Integration is an intentional process by which the researcher can gain insights and access knowledge that would otherwise be unavailable using only quantitative or qualitative methods (Fetters & Freshwater, 2015). The point where mixing and integration occurs is called a point of interface (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). These points of interface can occur at all stages of the research process such as during data collection and analysis (Johnson et al., 2007).

Mixed methods research all includes a rationale, explicit reasons and arguments for using mixed methods research to address research problems, for mixing as part of the research process (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Since mixed methods approaches are relatively new, the field has focused on articulating justifications for employing mixed methods, and by doing so have made mixed methods research a legitimate approach with strong reasons and arguments for its use (Greene, 2007;
The rationale includes the research design and the meta-inferences, which are insights that emerge from integration (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). For example, if the rationale for mixed methods is triangulation, the meta-inferences will be related to the convergence and divergence of the strands (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016).

**Mixed Methods Rationale**

As compared to quantitative and qualitative research, a mixed methods research approach has unique potential (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The purpose of quantitative research is to test hypotheses with empirical data and either confirm or reject these hypotheses, and depending on the design, they also have the potential to determine cause and effect relationships (Shadish et al., 2002). In contrast, the purpose of qualitative research is to uncover the meaning of a phenomenon. Qualitative researchers are interested in exploring and understanding how people interpret and make meaning of their experiences (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In mixed methods research, researchers have also identified rationales (Bryman, 2006; K. M. Collins et al., 2006; Greene et al., 1989; Reichardt & Cook, 1979; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). According to Plano Clark and Ivankova (2016), mixed methods rationales are explicit reasons and arguments for why using mixed methods is appropriate for addressing the purpose of the research and the research problem.

In this study, there were two primary rationales for implementing a mixed methods research design: (1) expansion and (2) social justice. The first rationale, expansion, refers to extending the breadth and scope of inquiry by utilizing quantitative and qualitative methods to assess and understand different, but related,
phenomena (Greene, 2007; Greene et al., 1989). In this study, the quantitative data was used to examine street-identified Black American girls and women’s attitudes toward their schooling and the qualitative data was used to explore their schooling experiences. Therefore, these methods will expand our understanding of street-identified Black American girls and women’s schooling. The second rationale, social justice, refers to an argument for conducting research using quantitative and qualitative methods to uncover and challenge oppression (Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). Mixed methods studies that utilize a social justice rationale generally emphasize the need to use both methods as the best way to empower participants, expose injustices, involve community members as research partners, raise awareness among stakeholder groups, and advocate for social justice and action (Mertens, 2003; Onwuegbuzie & Frels, 2013). In this study, using both quantitative and qualitative methods allowed me to raise awareness about street-identified Black American girls and women’s schooling as well as use both methods to advocate for social justice and action, including avenues for future research.

Crafting a Mixed Methods Research Design Using Secondary Data

In this section, I describe the design development process and explain some of the choices I made in the process of selecting an appropriate mixed methods research design. First, I assessed the available data by connecting the available quantitative and qualitative data using a data inventory. Then, I compared the feasibility and alignment for three mixed methods designs, ultimately selecting an explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Ivankova et al., 2006).

Integration is considered the defining feature of mixed methods research (Fetters et al., 2013; Fetters & Freshwater, 2015). According to Fetters and Molina-
Azorin (2017), integration refers to “the linking of qualitative and quantitative approaches and dimensions together to create a new whole or more holistic understanding than achieved by either alone” (p. 293). Integration is an intentional process by which the researcher can gain insights and access knowledge that would otherwise be unavailable using only quantitative or qualitative methods (Fetters & Freshwater, 2015). Mixed methods integration should occur throughout the research stages and phases (Creamer, 2018; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Moseholm and Fetters (2017) provided a guide for integration approaches and stated that researchers “can achieve MMR [mixed methods research] integration through the philosophical, research design, methods and data collection, and/or during the interpretation and reporting levels of the research” (Moseholm & Fetters, 2017, p. 1). Below I outline how I implemented integration at the research design level.

In this study, integration occurred at the research design level by connecting, which is the process of linking the quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2015; Fetters et al., 2013). I used this approach at the design level in this study to determine the mixed methods research design. In the context of my secondary data analysis study, many connections were already established. Therefore, my focus was how to make connections between the quantitative and qualitative data that was already collected to answer new research questions. Integration through connecting was first used to link the quantitative and qualitative questions to determine what mixed methods design was most appropriate for this study. I began by making connections between the subsections in the quantitative survey and the major themes in the qualitative interview protocol.
As previously mentioned, the Street PAR Health Project team co-developed a 45-page comprehensive paper-based survey that focused on participant’s relationships with the following: (1) family, (2) violence, (3) employment and educational opportunity, (4) living/health conditions, (5) local leadership (e.g., religious leaders, policy makers, and service providers), (6) law enforcement, and (7) community re-entry from prison. Furthermore, the structure of the interview included both open- and closed-ended questions regarding the following 12 themes: (1) demographic and community, (2) family, (3) street life and structural violence, (4) street masculinity and street femininity, (5) violence, (6) crime, (7) police, (8) education, (9) employment, (10) health, (11) political and civic leadership, and (12) religious leadership.

Then, I examined the survey items and interview questions in the education sections by creating a table to see if any of the items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale and interview questions were similar. I began by putting the survey items and interview questions side-by-side (see Table 6, Step 1), and then I grouped similar quantitative and qualitative questions together (see Table 6, Step 2). Although some of the survey items could be included in multiple groupings, for the purpose of this process, I only included the items once. Based on the number of links that I made between the two strands of data, I determined that there was enough commonality and linkage between the two and therefore moved forward with the Attitudes Toward Education scale and education interview questions.
Table 6  Process of Linking the Quantitative Survey Questions and the Qualitative Interview Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Survey Questions</th>
<th>Qualitative Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People basically get fair treatment in the United States, no matter who they are.</td>
<td>1. What grade did you reach in school? What is the educational status of your siblings, children and parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the United States, a “low-income” student has the same chance of a good education as a “wealthy” student.</td>
<td>2. How would you describe public education or schools for youth in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We have the ability to change the government if we don’t like what it is doing.</td>
<td>3. What were your experiences in school or with the educational system? What kinds of positive or negative experiences did you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The government doesn’t really care what people like my family and I think.</td>
<td>4. What was valuable or enjoyable about those experiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.</td>
<td>5. What type of education do poor Black youth receive in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.</td>
<td>6. In what ways do students from your neighborhood take school seriously?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.</td>
<td>7. Do they receive a quality education in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I cared a lot about my clothes or how I was dressed in high school.</td>
<td>8. How do teachers treat poor Black youth from the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometimes I didn’t voice my opinion in high school because I worried that my friends or classmates would criticize me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My teachers really knew and understood me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers believe that all students can achieve high levels if they try.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Quantitative and qualitative questions grouped together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative Survey Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These reflect similar questions asked in the demographic characteristics section of the survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Interview Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What grade did you reach in school? What is the educational status of your siblings, children and parents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How would you describe public education or schools for...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. A student’s wealth or poverty affects how teachers treat them.
20. Students were encouraged to take leadership positions in my high school (e.g. Class President).
21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building.
22. Honors and Advanced Placement students think they are smarter than other people.
23. Most students in special education get the help they need.
24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork.
25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.
26. Money has a lot to do with who goes to or attends college.
27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.
28. My parent(s)/guardian(s) had a hard time paying for what I needed as a child.
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.
30. I felt safe at my high school.
31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.
32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.
33. In my high school, it was important to have name brand clothing.

9. In what ways do teachers respect students from the Westside/Northside?
10. Are poor Black children from these Westside/Northside prepared for college?
6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.
11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.
20. Students were encouraged to take leadership positions in my high school (e.g. Class President).
21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building.
23. Most students in special education get the help they need.
24. I was challenged in high school by my coursework.
25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.
27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.

8. I cared a lot about my clothes or how I was dressed in high school.
10. Sometimes I didn’t voice my opinion in high school because I worried that my friends or classmates would criticize me.
30. I felt safe at my high school.
31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.
32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.
33. In my high school, it was important to have name brand clothing.

9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.

5. What type of education do poor Black youth receive in the Westside/Northside?
7. Do they receive a quality education in the Westside/Northside?

3. What were your experiences in school or with the educational system? What kinds of positive or negative experiences did you have?
4. What was valuable or enjoyable about those experiences?

6. In what ways do students from your neighborhood take school seriously?

8. How do teachers treat poor Black youth from the Westside/Northside?
9. In what ways do teachers respect students from the
16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.
17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.
18. Teachers believe that all students can achieve high levels if they try.
19. A student’s wealth or poverty affects how teachers treat them.
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.

7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.
26. Money has a lot to do with who goes to or attends college.

8. Westside/Northside?
10. Are poor Black children from these Westside/Northside prepared for college?

After making those decisions, I needed to determine what type of mixed methods design to implement. During this process, I examined the possibility of implementing a convergent, exploratory sequential, and explanatory sequential design. I chose to implement an explanatory sequential mixed methods design in order to use the qualitative findings to help explain and provide nuance to the quantitative findings. The education data for the quantitative strand was self-report data related to attitudes toward schooling and the qualitative strand was data related to participant’s lived experiences related to schooling. Therefore, an explanatory sequential mixed methods design was the most appropriate given that the participant’s lived experiences could be used to help explain and provide nuance to their self-reported attitudes. Furthermore, this design was the most feasible for this dissertation because it allowed me to use findings from the quantitative findings to purposefully sample two age cohorts of street-identified Black American girls and women for the qualitative phase.

Although the primary data was collected using a convergent mixed methods design, I chose not to implement this design because of its data collection processes
and feasibility. In a convergent design, researchers collect quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously and then merge them. Typically, this design involves collecting data that are complementary in that they are about the same phenomena (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). I decided this design was not appropriate given that the two strands of education data are about related, but different phenomena (i.e., attitudes and experiences). Furthermore, based on the available data, the convergent design was not as feasible for this dissertation because of the number of the qualitative interview participants that would have to be coded ($N = 50$).

I also chose not to implement an exploratory sequential design because of its data collection processes (Ivankova et al., 2006). An exploratory sequential design is a two-phase design researchers collect and analyze qualitative data and then recruit participants to conduct quantitative data collection based on the qualitative results. This design is useful for developing a new instrument, treatment, or theory (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Since this study is a secondary data analysis, the quantitative data was already collected. Therefore, I did not have the ability to develop a new instrument, treatment, or theory based on the qualitative findings and then test the product in the quantitative phase.

**Research Design**

I employed an exploratory sequential mixed methods design using secondary data from the Street PAR Health Project. An explanatory sequential mixed methods design occurs in a sequential order and consists of two phases (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Figure 2 displays the sequential diagram for this study including the research questions for each phase of the research design. In the first phase, a quantitative phase, of the study, numeric data from the Attitudes Toward Education
scale was analyzed to examine differences in self-reported attitudes toward schooling across four age cohorts of street-identified Black American girls and women. Then, the results of the quantitative analysis were used to inform the purposeful sampling of participants for the second phase. In the second phase, a qualitative phase, of the study, semi-structured interview data were coded to develop an in-depth understanding of the lived schooling experiences of participants, and to explore differences and similarities in their schooling experiences. Then, the aim of the mixed methods analysis was to integrate findings from the two phases to determine how the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women help to explain and add additional insight and nuance to their self-reported attitudes toward schooling.
In mixed methods research, there are notions that are used to discuss the features and flow of mixed methods designs (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Morse, 1991). These notions are used to indicate the relative priority or importance of the two methods within the mixed methods framework to answer the study’s research questions (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Leech &
Prioritized methods are generally indicated by the use of uppercase letters notions (i.e., QUAN and QUAL), while less prioritized methods are generally indicated by the use of lowercase letters notions (i.e., quan and qual). The notions also indicate the study design by using a plus sign (+) to indicate when the methods occur at the same time and by using an arrow ( → ) to indicate when methods occur sequentially (Johnson & Christensen, 2017; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Typically, in an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, the quantitative phase is given priority because it is the first phase and is represented using the following notations, QUAN → qual. The “QUAN” signifies priority for the quantitative phase of the study because it is the second phase and the “qual” signifies a lesser priority (Ivankova et al., 2006). Although this study implemented an explanatory sequential design, priority was given to the qualitative strand and lesser priority to the quantitative strand as shown in the following notation, quan → QUAL. The qualitative strand consisted of semi-structured interviews with participants to gather rich, in-depth information and represented a major aspect of the data collection and analysis for this study. Prioritizing the qualitative strand has been used in previous explanatory sequential mixed methods studies (e.g., Ivankova et al., 2006; Sanders, 2021).

**Research Paradigm**

In mixed methods research, a framework is needed to demonstrate how philosophical assumptions fit into the research design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). For this study, I employed Morgan’s (2007) definition of paradigms as “systems of beliefs and practices that influence how researchers select both the questions they study and methods that they use to study them” (p. 49). Paradigms are ways of looking at the world, and therefore are often called worldviews (Mertens, 2015). Paradigms are
generally characterized by the following four basic belief systems: (1) axiology, the nature of ethical behavior; (2) ontology, the nature of reality; (3) epistemology, the nature of knowledge in relation to the research and participants; and (4) methodology, the approach to systematic inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 2005).

The use of paradigms (also referred to as worldviews) in mixed methods research has been debated extensively in the field (e.g., Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016; Shannon-Baker, 2016). Arguments in the field over the past four decades have emerged suggesting that quantitative and qualitative methodologies could not be merged because of the incompatibility of the paradigms (Howe, 1988). This resulted in what is called the paradigm wars (Gage, 1989). During the paradigm wars, a primary focus was on the difference between quantitative and qualitative approaches (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) and thus argued that researchers must take an “either-or-position” (Johnson & Christensen, 2017, p. 31). However, many researchers have rejected the incompatibility thesis arguing that it failed to take into account the thoughtful and creative ways that mixing assumptions, ideas, and methods could support new insight (Johnson & Christensen, 2017). They began advocating for the use of philosophical positions that posit that both quantitative and qualitative research are important and can be mixed in a single study (Cronenberg & Headley, 2019).

I situate my work within the transformative paradigm. The transformative paradigm builds upon the belief systems and assumptions identified by Guba and Lincoln (2005). The paradigm emerged from scholars who expressed concerns that research being conducted within the dominant paradigms were not accounting for and representing individual’s experiences with oppression. As a result, these scholars called for the need to be more explicit about how researchers address issues of power

The transformative paradigm is rooted in the acknowledgement that inequities and social injustices are pervasive, and that research should play an explicit role in identifying and addressing discrimination and oppression-based factors such as gender, race, ethnicity, age, religion, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. Researchers who utilize this worldview often examine systems of privilege and power dynamics and how these contribute to inequities in contexts such as schools. This research should move beyond generating knowledge by promoting an activist stance on the issues being researched (Mertens, 2010, 2015).

The transformative paradigm places priority on axiological beliefs as the guiding force for ethical research. These beliefs include respecting cultural norms, promoting human rights and social justice, and engaging in transparency and reciprocity throughout the research process. Research conducted within this paradigm generally involves participants in aspects of the research process (Mertens, 2009). The ontological beliefs recognize that there are multiple versions of reality based on one’s social positioning. This paradigm emphasizes the importance of different perspectives and the consequences of privileging certain versions over others (Mertens, 2009, 2015). The epistemological beliefs recognize that knowledge is historically and socially situated and shaped by personal characteristics, individual experiences, and community affiliations. This paradigm posits that privileged groups, such as researchers in academic institutions, have been given a greater say in constructing knowledge, and therefore there is a need to address issues of power and trust between
researchers and the “researched” and involve participants throughout the study process (Mertens, 2009).

The transformative paradigm has been used with a variety of methodologies including mixed methods research (Buck et al., 2009; Sweetman et al., 2010), qualitative research (Hesse-Biber, 2014), quantitative research (Garcia et al., 2018), and PAR (T. M. Brown, 2016; Hitchens, 2020; Payne, 2013). Regardless of the methodology chosen, Mertens (2007) states:

There should be an interactive link between the researcher and the participants in the definition of the problem, methods should be adjusted to accommodate cultural complexity, power issues should be explicitly addressed, and issues of discrimination and oppression should be recognized. (p. 216)

The transformative paradigm is an appropriate worldview for my mixed methods research dissertation because of its alignment with the primary data collection method, Street PAR, and the guiding theoretical framework, CRF. The assumptions of the transformative paradigm align with principles of Street PAR (Baum et al., 2006; Mertens, 2007, 2009; Payne, 2013, 2017; Payne & Bryant, 2018). For example, transformative research and Street PAR Projects should involve community members in all aspects of the research process, build rapport and trust with participants to improve the validity of the data, and privilege the experiences and worldviews of participants (Mertens, 2009; Payne, 2017; Payne & Bryant, 2018). Furthermore, transformative researchers and Street PAR Projects should develop an understanding of the participants’ culture and provide transparency as well as incentives for participants. Both require action-based responses and a social justice lens through all phases of the research study (Mertens, 2007, 2009; Payne, 2017; Payne & Bryant, 2018).
However, given this alignment with the transformative paradigm and Street PAR, it must be noted that this secondary data analysis departs from some of the epistemological commitments tied to PAR. For example, I was not involved in the interviews and therefore not able to build rapport or trust with participants, and it was not possible to involve the Street PAR Associates in this process since the original project had ended. This misalignment is addressed in further detail in relation to the research process and the steps that I have taken to address this (see Researcher Positionality).

In addition, the transformative paradigm is also an appropriate worldview for this research because of its similarities and compatibility with CRF. Philosophical worldviews impact the use of theoretical frameworks as theories themselves describe some aspect of reality and are considered to be nested within paradigms (Mertens et al., 2010). Researchers who situate their work within the transformative paradigm often use critical theories such as CRT (Ladson-Billings, 2000), feminist theory (Hesse-Biber, 2014), queer theory (Mertens et al., 2008), disability theory (Mertens & McLaughlin, 2004; Sullivan, 2009), and indigenous theory (Chilisa, 2012; Cram & Mertens, 2015). The transformative paradigm and CRF both address discrimination and oppression based on factors such as gender, race, ethnicity, age, religion, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status (Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010; Mertens, 2009). They also center the lives and experiences of groups who have been marginalized (Crenshaw, 1993; Mertens, 2009, 2015; Wing, 2003), and CRF focuses more specifically on Black women.
Phase I: Quantitative

The first phase of this explanatory sequential mixed methods research study is outlined below.

Participants

For the quantitative phase of the study, a total of 276 street-identified Black American girls and women were included. All of the street-identified Black American girls and women who completed a survey as part of the Street PAR Health Project were included in this study.

Data Collection

As a graduate research assistant working under the supervision of one of the Co-PIs of the Street PAR Health Project, I became a member of the Street PAR Health Project team in Fall 2018. From then until Summer 2019, my primary responsibilities on the team included coordinating and managing the cleaning and entering of the 770, 45-page long surveys. In order for the team to accomplish this, I worked with another graduate student to organize and lead training sessions to ensure that everyone was entering and cleaning data in Excel in a systematic manner. We also implemented a numbering system to de-identify every participant and to organize the surveys. I also personally entered and cleaned approximately 200 surveys. Once the team finished entering and cleaning the surveys, I converted the data from Excel to SPSS. As a result of my involvement, I became not only familiar with the quantitative data, but I also learned more about and became interested in notions of resilience and resiliency and the experiences and opportunities of street-identified populations. Furthermore, as a member of the team, I was granted access by the PI and one of the Co-PIs to use the data for my dissertation.
Attitudes Toward Education Scale

For this study, I used one scale from the survey, Attitudes Toward Education scale, and questions in the demographic inventory. This section of the survey is the only measure in the survey specifically related to experiences in school, and therefore was the best suited to answer my research questions. The Attitudes Toward Education scale consists of 33 items that examine participant’s attitudes toward their education and learning overall (Fine et al., 2004). This scale is a subset of a larger survey called the Opportunity Gap Survey (Fine et al., 2004). This scale was designed with researchers from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and youth from urban and suburban high schools as part of a PAR project. The researchers and youth worked together to understand and document youth’s educational opportunities and designed the Opportunity Gap Survey, which was then distributed to over 10,000 youth from 15 suburban and urban school districts (Fine et al., 2004). The following are the 33 items from this scale:

1. People basically get fair treatment in the United States, no matter who they are.
2. In the United States, a “low-income” student has the same chance of a good education as a “wealthy” student.
3. We have the ability to change the government if we don’t like what it is doing.
4. The government doesn’t really care what people like my family and I think.
5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.
6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.
7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.

8. I cared a lot about my clothes or how I was dressed in high school.

9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.

10. Sometimes I didn’t voice my opinion in high school because I worried that my friends or classmates would criticize me.

11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.

12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.

13. My teachers really knew and understood me.

14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.

15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.

16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.

17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.

18. Teachers believe that all students can achieve high levels if they try.

19. A student’s wealth or poverty affects how teachers treat them.

20. Students were encouraged to take leadership positions in my high school (e.g. Class President).

21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building.

22. Honors and Advanced Placement students think they are smarter than other people.

23. Most students in special education get the help they need.

24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork.

25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.
26. Money has a lot to do with who goes to or attends college.

27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.

28. My parent(s)/guardian(s) had a hard time paying for what I needed as a child.

29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.

30. I felt safe at my high school.

31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.

32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.

33. In my high school, it was important to have name brand clothing.

Participants responded to items using a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Items 4, 6, 10, 11, 17, 19, 22, 26, 28, 32, and 33 were reverse coded. Higher scores indicated more positive attitudes toward education.

Data Analysis

The purpose of the quantitative analyses was to address the quantitative research question: What are the group mean differences in street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling based on the Attitudes Toward Education subscales and critical items by age cohort? Given the exploratory nature of this study, the analyses were also intended to be exploratory as these are the first steps to exploring the Attitudes Toward Education scale. The following sections outline the three approaches used to explore the survey data: (a) demographic characteristics, (b) exploratory factor analysis, and (c) one-way analysis of variance.
Demographic Characteristics

I began the analysis by generating descriptive statistics for the demographic characteristics (i.e., frequency and percentage) that were reported by participants in the survey. The purpose of reporting these was to provide additional information about the sample including their age cohort, neighborhood, educational degree level, marital status, employment status, and whether they had children.

Exploring the Attitudes Toward Education Scale

The next step in the analysis was cleaning and exploring each item on the Attitudes Toward Education scale. I began by reverse coding the items that were identified as being reverse coded such that higher scores indicated more positive attitudes toward schooling. Then, I explored the data using pre-analysis diagnostic screenings and tests. The purpose of screening the data in these ways was to determine the adequacy of the data for running an exploratory factor analysis (described in detail below).

First, I examined the data to determine the participant sample size of the available secondary data set. The purpose of factor analysis is to explain the maximum amount of common variance in a correlation matrix and do so by using the smallest number of constructs (Fields, 2013; Kline, 2016). Having an adequate sample size is important for factor analysis because sample size impacts the reliability of correlation coefficients (MacCallum et al., 1999). Previous research has indicated that a sample size of 300 should provide a stable factor solution (e.g., Comrey & Lee, 1992; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012).

Next, I examined the data at the item level for missing values by running a missing value analysis in SPSS 28. Although the survey was paper-based and
therefore participants were able to skip questions, the missingness at the item level was expected to be minimal since members of the Street PAR Health Project team checked surveys for accuracy and consistency. Furthermore, they reviewed any missing data with participants to ensure that the participant did not miss any questions by accident. Missing data was reviewed and based on missingness, the number of participants who were dropped for the analysis were reported.

Then, I screened all 33 items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale for outliers. An outlier is a score that is very different from the rest of the data (Fields, 2013). To examine each item for outliers, I converted each item to a z-score, which represents scores in terms of a normal distribution with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 (Field, 2013). Converting the data to z-scores enabled me to use benchmarks for outliers that are not influenced by the means and standard deviations (Fields, 2013). The benchmarks were based on a normal distribution such that it would be expected that approximately 5% of the z-scores to have an absolute value > 1.96, 1% to have an absolute value > 2.58, and none of the values to be > 3.29 (Field, 2013).

Then, I examined each item on the scale for normality. The assumption of normality is that the sampling distribution of the mean is normal (Fields, 2013). To assess normality, I visualized the data using P-P plots to compare the distribution of mean scores to that of a normal distribution (i.e., the value that would be expected if the data is normally distributed; Fields, 2013). The data will form an approximate straight line if the data are normal and departures from that line indicate potential non-normality. To provide additional information regarding the assumption of normality, I also examined each item’s values of skewness and kurtosis. Positive values of skewness indicate that there are many low scores in the distribution, while negative
values of skewness show that there are many high scores in a distribution. Positive values of kurtosis indicate that the distribution is pointy and heavy-tailed, while negative values of kurtosis indicate that the distribution is flat and light-tailed (Fields, 2013). I converted the values of skewness and kurtosis to z-scores and examined the results for values > 1.96, which means that the resulting score is statistically significantly different from 0 (i.e., normal) at a .05 threshold. Items that were statistically significant indicate that the item likely does not meet the assumption of normality.

Next, I tested the items for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is when variables are correlated very highly with each other. A general rule is that variables are highly correlated when $r > .8$. When variables are multicollinear, that means that they contain redundant information and do not need to be included in the analysis (Fields, 2013). In order to test for multicollinearity, I ran polychoric correlations and scanned the matrix for correlations > .80. Polychoric correlations were the most appropriate because the items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale were based on a 4-point Likert scale (i.e., ordinal responses) from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Running a factor analysis using polychoric correlations is well-suited for this analysis of item-level variables (Flora et al., 2012). As compared to Pearson correlations, factor analysis using polychoric correlations produce superior results (i.e., more accurate factor loading estimates), especially when the response categories are five or less (e.g., 4-point Likert scale; DiStefano, 2002; Flora et al., 2012). Simulation studies have demonstrated that factor analysis using polychoric correlations is superior when analyzing categorical data, especially when the data has strong skew or kurtosis (Gilley & Uhlig, 1993; Holgado-Tello et al., 2010; Homer & O’Brien, 1988).
Furthermore, running a factor analysis with polychoric correlations is the most appropriate because it specifies a non-linear relationship (Flora et al., 2012).

After cleaning and exploring the data, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to examine the underlying factor structure of the 33-item Attitudes Toward Education scale. I ran the analysis in Mplus Version 8.6 because of its ability to model EFAs using categorical data (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017). An EFA is an analysis used to identify clusters of variables, referred to as factors. These clusters of variables correlate highly with one another and are relatively independent from other clusters (Field, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In addition to an EFA, there is another type of factor analysis called confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). An EFA is best for the early stages of research, and it can provide the initial steps to identifying any clusters of variables, while a CFA is a more advanced statistical technique that is best for the later stages of research to test theories about latent processes (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Therefore, I ran an EFA because this was an exploratory study, and this is the early stages of research examining the properties of the Attitudes Toward Education scale for street-identified Black American girls and women. Also, the focus of this study was not related to testing theories regarding latent processes.

In order to obtain model parameter estimates, standard error estimates, and overall model fit statistics, I employed the weighted least squares mean and variance adjusted (WLSMV) estimation (Muthén et al., 1997). The WLSMV estimator was designed specifically for small to moderate sample sizes, and it has shown to yield accurate parameter estimates, standard error estimates, and overall model fit statistics for ordinal data with nonnormal distributions and sample sizes ranging from 100 to 1,000 (Byrne, 2012; Flora & Curran, 2004). The WLSMV estimator handles missing
data using pairwise deletion, such that participants were dropped from the analysis if they had missing data for one or more of the items (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2013).

In addition, the EFA was run using Mplus’s default GEOMIN (oblique) factor rotation (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017). Factor rotation is a technique used to help discriminate between factors (Fields, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to Fields (2013), “If we visualize our factors as an axis along which variables can be plotted, then factor rotation effectively rotates these axes such that variables are loaded maximally to only one factor” (p. 679). I used an oblique rotation, as compared to an orthogonal rotation, because this rotation allows factors to correlate with one another (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). This was an appropriate rotation because given that the items forming the factors are from the same scale and were written to examine attitudes toward schooling, potential factors would likely be correlated with one another. Therefore, I would not expect their underlying dimension to be independent of one another.

After running an EFA, I examined the output to determine if factors should be retained, and if so, how many factors. This is one of the most critical decisions in an EFA (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Preacher et al., 2013). First, I examined model fit indices, such as the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990) and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; Bentler, 1995; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1986). Model fit indices are not significance tests, but rather are measures of model-data correspondence (Kline, 2016). They indicate how well the data fits the model. Then, I also examined common criteria for factor retention, such as examining eigenvalues (Kaiser, 1974) and creating a scree plot (Cattell, 1966). I used multiple criteria for determining factor retention because using only one can lead to the under
or overestimation of the number of true factors (Henson & Roberts, 2006; Velicer et al., 2000; Zwick & Velicer, 1986). I did not use other common criteria such as minimum average parcels (Velicer, 1976) or Glorfeld’s (1995) extension of parallel analysis (Horn, 1965) because neither are available in Mplus with categorical data.

After running the EFA and examining the results, I had to make a decision about my next steps. While making this determination, I identified the following potential outcomes:

First potential outcome: There was a discernible factor structure with cluster variables that were highly correlated with one another and were relatively independent of one another. In this instance, I decided that I would run a separate reliability analysis for each factor to assess factor consistency which would result in a Cronbach’s alpha (α; Field, 2013). Then, I would create a continuous variable for each factor by calculating a sum score for each participant.

Second potential outcome: There was no discernable factor structure, indicating there were no cluster variables that were highly correlated. In this scenario, I decided that I would collaborate with committee members to create subscales and to identify critical items by selecting a combination of individual items and groups of items from the scale that represent key themes and are aligned with the qualitative questions, the literature, and my theory. Similar to the scenario above, I would run a separate reliability analysis for each subscale to assess factor consistency which would result in a Cronbach’s alpha (α; Field, 2013). Then, I would create a sum score for each participant and explore each subscale and critical item in terms of central tendency and dispersion. In the Exploratory Factor Analysis section in the Results below, I describe the outcome and steps taken based on the findings.
Analysis of Group Differences

The next step in the analysis was cleaning and exploring each subscale and critical item using pre-analysis diagnostic screenings and tests. The purpose of screening the data in these ways was to determine the adequacy of the data for running a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA; described in detail below).

First, I examined the subscales and critical items for outliers. Outliers can significantly alter the mean scores on a measure and therefore impact the results of a one-way ANOVA. To examine the data for outliers, I converted the sum scores on each subscale and critical item to z-scores, and then used the same process as detailed above (see Exploring the Attitudes Toward Education Scale section).

Then, I examined the subscales and critical items for normality. The assumption of normality is that the sampling distribution of the mean is normal (Fields, 2013). In terms of normality, when examining data based on groups (i.e., age cohorts), each of the groups must be screened to examine whether they met the normality assumption (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). To assess normality, I used the same process (i.e., P-P plots and values of skewness and kurtosis) as detailed above (see Exploring the Attitudes Toward Education Scale section).

Next, I examined the subscales and critical items to test for homogeneity of variance. When examining groups of data, this assumption is that the variance of the outcome data is roughly equal for each of the groups (Fields, 2013). To test the assumption of homogeneity of variance, I ran the Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variances (Levene, 1960). Levene’s test examines the null hypothesis which is that the variances are the same in each group. If the results indicate that the variances across the groups were not equal, and therefore violating the homogeneity of variance assumption, I reported Welch’s F, instead of the F-ratio that is usually presented for a
one-way ANOVA. Welch’s F (Welch, 1951) is an alternative F-ratio that was derived to be robust to violations of homogeneity of variance (Fields, 2013). The F-ratio can be biased when group sizes are unequal and when the larger groups have the biggest variance, and these biases can lead to more conservative F-ratios (Fields, 2013).

After cleaning and exploring the data, I conducted a series of one-way ANOVAs to test for group mean differences across the four age cohorts. An ANOVA is an appropriate analysis to compare several means when there is one categorical independent predictor with multiple levels (i.e., age cohort) and a continuous outcome variable (i.e., sum scores; Field, 2003). The number of ANOVAs that I ran was determined by the results of the EFA and the two subsequent potential outcomes (reference the Exploring the Attitudes Toward Education Scale section above):

First potential outcome: There was a discernible factor structure with cluster variables that were highly correlated with one another and were relatively independent of one another. In this instance, I decided that I would determine differences among age cohorts using a sum of mean scores for each factor. Each factor retained from the EFA would represent a dependent variable and determine the number of ANOVAs that would need to be conducted.

Second potential outcome: There was no discernable factor structure, indicating there were no cluster variables that were highly correlated. In this instance, I decided that I would determine differences among age cohorts using sum of mean scores or item means from the subscales and critical items. The number of subscales and critical items identified would each represent a dependent variable and determine the number of ANOVAs that would need to be conducted.
Given the exploratory nature of this study, I did not have specified a priori predictions about the findings. Therefore, I included post hoc tests for the analysis. Post hoc tests are pairwise comparisons that are designed to compare different combinations of groups (Fields, 2013). After running the series of one-way ANOVAs, for overall tests that were statistically significant, post hoc tests were used to identify if there are specific group means that are driving the statistical significance.

Since I ran multiple one-way ANOVAs, there was an inflated likelihood of a Type I error. A Type I error is when there appears to be a genuine effect in the population when there is not (Field, 2013). I used the conventional criteria, so the probability of committing a Type I error was .05 or 5% (i.e., \(\alpha\)), and as a result, the probability of not committing a Type I error was .95 or 95% for each test. I ran multiple ANOVAs, and each test increased the probability of making a Type I error. Therefore, I adjusted the level of significance for each individual ANOVA so that the Type I error rate across all comparisons remains at .05. The error rate across multiple tests conducted on the same data is known as a familywise error rate. The most popular method to control the familywise error rate is known as the Bonferroni correction. Therefore, I decided to use the most common criterion for significance which was to divide alpha by the number of comparisons (Field, 2013). For example, if the results from the EFA revealed that there were three underlying factors that make up the Attitudes Toward Education scale, then the criterion for significance would be .05/3=.016. The tradeoff for controlling the familywise error rate is that there is a loss of statistical power (Field, 2013).

A power analysis suggests that this study was adequately powered. Power is the probability of detecting statistical significance if there really is an effect (Field,
Power is related to a Type II error which is when there appears to be no effect in the population when in fact there is. Cohen (1992) suggests that a reasonable probability for committing a Type II error is .20 or 20%, known as the β-level. The power of a test is expressed as $1 - \beta$. In order to calculate the power, I performed an a priori power analysis for a one-way ANOVA in the G*Power software program (Faul et al., 2007). The significance level (i.e., $\alpha$) was set to .05 and power (i.e., $1 - \beta$) was set to .80, indicating an 80% probability of obtaining a statistically significant $p$-value if those differences were present in the population. In the absence of benchmark effect size data for this population, I estimated a medium expected difference for this sample; therefore, the effect size was set to $f = .25$ (Cohen, 1988). An effect size is an objective and generally standardized measure of the magnitude of an observed effect (Cohen, 1988; Field, 2013). Results from the power analysis demonstrated that the overall sample size would need to be 180 participants and each of the four groups would need to have 45 participants each. The sample size for this study was $N = 276$ and each group exceeded 45 participants. This indicates that the study was adequately powered to detect statistical significance if there really was an effect.

Age Cohort Selection Process: Connecting the Quantitative and Qualitative Phases

As described above in the Crafting a Mixed Methods Research Design Using Secondary Data section, another point of integration in mixed methods studies is at the methods level. In this study, integration at the methods level was also implemented by connecting the process of linking the quantitative and qualitative data by means of the sampling frame (Creswell, 2015; Fetters et al., 2013). In an explanatory sequential mixed methods study, connecting is implemented by selecting participants for the qualitative phase of the study based on quantitative findings (Ivankova et al., 2006;
Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). The participant selection process can be based on a variety of factors such as quantitative significant or non-significant results, outlier results, group differences, or confusing or surprising findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016).

In this study, the majority of participants’ survey responses were not able to be connected with their interviews. In other words, selecting individual participants for the qualitative phase based on their quantitative findings was not an option. However, what was an option was selecting age cohorts for the qualitative phase based on their quantitative findings. Therefore, the purpose of this connecting phase of the study was to determine which age cohorts should be examined in-depth during the second phase, a qualitative phase, of the study based on the quantitative findings. For this study, I was interested in selecting two age cohorts that were different from one another based on significant findings, effect sizes, mean differences, and interesting findings.

Phase II: Qualitative

The second phase of this explanatory sequential mixed methods research study is outlined below.

**Participants**

For the qualitative phase, the sample was influenced by the quantitative findings. Therefore, after analyzing the quantitative data, I used the findings from the series of one-way ANOVAs to purposefully sample participants based on age cohort. Specifically, I employed maximal variation sampling, which is a sampling strategy used to choose participants who hold different perspectives regarding the same phenomenon (Patton, 1990). Maximal variation sampling is often used in qualitative
research to capture common patterns and variations in the participants’ experiences (Patton, 1990). This was an appropriate sampling method given my interest in understanding similarities and differences in the participants’ experiences.

Data Collection

As previously mentioned, as a graduate research assistant working with one of the Co-PIs of the Street PAR Health Project, I became a member of the Street PAR Health Project team in Fall 2018. In addition to my primary responsibilities with the quantitative data, I also supported the qualitative research by providing the camera and tripod to Co-Project Director/Lead Researcher before she conducted interviews, and I also uploaded and submitted the video recordings of the interviews to Rev, the transcription service used to transcribe interviews. As a result of my involvement and interest in the study, I was granted access by the PI and one of the Co-PIs to use the qualitative data for my dissertation.

Interview Questions

The structure of the interviews included both open- and closed-ended questions regarding the following 12 themes: (1) demographic and community, (2) family, (3) street life and structural violence, (4) street masculinity and street femininity, (5) violence, (6) crime, (7) police, (8) education, (9) employment, (10) health, (11) political and civic leadership, and (12) religious leadership. I explored all of the questions in the Education section, which included the following:

1. What grade did you reach in school? What is the educational status of your siblings, children and parents?

2. How would you describe public education or schools for youth in the Westside/Northside?
3. What were your experiences in school or with the educational system? What kinds of positive or negative experiences did you have?

4. What was valuable or enjoyable about those experiences?

5. What type of education do poor Black youth receive in the Westside/Northside?

6. In what ways do students from your neighborhood take school seriously?

7. Do they receive a quality education in the Westside/Northside?

8. How do teachers treat poor Black youth from the Westside/Northside?

9. In what ways do teachers respect students from the Westside/Northside?

10. Are poor Black children from the Westside/Northside prepared for college?

The interviews were semi-structured and therefore questions were asked in different ways. For example, instead of asking a participant “Are poor Black children from the Westside/Northside prepared for college?”, the question might have been phrased like, “Do you believe that you were prepared for college?” Therefore, participants responded to questions about schools and education in their community, for their children, as well as their own experiences.

Data Analysis

The purpose of the qualitative analysis was to explore the following qualitative research questions:

2. In what ways do street-identified Black American girls and women describe their schooling experiences?

3. In what ways are street-identified Black American girls and women’s schooling experiences different and similar across age cohorts?
I conducted the analysis of the qualitative data in MAXQDA 2022, which is a qualitative software package that also supports mixed methods analysis (VERBI Software, 2019). MAXQDA is a user-friendly software that enabled me to edit text when there was a mistake in the transcripts as well as enabled me to log memos (see Qualitative Integrity section below for more detail).

I analyzed the qualitative interview data using directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Directed content analysis is both an inductive and deductive approach to qualitative analysis. As such, I began the analysis by developing pre-identified categories based on theory, and then I allowed categories and names of categories to arise from the data (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Mayring, 2014). Directed content analysis was appropriate for this study because it enabled me to incorporate principles of CRF to help understand the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women relative to their race, gender, class, and age. For the purposes of my work, I used codes related to the following CRF principles: (a) multiple identities of Black girls and women; (b) multiple forms of oppression based on gender, race, and class; (c) consequences of those forms of oppression; and (d) legal and social policies that oppress street-identified Black American girls and women and their families. I looked for evidence of the girls and women’s experiences being related to their multiple identities based on gender, race, and class as well as evidence of legal and social policies that oppressed them in the school context (e.g., zero-tolerance policies). Examples of deductive codes from participant interviews related to CRF included multiple identities, consequences of oppression, legal and social policies, and Black womanhood.
Coding proceeded in multiple steps. I began data analysis by reading and listening to each interview in order to immerse myself into the participants’ voiced perspectives (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Tesch, 1990). Then, I consulted with my advisor to develop main categories using CRF principles, identified above, and developed definitions of these predetermined categories. I then utilized initial coding by using these predetermined coding categories (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). As I continued this process of initial coding, I engaged in open coding by identifying any text that I was not able to categorize using these predetermined categories. I labeled these codes as they emerged directly from the text and determined if they represented a subcategory of an existing code or a new category (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). In order to answer the second qualitative research question comparing and contrasting experiences across age cohorts, I completed these coding steps twice. I began with initial and open coding for all of the participant interviews in the 45-54 year old age cohort first, and then engaged in initial and open coding of the interview data for the 25-34 year old age cohort. This enabled me to develop initial codes within each age cohort and to document the similarities and differences related to the codes that emerged.

After engaging in this initial round of coding with all of the participant interviews in both age cohorts, I went back to the interview data to code again using the more comprehensive set of codes that I had developed. This second round was a vital step in the coding process because it allowed me to review each participant’s interview with the additional codes that I had generated since last coding their interview. During the second round of coding, I also engaged in focused coding where I reviewed all of the codes and merged relevant codes with others (Charmaz, 2014). Although focused coding is generally used in grounded theory analyses, it is a process
that can be used with other analyses, such as directed content analysis, as a method to categorize data (Saldaña, 2021). Throughout this process, themes began to emerge from the data related to participants’ racialized, gendered, and classed schooling experiences. I also created written memos for each of the interview participants that ranged in length from 1 to 5 pages. The memos included thoughts and reflections about their interviews as well as demographic information and themes that emerged from each interview.

**Trustworthiness**

In order to establish trustworthiness, I took steps to assess the *dependability* of the data. Dependability is the consistency and reliability of the findings given the data that was collected (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I used multiple strategies to enhance the dependability of the data. One strategy was to check all transcripts to ensure they did not contain any mistakes (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), and when I found mistakes, I updated the transcript to reflect these changes. The transcripts have been reviewed and cleaned by members of the Street PAR Health Project team, so mistakes in the transcripts were minimal.

In addition to dependability, I took steps to strengthen the *credibility* of the qualitative data. Credibility is based on determining whether the findings are credible, trustworthy, and accurate given the data being analyzed (Creswell & Miller, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). One strategy that I used to enhance the accuracy of the qualitative findings is to actively engage in critical self-reflection throughout the research process. I used this strategy, known as *reflexivity*, to reflect on and monitor my potential biases and predispositions that I bring to the analysis and interpretation (Devine & Heath, 1999; Lincoln & Guba, 1982). In order to facilitate this reflexivity, I
wrote memos to record my thoughts and feelings throughout the research process. Memos are most often associated with grounded theory research, but they can be used as a valuable tool in all qualitative approaches (Birks et al., 2008). I also dedicated space and time during my regular dissertation meetings with my dissertation chair to be reflexive and share my memos and notes with her (Mauthner & Doucet, 2003; see Research Positionality section below). Another strategy that I employed to enhance the accuracy of the qualitative findings is peer debriefing (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The peer debriefer has been described as the “devil’s advocate”, meaning it is an individual who asks questions about the researcher and research findings as an external check of the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For this study, my dissertation chair served as my peer debriefer. We met regularly during the qualitative analysis and interpretation phases of my dissertation research to extensively discuss progress on the analysis and the research findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). When we met, she also asked questions to help me understand how my background and personal experiences could be impacting the findings and help minimize those biases (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Spall, 1998). I also engaged in conversations/debriefings with the other members of my dissertation committee, including the PI and Co-Project Director/Lead Researcher of the project when they were available.

**Researcher Positionality**

Reflexivity throughout the research process is important as our identities, background, and experiences shape this process. I identify as a white female who grew up in a middle-income home with two married parents in a predominantly white suburban town in Ohio. These visible aspects of my identity position me as a racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic outsider to the street-identified Black American girls and
women (Milner, 2007). I enter this work with my own interests in schooling and education in large part because of my own academic experiences and challenges in learning how to read. My grandma was actually the one who discovered that I could not read. In 3rd grade. One afternoon when I was “reading” a book to her, the word that I was supposed to be reading in the book was either “afternoon” and I said “morning” or the word was “morning” and I said “afternoon.” My grandma cannot remember, but either way, this made my grandma realize that I did not know how to read. My grandma told my mom who then advocated for me to get tested to see what was going on. The school tested my ability to read nonsense words, of which I could not read anyway, indicating that I indeed did not know how to read.

I spent the next year and a half working one-on-one with a reading specialist every day after school. This service was not actually provided by my school, so my parents paid $30 a week so that I could learn how to read. I eventually caught up in terms of reading the words on the page. However, even after a year and a half of one-on-one instruction, I still experienced significant reading and writing difficulties. During summers in high school, my parents paid for me to go to a learning center multiple times a week because my writing skills were “poor”, and I was in the 1% percentile for reading comprehension, meaning I did not comprehend anything that I read.

Furthermore, although at the time receiving all of these extra supports was upsetting and I did not like having to do them, I now have a much different perspective. I see how unique it was to have a grandma born in the 1930s and receive a bachelor’s degree in education. One of the reasons I was identified as having a reading disability was because of my grandma’s knowledge about reading. Then, once
my grandma figured this out, she told my mom who was able to advocate for me to get tested. Also, I did not know it then, but now I know 3rd grade is such an important year. This is the year where students transition from learning how to read to reading to learn. This is when students who have not received adequate support begin to fall behind. Most importantly, I now see and understand that my family’s financial and racial capital was a significant event and can be attributed to why I learned how to read and am where I am today. This is an example of my (and my family’s) racial privilege in a society that believes in the innocence and well-being of white girls and women.

I also know that my experiences in school were based on being a middle-class white female and have been afforded a myriad of invisible and unearned privileges along the way. I know now that I was perceived and treated differently than if I was a Black female. I was never put into special education classes, subjected to constant surveillance and perpetual discipline, or removed from school like all too many Black girls are. Instead, my elementary school teachers used to tell my mom “how nice I was” and “how helpful I was” in the classroom. I was raised to embody these normative constructs of white femininity and praised in the classroom for doing so. I was given the benefit of the doubt and always presumed “innocent.” I often think about how this entire scenario would have played out if it was a Black mom coming to school to advocate for her Black girl. How seriously would her concerns have been taken? Would they have immediately tested her daughter for a learning disability? Would she have had the money to pay for her daughter to learn how to read, especially given the pervasiveness of structural violence that disproportionately harms communities of color?
I began to make some of these connections and have a better understanding of the workings of these systems and structures of inequity while I was working as a college advisor in the Cleveland Public Schools to facilitate college access for my students who were predominantly Black and Brown. During my two years there, I built up trust through chats and check-ins with my students and this trust developed into us discussing race and white privilege and those became the forefront of our conversations. Whether it was in the context of filling out their FAFSA and their expected family contribution or the decision of whether to attend a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) or a Predominantly White Institution (PWI), we were talking about how whiteness and systems of oppression were impacting their lives. These conversations became prevalent after Tamir Rice was murdered by a white police officer in 2014 in Cleveland. This happened just down the road from the school I was working at. This extremely horrific murder of a 12-year-old Black boy ignited many conversations around these racial dynamics, and it made me realize just how deeply embedded racism and anti-Black violence is in our society.

In addition, I began to learn more about how structural violence impacted my students. Once, one of my Black female students came to my office after school; she wanted to talk. I thought it was going to be about her college applications, but instead she asked me what it was like to have a dad and a brother. She wanted to know what my dad and I as well as what my brother and I talked about and how I thought my life was being impacted by them. She said that she really wanted to know because the men in her family were no longer in her life. Due to blocked educational and employment opportunities, they turned to the streets to provide for their family and ended up being killed. This was not something I had ever thought about. As a white female from the
suburbs, the possibility of my brother or dad having to go to the streets to provide for
my family was not a part of my experience and due to my socioeconomic and racial
privilege this was a topic or area that I did not have to consider or confront—until she
brought this to my attention. My experiences as a college advisor combined with my
own educational experiences have drawn me towards research related to systems and
structures of inequity that disproportionately impact marginalized communities, in
particular Black communities given the continued and pervasive structural violence
and inequity that permeates every aspect of our society. I want my work to provide a
better understanding of these systems and structures to continue building on previous
scholarship while also working alongside those who also seek to dismantle and
redesign them as a way to promote equity in education. I also acknowledge that just in
the way that bell hooks (2000) described that “feminism is for everybody” as we all
stand to benefit from women’s access, for example, to preventative health care and
reproductive rights, equity in education for Black girls and women would mean
improvements for everybody, including me.

When I first joined the Street PAR team in 2018, some of the members viewed
me somewhat cautiously. They harbored possible distrust for white women both in the
academia and outside. This makes sense given the harm that white women have
cau sed Black folks such as the ways white women have and continue to exclude Black
women from women’s rights and feminist movements and the power white women
wield because of their white privilege that often goes unacknowledged and the
inherently exploitative nature of some white women’s work in academia. I also know
now that some of their cautious nature could be attributed to resiliency, one of the
most important aspects of this work, and the resulting harm that white women have
caused by using their own Eurocentric ideals to decide who is deemed resilient. Over time, my relationship on the team began to shift. I believe that part of this change could be attributed to the trust that the Co-PI and my advisor had established with the team, some of which was transferred over to me as her advisee. My funding was not tied directly to the project itself, so bringing me on the team was not a requirement but something she knew that I was interested in. I also believe that as time went on, the members began to see my commitment to the work and my eagerness to learn. I believe that as I gained their trust, this was also mirrored in my responsibilities on the team. I started out with tasks such as uploading qualitative interviews to a transcription service and ended with helping to lead the data management for the quantitative data by supervising the team as we entered and cleaned 770 surveys.

There was one moment in particular that stands out to me four years later. One afternoon, I went to the Center for Drug and Health Studies at UD for a Street PAR meeting and when I entered the room, only the PI, Dr. Yasser Payne and one of the project directors and Street PAR members, Darryl Chambers, affectionately referred to as Wolfie, were present, both Black American men. As I entered and said hello, Wolfie asked me, in what I interpreted as an upset tone of voice, if I had been in his office this week. I told him that of course I had because that’s where the surveys were located, and I was helping to manage the data so he said I could do so in his office. He quickly responded by saying that he did not give me permission and that I should not have been in there. I remember wracking my brain as fast I could to figure out when I thought he gave me that permission and began profusely apologizing. Meanwhile, the PI began laughing in the corner of the room and told me Wolfie was just kidding and suggested that I talk to Brooklynn about how “to stand up to” Wolfie and “not let him
talk to me like that.” As if on cue, another project director, Brooklynn, who identifies as a Black American woman, walked into the room and Yasser explained the situation. Brooklynn told me not to put up with that and to make sure I tell him to not talk to me like that. To this day, I’m not sure if Wolfie was testing me or just joking around but looking back on the situation I believe that this moment signified that I was a member of the team because it was a moment where I learned about the team’s culture and specifically how women and men on the team interact with one another in these types of situations. I believe they instilled in me this knowledge knowing that I was going to need it as a member of the team. These experiences and trust that I built with the team ultimately led me to being granted access to the data for my dissertation.

Throughout this research process, I have continued to reflect on the intersections of my race, gender, class, education, and lived experiences, and the ways in which my identities/positionalities informed my understanding of the participants’ lived schooling experiences. One area in particular that I continued to think about was the ways that using secondary data influenced my relationship with participants and the findings. Since I was not present in the interviews and therefore not involved in the initial data creation process, this presented some epistemological issues given my “distance” to the participants. I was not able to follow-up with participants to ensure that I was not misinterpreting their words during the interview or later on in the analysis. I was not a part of the trust building process. In order to overcome some of these issues, researchers have argued that collaboration between the researchers who conducted the interviews, and the secondary researcher is vitally important to the integrity of the interpretability of the qualitative data (Feldman & Shaw, 2018). Therefore, part of the data interpretation and analysis involved talking to the
researchers who conducted the interviews to help situate the data in its historical context. I also watched the videos of every interview in order to situate myself within the interview context and to be able to hear the participant’s voice and listen to their speech patterns as well as watch their facial expressions and body language. During this process, I realized that many of the women’s stories about their schooling included negative experiences and interactions with white female peers and white teachers and having me present in the interview might have influenced their comfort with sharing those.

In addition, I recognized and reflected on the implications of conducting research that highlights the experiences and attitudes of Black girls and women within the schooling context. I critically reflected on the implications of my positionality as a white woman conducting research with Black girls and women and using CRF as a framework. I was acutely cognizant of the ways that white women have continued to exclude Black girls and women and use whiteness to harm and oppress Black girls and women. In particular, I reflected on the ways that white women are complicit in the oppression of Black girls and women in the context of education. The majority of teachers in the United States are middle class, white women. They bring with them traditional standards of white femininity often forcing their expectations on Black girls to be passive, modest, silent, and selfless as well as considered “worth” protecting assuming they conform to these standards. Many Black girls reject the notion that they should uphold these white standards of femininity and instead are independent, assertive, and emotionally resilient. Due to the structural violence pervasive in their communities along with societal systems that are racialized, gendered, and classed, Black girls must navigate society differently. As a result, many white teachers tend to
view Black girl resistance as problematic. I thought about these aspects of identity in terms of the women’s stories when they talked about their white teachers and white female peers. Among other thoughts, I considered the ways that white girls, like myself, are taught to think that white femininity is normative, neutral, and the “ideal” way of moving through life.

I also reflected on these ideas as a white female researcher. Throughout this study, I have often asked myself, should I, as a white middle class female, be the person conducting this research study about the experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women? In what ways am I inflicting more harm or damage? I continue to grapple with these questions and am cognizant of these dynamics. The words of Dr. Evans-Winters and Dr. Esposito in their 2010 piece about CRF and Black girls in education resonate with me. They stated:

For the sake of clarity, it is probably important to note at this point that we are not suggesting that only minority women can or should research the educational issues affecting minority girls inside or outside of schools. At the very least, such a stance would be negligent, simply because there are enough social and educational problems confronting the social and emotional development of minority girls that we need allies on all fronts. Furthermore, to suggest that only other minority women are competent to research African American female students is shortsighted because there is much to learn from this student group that any researcher or educator, regardless of race, class, or gender, could learn from the resourcefulness and vitality of Black girls. (p. 15).

They argued that there “is a need for a coalition of educational researchers who seek to understand Black girls’ multiple realities” (p. 15). While they did affirm some of the questions that I have been asking myself as a white middle class female researcher, I also acknowledge that I have not wanted their words to make me complacent or less reflexive. Instead, I used their words as motivation to continue conducting high-quality research about street-identified Black American girls and
women’s lived schooling experiences, engaging in this reflexive process, and learning from the girls and women in this study. Learning from them about their adaptiveness, resilience, and “resourcefulness and vitality” (Evans-Winters & Esposito, 2010, p. 15).

I come to this work as a form of resistance, seeking to disrupt and reject notions that the needs of white girls and women are the needs of all girls and women and that white female teachers should be forcing their own standards of femininity on Black girls in schools. I am resisting and standing in opposition to white supremacy, white privilege, white saviorism, and deficit framings. I am resisting and standing in opposition to these systems and structures that I benefit from and trying to change these systems so that it is not just one racial group, white people, who benefit. I also acknowledge that there are other white women and men who have been and continue to do the work and resist these notions steeped in whiteness, such as Dr. Kate Slater, Dr. Bree Picower, Dr. Kristen Buras, and Dr. Benjamin Blaisdell (and many others).

I aim to stand in solidarity with the Black girls and women who have these experiences and acknowledge my identity as a white woman who is learning from, listening to, walking alongside, and advocating with Black girls and women who are and have always been doing the work. I also recognize the need to engage my own reflective and equity work around these dynamics. As a white woman fully entrenched in this system of whiteness, I know my work is not done. I am still learning and working as I do not want to be complicit in these systems nor do I wish to not acknowledge and recognize my privilege within these systems.

Mixed Methods Integrative Analysis

The purpose of the mixed methods analysis was to explore the following mixed methods research question:
4. In what ways does the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women explain their attitudes towards their schooling?

Integration at the interpretation and reporting level was implemented in two ways: integrating through narrative and integrating through joint displays (Fetters et al., 2013). Integrating through narrative involves describing the quantitative and qualitative findings within one report or a series of reports (Fetters et al., 2013). Specifically, I implemented a weaving approach to integration which involves presenting the quantitative and qualitative findings together based on a theme or concept (Fetters et al., 2013).

Furthermore, I also integrated by using a joint display. A joint display is a visual approach to the integration of the quantitative and qualitative findings where the results are presented in a table, figure, photo, or other representation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Fetters, 2020; Guetterman et al., 2015). The findings from this study are presented in a statistics-by-theme joint display where the joint display is organized by the quantitative subscales and critical items and the qualitative themes, and then I interpreted them all together by drawing meta-inferences (Fetters et al., 2013; Guetterman et al., 2015). Meta-inferences are insights that emerge from viewing the merged data in a joint display and are an important feature of mixed methods research (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

**Mixed Methods Strategies for Legitimation**

Mixed method researchers have begun to identify types of validity, referred to as legitimation, relevant to the integration of quantitative and qualitative data. Onwueboguizie and Johnson (2006) outlined nine types of mixed methods research validity, Johnson and Christensen (2017) added two additional types of legitimation,
and Perez and colleagues (2022) proposed one additional type of legitimation. Below, I describe two types of legitimation and the actions that I took to address them, when possible.

The first type of legitimation is **sequential legitimation** which is the extent to which the later phase of a sequential mixed methods design builds upon the initial phase. In an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, threats to this type of legitimation are when the qualitative follow-up questions do not explain quantitative results and when there is a failure to consider when the qualitative findings do not explain the quantitative results (Johnson & Christensen, 2017; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). This type of validity is generally addressed by designing qualitative follow-up questions that probe quantitative results. However, since I am using secondary data, these decisions were already made prior to the quantitative findings. The steps that I took to address this threat to validity was during the design process when I examined the data available and tried to determine whether I thought the qualitative questions might be able to probe potential qualitative findings.

The second type of legitimation is sample integration legitimation which is the extent to which the quantitative and qualitative samples were integrated. In an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, a threat to this type of legitimation is when the qualitative participants are not a subset of the quantitative participants (Johnson & Christensen, 2017; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). This threat to validity was minimized because the qualitative participants for the interview data were a subset of the quantitative participants for the survey data. In other words, all of the participants who were interviewed filled out a survey. Although the majority of the qualitative participants were a subset of the quantitative participants, it must be noted
that the two subsets could not be linked at the participant level (see Limitations section for further discussion).

**IRB Approval**

The Street PAR Health Project was approved through UD’s IRB. I was added to the IRB when I joined the team in 2018. As I was not making any modifications to the proposal or study nor was I collecting new data, my research questions were in line with the original topic/areas of research (i.e., education). As such, no additional approval from IRB was needed. Since this is a secondary data analysis, all storage and security of study materials have already been approved and have been implemented by the Street PAR Health Project team.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

Phase I: Quantitative Findings

The purpose of the quantitative phase of the study was to examine the self-reported attitudes toward schooling of street-identified Black American girls and women across four age cohorts. The results address the following quantitative research question:

1. What are the group mean differences in street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling based on the Attitudes Toward Education subscales and critical items by age cohort?

First, I report the demographic characteristics of the survey sample. Then, I describe the process of screening the data followed by an exploration of the underlying factor structure of the Attitudes Toward Education scale. Then, I describe the process of developing subscales and identifying critical items, followed by an analysis of group differences.

This is an exploratory study of secondary data. The secondary data was analyzed in a way that was not intended, and the Attitudes Towards Education scale has not been examined specifically with street-identified Black American girls and women. These analyses were conducted as exploratory and should be interpreted as such.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 7 provides overall demographic characteristics of the quantitative sample ($N = 276$). Demographic characteristics were generated from self-report survey data. Of the 276 participants, street-identified Black American girls and women between the
ages 16 to 24 represent 31.2% \( (n = 86) \) of the survey subsample, 25 to 34 represent 26.4% \( (n = 73) \), 35 to 44 represent 24.3% \( (n = 67) \), and 45 to 54 represent 18.1% \( (n = 50) \). Over half of the participants lived in the Northside \( (n = 148, 53.6\%) \) and approximately one-third lived in the Westside \( (n = 92, 33.3\%) \). In terms of education degree level, approximately half of the street-identified Black American girls and women in the study earned a high school diploma \( (n = 137, 49.6\%) \), followed by a GED \( (n = 58, 21.0\%) \), and a bachelor’s degree \( (n = 4, 1.4\%) \). See Table 7 for additional details about marital status, employment, and children.
Table 7  Quantitative Sample: Demographic Characteristics ($N = 276$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Degree Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single without a Significant Partner</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with a Significant Partner</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together (cohabitation)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law Marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married but Separated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and Looking for Work</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed and Not Looking for Work</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploring the Attitudes Toward Education Scale

Below, I describe the process I used to screen the Attitudes Toward Education scale to determine whether it met certain data assumptions prior to running to exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Then, based on the results, I provide a description about running the EFA using the Attitudes Toward Education scale, and then I describe the process of determining factor retention.

Data Screening

Prior to conducting an EFA, I cleaned and explored the data for the following: (a) sample size, (b) missing data, (c) outliers, (d) normality, and (e) multicollinearity (Fields, 2013; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The results from each of these screenings are presented below.

First, I examined the data to determine the participant sample size of the available secondary data set. The sample size in the secondary data set was 276, which is approaching the recommended sample size of 300.

Next, I examined the data at the item level for missing values by running a missing value analysis in SPSS 28. My analysis showed that there was a low rate of missing data at the item level for the Attitudes Toward Education scale. Only 20 participants omitted items on the scale and the participants omitted a maximum of two items for a total of 26 items. Across all 33 items, approximately 1 percent or less of the item responses were missing, see Table 8. Since 20 participants were missing one or more item responses, they were dropped from the analysis resulting in a new sample size of 256 for the EFA analysis.
Table 8  Summary of Missingness by Item from the Attitudes Toward Education Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Items with no missingness were omitted from the table.

Next, I screened each item on the Attitudes Toward Education scale for outliers. An outlier is a score that is very different from the rest of the data (Fields, 2013). Using the process outlined in the Methods section, the results demonstrated that there were no extreme outliers for any of the items on the scale. Therefore, I did not remove any participants from the dataset for having an outlier.

Then, I examined each item on the scale for normality. The assumption of normality is that the sampling distribution of the mean is normal (Fields, 2013). Using the process described in the Methods section, my review of the P-P plots showed that the majority of the points on the plot did not fall on the line, indicating that the actual
distribution of the item was not what would be expected if the data was normally distributed. See Figure 3 below for an example of when points on the plot did not fall on the line.

![Normal P-P Plot](image)

**Figure 3**  Example P-Plot from Question on Attitudes Toward Education Scale

For additional insight, I examined each item’s values of skewness and kurtosis. The results showed that skewness z-scores for 19 out of 33 items were statistically significant and kurtosis z-scores for 7 out of 33 items were statistically significant. These results indicate that the data likely do not meet the assumption of normality.
Next, I tested the items for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is when variables are correlated very highly with each other (Fields, 2013). In order to test for multicollinearity, I ran polychoric correlations. After conducting the polychoric correlations among the items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale, I scanned the correlation matrix for correlations > .80 and did not find any. This indicated that multicollinearity was likely not an issue in this analysis.

In summary, the results from screening the data indicated that there is an adequate sample size for running the EFA. The sample size of the secondary data set was 276; however, since 20 participants were missing one or more item responses, they were dropped from the analysis resulting in a new sample size of 256 for the EFA analysis. The results indicated that there were no extreme outliers on any of the items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale. Furthermore, the majority of items did not meet the assumption of normality which was not necessarily surprising given that items were scored on a Likert scale. This assumption violation was addressed in the EFA by using the WLSMV estimator (see Methods section for more details). The findings also demonstrated that multicollinearity was not an issue for this analysis.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

After determining that the data was suitable for running an EFA, I conducted an EFA using Mplus Version 8.6 to examine the factor structure of the 33-item Attitudes Toward Education scale. I ran the model to compare 1 to 10 factor solutions. Since this was an exploratory study and analysis and the number of underlying dimensions is unknown, I compared a large number of potential factor solutions.
**Faction Retention**

After running the model, I examined the output to determine if factors should be retained, and if so, how many factors. This is one of the most critical decisions in an EFA (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Preacher et al., 2013). I used multiple model fit indices and common criteria because using only one can lead to the under or overestimation of the number of true factors (Henson & Roberts, 2006; Velicer et al., 2000; Zwick & Velicer, 1986). Below, I describe the process I used to determine factor retention. I begin by examining the model fit indices, and then I report the findings from the common criteria. Finally, I describe the overall factor retention determination.

**Model Fit**

After running the analysis, I began by examining model fit indices. Model fit indices are not significance tests, but rather are measures of model-data correspondence and indicate how well the data fits the model (Kline, 2016; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). According to Kline (2016), the minimum set of fit statistics that should be reported are the chi-square test of model fit, RMSEA, Bentler Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and SRMR. For this study, I examined the following five model fit criteria: (a) chi-square test of model fit, (b) RMSEA, (c) SRMR, (d) CFI, and (e) Tucker-Lewis Fit Index (TFI). I examined these criteria because prior research has demonstrated that the chi-square test of model fit and these model fit indices are accurate in terms of factor retention with the following characteristics: when the scale used a 4-point Likert scale, there were at least 24 items on the scale, the categorical distributions across items were similar, and the sample size was at least 200 (Yang & Xia, 2014).
First, I examined the chi-square test of model fit. The chi-square test of model fit is traditionally used to evaluate overall model fit. It is an absolute fit index in that it determines how well the model fits the sample data and does not require a comparison with a baseline model (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993; Kline, 2016; McDonald & Ho, 2002). Furthermore, it is a test of statistical significance where the null hypothesis states that there is no difference between the predicted model and the observed data, indicating that the model is reasonably useful for modeling the data (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Therefore, this model is supported when the researcher fails to reject the null hypothesis or the absence of statistical significance at a .05 threshold (Barrett, 2007; Kline, 2016). In other words, the test indicates good model fit when there is a nonsignificant finding. As demonstrated in Table 9, the process generated 9 possible solutions. The model was statistically significant for 9 possible factor solutions (as there was no convergence for a 7-factor solution) and therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. This provides preliminary evidence against the models but does not by itself determine whether to reject the EFA (Kline, 2016).
Table 9  Chi-Square Test of Model Fit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3918.42</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2141.29</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1371.92</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1217.65</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1040.59</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>921.71</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>722.90</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>634.00</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>534.16</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ***There was no 7-factor solution.

Second, I examined the RMSEA (Steiger, 1990), which is considered one of the most accurate measures of model fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; MacCallum et al., 1996). This is an absolute fit index, which means it examines how well the model explains the data (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993; Kline, 2016; McDonald & Ho, 2002). It is scaled as a badness-of-fit statistic such that the smaller the RMSEA value, the better the data fits the model (Kline, 2016). Researchers have established the following RMSEA criteria: (a) values > .10 indicate poor model fit, (b) values < .10 and > .08 indicate mediocre fit, (c) values < .08 indicate acceptable model fit, and (b) values < .05 indicate excellent model fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1998; MacCallum et al., 1996; Marsh et al., 2005; Marsh et al., 2004). As demonstrated by Table 10, the five-factor solution is the first model with a RMSEA value that is < .05, indicating excellent model fit; therefore, RMSEA pointed to retaining the 5-factor solution.

Third, I examined the SRMR (Bentler, 1995; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1986). Similar to RMSEA, SRMR is an absolute fit index that is scaled as a badness-of-fit statistic (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993; Kline, 2016; McDonald & Ho, 2002), and the
following is the SRMR criteria that has been established: (a) values > .10 indicate poor model fit, (b) values < .08 indicate acceptable model fit, and (c) values < .05 indicate excellent model fit (Byrne, 2012; Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000; Kline, 2016). As indicated by Table 10, the three-factor solution is the first model with a SRMR value that is < .05, indicating excellent model fit; therefore, SRMR pointed to retaining the 3-factor solution.

Fourth, I examined the CFI (Bentler, 1990). The CFI is an incremental fit index, also known as a comparative or relative fit index (McDonald & Ho, 2002). This means that it measures the relative improvement in fit compared to that of the baseline model which specifies no relationship between variables (McDonald & Ho, 2002). Furthermore, it is scaled as a goodness-of-fit statistic such that the larger the CFI value, the better the data fits the model (Kline, 2016). The CFI takes sample size into account and will perform well even with a small sample size (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The CFI values range from 0 to 1.0, with higher values representing better fit (Bentler, 1990). A value > .95 is considered a well-fitting model (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Based on the results presented in Table 10, in the CFI column, the 6-factor solution is the first factor solution where the indicator is > .95; therefore, the CFI points to retaining the 6-factor solution.

Finally, I examined the TLI (Tucker & Lewis, 1973). Similar to the CFI, the TFI is also an incremental fit index that is scaled as a goodness-of-fit statistic (Kline, 2016). The TFI values can extend beyond the range of the CFI, but the TFI values are still interpreted in the same way such that higher values represent better fit (Kline, 2016). A value > .95 is considered a well-fitting model (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Based
on findings presented in Table 10, the TFI points to retaining 10 factors as the TFI value for the 10-factor solution is very close to .95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td><strong>.949</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ***There was no 7-factor solution.

Common Criteria

In addition to examining the model fit indices, I used the following common criteria to determine how many factors to retain: (a) Kaiser’s criterion (Kaiser, 1974), (b) scree test (Cattell, 1966), and (c) interpretability (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Gorsuch, 1983).

I began by examining Kaiser’s criterion (Kaiser, 1974). Kaiser’s criterion is one of the most commonly used criteria for determining the number of factors to retain. The criterion is to retain factors that have eigenvalues > 1.00 (Kaiser, 1974). Eigenvalues represent the percent of variance explained by a factor, so Kaiser (1974) argued that eigenvalues > 1.00 represent a substantial amount of variance. Based on the current analysis, Kaiser’s criterion points to 9 factors because the first 9
eigenvalues are > 1.00, and the 10th eigenvalue is < 1.00, see Table 11. These 9 factors account for 60.36 percent of the variance in the model.

Table 11  Eigenvalues and Percent of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent of Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>23.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>33.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>39.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>43.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>47.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>50.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>54.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>57.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>60.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I examined the scree plot (Cattell, 1966). The scree plot provides visual evidence for the number of factors. This test involves plotting all of the eigenvalues from the EFA, as reported in Table 11. In Figure 4, shown along the x-axis are the total possible number of factors, which is one factor for each of the 33 items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale, and displayed along the y-axis are the eigenvalues. The criterion to retain factors is to determine the point of leveling, which is the point where the line begins to level off (Cattell, 1966). Based on Figure 4, the scree plot points to retaining the 4-factor solution because the fifth eigenvalue demonstrates that point at which the eigenvalues begin to level off.
Finally, I examined the interpretability of the findings from the EFA and the actual factor loadings (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Gorsuch, 1983). The purpose of this criteria is to determine whether the findings and in particular the factor loadings are interpretable based on the study content and theory. Therefore, I used the information from the model fit and common criteria to guide my exploration by determining which factor solutions to examine and then used the principles of CRF, SOR’s framing of resilience, the foundations of Street PAR, and the relevant literature as guides. Since the SRMR pointed to 3 factors and the TFI pointed to 10 factors, I examined the factor loadings for the 3- through 10-factor solutions to determine whether the loadings theoretically made sense. I examined all potential solutions and consulted with committee members about my findings. Based on this exploratory process, it was determined that none of the factor solutions were interpretable and therefore no discernible factor structure, see Table 12 below for an example.
Table 12  Six-Factor Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the United States, a “low-income” student has the same chance of a good education as a “wealthy” student.</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. People basically get fair treatment in the United States, no matter who they are.</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We have the ability to change the government if we don’t like what it is doing.</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My teachers really knew and understood me.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. In my high school, it was important to have name brand clothing.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A student’s wealth or poverty affects how teachers treat them.</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Honors and Advanced Placement students think they are smarter than other people.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Money has a lot to do with who goes to or attends college.</td>
<td>0.51  0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational</td>
<td>0.45  0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opportunities for students of color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I cared a lot about my clothes or how I was dressed in high school.</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My parent(s)/guardian(s) had a hard time paying for what I needed as a child.</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Most students in special education get the help they need.</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building.</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork.</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Students were encouraged to take leadership positions in my high school (e.g. Class President).</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometimes I didn’t voice my opinion in high school because I worried that my friends or classmates would criticize me.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I felt safe at my high school.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The government doesn’t really care what</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the findings from the EFA demonstrated that there were a number of different factor solutions based on model fit statistics and common criteria for factor retention. However, the interpretability of the factor loadings based on content knowledge and theories as guides indicated that the groupings did not make theoretical sense. For example, as shown in Table 12, factor 3 included 10 questions related to topics such as students not identifying with the subject matter taught in the classroom, students witnessing fighting in school, and honors and advanced placement students thinking they are smarter than other students. Based on this exploratory process, it was determined that the factor solutions were not interpretable and therefore there was no discernible factor structure.

**Theory-Driven Sequential Integration**

Based on the findings from the EFA, it was clear that the underlying factor structure was not interpretable based on the principles of CRF, SOR’s framing of resilience, the foundations of Street PAR, and the relevant literature. In order to facilitate the mixed methods integrative analysis, I needed to use another way to break down the scale based on themes. Therefore, I collaborated with committee members who have expertise related to CRF, SOR, foundations of Street PAR, and the relevant
literature to select a combination of individual items and groups of items from the scale that represent key themes and are aligned with the qualitative questions and my theories. Below, I describe in more detail this deductive approach to creating these subscales and identifying critical items. Next, I describe the process of developing subscales and identifying critical items in order to break down the Attitudes Toward Education scale and facilitate integration. Finally, I report the results of the group differences.

Subscale Development and Critical Item Identification

In order to create the subscales and identify critical items, I began by re-examining and re-creating Table 6. As shown in Table 13 Step 1, I included all of the items on the Attitudes Toward Education scale and the interview questions from the Education section of the interview protocol. Then, also shown in Step 1, I italicized items and subsequently removed those that were not directly related to street-identified Black American girls and women’s own schooling (e.g., Teachers believe that all students can achieve high levels if they try; People basically get fair treatment in the United States, no matter who they are). Although I acknowledge that those types of attitudes could be informed by their experiences, I removed these types of items because the purpose of this study was to understand street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards their own schooling (e.g., My teachers really knew and understood me). Then, in Step 2, I grouped survey items with interview questions that were related in some way. Some of the quantitative items were included in multiple sections. After creating these groupings, I worked with my advisor and committee members and used the tenets of CRF, the foundations of Street
PAR, and the relevant literature to further support the development of the subscales and critical items.
Table 13  Steps for Subscale Development and Critical Item Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People basically get fair treatment in the United States, no matter who they are.</td>
<td>1. What grade did you reach in school? What is the educational status of your siblings, children and parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the United States, a “low-income” student has the same chance of a good education as a “wealthy” student.</td>
<td>2. How would you describe public education or schools for youth in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We have the ability to change the government if we don’t like what it is doing.</td>
<td>3. What were your experiences in school or with the educational system? What kinds of positive or negative experiences did you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The government doesn’t really care what people like my family and I think.</td>
<td>4. What was valuable or enjoyable about those experiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.</td>
<td>5. What type of education do poor Black youth receive in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.</td>
<td>6. In what ways do students from your neighborhood take school seriously?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.</td>
<td>7. Do they receive a quality education in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I cared a lot about my clothes or how I was dressed in high school.</td>
<td>8. How do teachers treat poor Black youth from the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.</td>
<td>9. In what ways do teachers respect students from the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometimes I didn’t voice my opinion in high school because I worried that my friends or classmates would criticize me.</td>
<td>10. Are poor Black children from these Westside/Northside prepared for college?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My teachers really knew and understood me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers believe that all students can achieve high levels if they try.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A student’s wealth or poverty affects how teachers treat them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Students were encouraged to take leadership positions in my high school (e.g. Class President).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. **Honors and Advanced Placement students think they are smarter than other people.**
23. **Most students in special education get the help they need.**
24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork.
25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.
26. **Money has a lot to do with who goes to or attends college.**
27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.
28. **My parent(s)/guardian(s) had a hard time paying for what I needed as a child.**
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.
30. I felt safe at my high school.
31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.
32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.
33. In my high school, it was important to have name brand clothing.

### STEP 2: Quantitative items and qualitative questions grouped together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These reflect similar questions asked in the demographic characteristics section of the survey.</td>
<td>1. What grade did you reach in school? What is the educational status of your siblings, children and parents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.</td>
<td>2. How would you describe public education or schools for youth in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.</td>
<td>5. What type of education do poor Black youth receive in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.</td>
<td>7. Do they receive a quality education in the Westside/Northside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.
27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.
8. I cared a lot about my clothes or how I was dressed in high school.
10. Sometimes I didn’t voice my opinion in high school because I worried that my friends or classmates would criticize me.
20. Students were encouraged to take leadership positions in my high school (e.g. Class President).
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.
30. I felt safe at my high school.
31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.
32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.
33. In my high school, it was important to have name brand clothing.
9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.
6. In what ways do students from your neighborhood take school seriously?
12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.
13. My teachers really knew and understood me.
14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.
17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.
7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.
10. Are poor Black children from these Westside/Northside prepared for college?

3. What were your experiences in school or with the educational system? What kinds of positive or negative experiences did you have?
4. What was valuable or enjoyable about those experiences?

**Note.** All items were on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*).
Attitudes Toward Quality of Education

The first subscale that I created was the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education subscale. This subscale was formed using the following 10 items from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:

5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.

6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.

7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.

11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.

15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.

16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.

21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building.

24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork.

25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school.

27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.

This subscale included items related to the quality of education and educational opportunities including questions related to tracking, college readiness, teacher quality, curriculum, academic expectations, and treatment of students. Given that previous research has shown that Black students are more likely to be tracked into lower level courses, placed into special education, and feel less prepared for college (Giersch, 2018; Grindal et al., 2019; Welton & Martinez, 2014), and are more likely to
attend schools with less qualified teachers and lower academic expectations (Gershenson et al., 2016; Goldhaber et al., 2015), these were important items to understand from the perspectives of street-identified Black American girls and women.

I calculated a total score as the sum of the numeric Likert scale responses. Items 6 and 11 were reverse scored. The distribution of the total scores ranged from 11 to 40, on a scale from 10 to 40. The histogram of the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education scores (see Figure 5) illustrates the central tendency and dispersion ($N = 268, M = 26.71, SD = 4.13, Mdn = 27, Mode = 27$, skewness = -0.31, kurtosis = 0.86). Due to listwise deletion, eight participants were dropped because they were missing a response for at least one of the items included in the subscale. Then, I calculated Cronbach’s alpha for the subscale, which was $\alpha = .723$. Cronbach’s alpha is the most common way to measure reliability, the consistency and stability of participants’ responses to a measure (Fields, 2013; Groves et al., 2009). It is expressed as a value between 0 and 1. Coefficients above .70 are generally considered acceptable in social science research (Bland & Altman, 1997; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011), indicating that the reliability for this subscale was acceptable.
Attitudes Toward School Safety

The second subscale that I created was Attitudes Toward School Safety. This subscale was formed using the following three items from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:

29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.
30. I felt safe at my high school.
31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.

This subscale included items related to feeling comfortable and safe while at school. Item 31 taps into the presence of police and security personnel in schools, which can be attributed to policies in the 1970s in urban schools and then federal legislation enacted after the Columbine shooting (Mallett, 2016). CRF seeks to
examine legal and social policies that oppress women of color. Using a CRF perspective, this is a policy that has disproportionately harmed Black girls in schools (Addington, 2019; Crenshaw et al., 2015). Furthermore, it also seeks to tap into the power dynamics of having these officers in schools and how student safety is influenced by their proximity to the criminal justice system in school.

I calculated a total score as the sum of the numeric Likert scale responses. The distribution of the total scores ranged from 3 to 12, on a scale from 3 to 12. The histogram of the subscale scores (see Figure 6) illustrates the central tendency and dispersion ($N = 274, M = 8.10, SD = 1.82, Mdn = 8, Mode = 9$, skewness = -0.19, kurtosis = 0.97). Due to listwise deletion, two participants were dropped because they were missing a response for at least one of the items included in the subscale. The Cronbach’s alpha for the subscale was, $\alpha = .676$. This indicates that the reliability was slightly lower than what is considered acceptable in social science research (Bland & Altman, 1997; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011).
Attitudes Toward Teachers

The third subscale that I created was Attitudes Toward Teachers. This subscale was formed using the following five items from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:

12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.
13. My teachers really knew and understood me.
14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.
17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.

This subscale included items related to student-teacher relationships. I wanted to examine these questions as a way to understand Black girls and women’s self-
reported attitudes towards their teachers, especially from their perspectives given that the majority of teachers in U.S. public schools are white women (Taie & Goldring, 2017). Although the items do not specifically tap into street-identified Black American girls and women’s multiple forms of discrimination based on their intersectional identities as the items are related to the influence of race and class separately, their responses to the items provide context for their relationships with their teachers.

I calculated a total score as the sum of the numeric Likert scale responses. Question 17 was reverse scored. The distribution of the total scores ranged from 5 to 20, on a scale from 5 to 20. The histogram of the subscale scores (see Figure 7) illustrates the central tendency and dispersion ($N = 273$, $M = 13.76$, $SD = 2.65$, $Mdn = 14$, $Mode = 14$, skewness = -0.18, kurtosis = 0.50). Due to listwise deletion, three participants were dropped because they were missing a response for at least one of the items included in the subscale. The Cronbach’s alpha for the subscale was, $\alpha = .713$. This indicates the reliability was acceptable.
The first critical item that I identified was Attitudes Toward Grades in High School, which was formed using the following item from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:

9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.

This critical item tapped into caring about grades, which is one aspect related to caring about and valuing learning and education. I used this item because it has been used in previous Street PAR work (e.g., Payne & Brown, 2010) as a counter-narrative pushing back on one of the dominant argument that frames street-identified youth from a deficit perspective arguing that they do not care or place any value on learning and formal education.

Figure 7   Histogram of the Attitudes Toward Teacher Scores

**Attitudes Toward Grades in High School**

The first critical item that I identified was Attitudes Toward Grades in High School, which was formed using the following item from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:

9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.

This critical item tapped into caring about grades, which is one aspect related to caring about and valuing learning and education. I used this item because it has been used in previous Street PAR work (e.g., Payne & Brown, 2010) as a counter-narrative pushing back on one of the dominant argument that frames street-identified youth from a deficit perspective arguing that they do not care or place any value on learning and formal education.
The distribution of the total scores ranged from 1 to 4, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The histogram of the item scores (see Figure 8) illustrates the central tendency and dispersion \((N = 275, M = 3.07, SD = 0.76, Mdn = 3, Mode = 3, \text{ skewness } = -0.47, \text{ kurtosis } = -0.17)\). Due to listwise deletion, one participant was dropped because the participant was missing a response for this item.

![Histogram of the Attitudes Toward Grades in High School Scores](image)

Figure 8  Histogram of the Attitudes Toward Grades in High School Scores

**Attitudes Toward College Readiness**

The second critical item that I identified was Attitudes Toward College Readiness, which was formed using the following item from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:
7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.

This critical item was specifically about how well the participants’ high schools prepared them for college in relation to other students in the United States. This item was selected because of the ways that Black students are often blocked from postsecondary pathways primarily due to institutional, economic, and social factors (Carey, 2019b; Perez-Felkner, 2015). Analysis of this item will help to understand the attitudes and perspectives of street-identified Black American girls and women within the Wilmington schooling context.

The distribution of the total scores ranged from 1 to 4, on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The histogram of the item scores (see Figure 9) illustrates the central tendency and dispersion (N = 276, M = 2.55, SD = 0.81, Mdn = 3, Mode = 3, skewness = -0.24, kurtosis = -0.44).
Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School

The third critical item that I created was Attitudes Toward Fighting in High School, which was formed using the following item from the Attitudes Toward Education scale:

32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.

This critical item was about witnessing physical fights in high school. The item was not specifically about participants engaging in fighting but rather more about the environment in which the participant went to high school. This provides an understanding of the environment and the physical violence that street-identified Black American girls and women witnessed while in school. Understanding this item from the perspective of street-identified Black American girls and women and using
CRF is important given that research has shown that Black girls and women are more likely to experience violence as compared to white girls and women (Isom Scott, 2018).

The distribution of the total scores ranged from 1 to 4, on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). The scale was different from the other subscales and critical items because it was reverse scored with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes toward schooling. The histogram of the item scores (see Figure 10) illustrates the central tendency and dispersion ($N = 275, M = 2.07, SD = 0.73, Mdn = 2, Mode = 2$, skewness $= 0.34$, kurtosis $= -0.07$). Due to listwise deletion, one participant was dropped because the participant was missing a response for this item.

![Histogram of the Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School Reversed Scores](image)

Figure 10  Histogram of the Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School Reversed Scores
Analysis of Group Differences

I ran a series of six one-way ANOVAs in SPSS 28 to examine group differences to answer the following research question:

1. What are the group mean differences in street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling based on the Attitudes Toward Education subscales and critical items by age cohort?

I assessed these differences based on mean scores for the following three subscales and three critical items: Attitudes Toward Quality of Education, Attitudes Toward School Safety, Attitudes Toward Teachers, Attitudes Toward Grades in High School, Attitudes Toward College Readiness, and Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School, see Table 14 for a complete list of the subscales and critical items.

Table 14  List of Three Subscales Developed and Three Critical Items Identified from the Attitudes Toward Education Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales Developed from the Attitudes Toward Education Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Quality of Education</td>
<td>5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes. 6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color. 7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States. 11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me. 15. My teachers knew their subject matter well. 16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material. 21. Most students in low level classes (e.g. special education) received an education equal to all other students in the building. 24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork. 25. Honors and Advanced Placement students were treated with the same level of respect as all other students in my high school. 27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward School Safety</td>
<td>29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem. 30. I felt safe at my high school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.

**Attitudes Toward Teachers**

12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.
13. My teachers really knew and understood me.
14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.
17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.

**Attitudes Toward Grades in High School**

9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.

**Attitudes Toward College Readiness**

7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.

**Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School**

32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.

As stated in the Methods section, I included post hoc tests for the analysis. For this study, I choose to use Hochberg’s GT2 and the Games-Howell procedure as post hoc tests. Hochberg’s GT2 is an appropriate pairwise comparison procedure when the sample sizes are very different across groups (Fields, 2013). For example, on the Attitudes Toward Teachers subscale, the cohort of Black women ages 45-54 had 48 participants and the cohort of Black girls and women ages 16-24 had 86 participants. Although unequal group sizes across age cohorts was intentional for this study based on the quota sampling method, this post hoc procedure was still appropriate because of the varying sample sizes across age cohorts. Furthermore, the Games-Howell procedure is an appropriate post hoc test when there is a possibility that the group variances are not equal (Fields, 2013). I included this post hoc procedure because it was evident from the assumption testing that indeed the group variances were statistically significantly different for many of the subscales and critical items.
In addition, since I ran multiple one-way ANOVAs, I adjusted the level of significance for each individual ANOVA using the Bonferroni correction (see Analysis of Group Differences in the Methods section). Using the formula, the level of significance was set to \( p < 0.008 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis for each test should only be rejected if the resulting p-value was less than 0.008.

Below are the results from the six one-way ANOVAs that I conducted to assess whether street-identified Black American girls and women’s mean scores significantly differed in regards to their attitudes toward schooling by age cohort. For each subscale and critical item, I describe the results from screening the data by age cohort, and then I present the results from the one-way ANOVA.

**Attitudes Toward Quality of Education**

Prior to running the next analysis, I screened the subscale for outliers, normality, and homogeneity of variance within each age cohort. Table 15 shows statistical measures of dispersion and central tendency of the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education scores for all four age cohorts side by side. I began the data screening process by examining the sum scores for outliers. An outlier is a score that is very different from the rest of the data (Fields, 2013). Using the process of converting sum scores to z-scores described in the Methods section, I determined that there were no extreme outliers on this subscale. Then, I examined the sum scores for normality. The assumption of normality is that the sampling distribution of the mean is normal (Fields, 2013). Using P-P plots as explained above, I determined that the majority of the data points were on or very close to the diagonal line, representing reasonable normality. For additional insight, I examined the values of skewness and kurtosis. Based on the process described in the methods section, none of the skewness and
kurtosis z-scores within groups were > 1.96, suggesting reasonable normality. Next, I examined the data to test for homogeneity of variance which is the assumption that the variance of the outcome data is roughly equal for each of the groups (Fields, 2013; Levene, 1960). The results from the Levene’s test indicated that the variances were equal for all four age cohorts, $F(3, 264) = 2.19, p = .090$.

Table 15  
Statistics for Attitudes Toward Quality of Education Subscale Among the Four Age Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>26.88</td>
<td>27.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Md$</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Mode$</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>24.99</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>26.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>28.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Md = median; CI = confidence interval.*
The first ANOVA that I conducted demonstrated that there were no significant differences across age cohorts on the Attitudes Toward the Quality of Education subscale, $F(3, 264) = 1.58, p = .195$.

Attitudes Toward School Safety

Prior to running the next analysis, I screened the subscale for outliers, normality, and homogeneity of variance within each age cohort. Table 16 shows statistical measures of dispersion and central tendency of the Attitudes Toward School Safety scores for all four age cohorts side by side. After examining the sum scores for outliers, the results demonstrated that there were no extreme outliers on this subscale. Next, I assessed the data for normality and my review of the P-P plots within groups suggested that the majority of the dots were not on the diagonal line, representing potential nonnormality. For additional insight, I examined the values of skewness and kurtosis. There were three z-scores that were $> 1.96$, indicating the within group data does not meet the assumption of normality. Finally, I examined the data to test for homogeneity of variance. The results indicated that the variances were equal for all four age cohorts, $F(3, 270) = 1.83, p = .143$.

Although the data violated the assumption of normality, I decided to still conduct a one-way ANOVA rather than running a Kruskal-Wallis test, which is an alternative test to the one-way ANOVA (Kruskal & Wallis, 1952). The Kruskal-Wallis test is used to compare differences between groups of scores when the group scores have come from different participants. It is commonly used when one-way ANOVA assumptions have been violated as it is a non-parametric test that does not assume normality (Fields, 2013; Kruskal & Wallis, 1952). However, I choose not to use this test because previous research indicates that even when violations to the assumption of
normality occurs, ANOVA is still the most robust and appropriate test (e.g., Blanca et al., 2017; Feir-Walsh & Toothaker, 1974). I also choose not to run this test because of the data transformation that is required for conducting a Kruskal-Wallis test (i.e., ranking scores from lowest to highest). Data and information are lost during this transformation and it makes the test less powerful than a one-way ANOVA (McDonald, 2009).

Table 16  Statistics for Attitudes Toward School Safety Subscale Among the Four Age Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  $M =$ mean; $SD =$ standard deviation; $Mdn =$ median; CI = confidence interval.
The second ANOVA that I conducted demonstrated that there were no significant differences across age cohorts on attitudes toward school safety, $F(3, 270) = .11, p = .953$.

**Attitudes Toward Teachers**

Prior to running the next analysis, I screened the subscale for outliers, normality, and homogeneity of variance within each age cohort. Table 17 shows statistical measures of dispersion and central tendency of the Attitudes Toward Teachers scores for all four age cohorts side by side. After examining the sum scores for outliers, the results demonstrated that there were no extreme outliers on this subscale. Next, I assessed the data for normality and my review of the P-P plots within groups suggested that the majority of the dots were on or very close to the diagonal line. I also examined the values of skewness and kurtosis. There was one z-score that was $> 1.96$, indicating the within group data was reasonably normal. Finally, I examined the data to test for homogeneity of variance. The results indicated that the variances were not equal for all four age cohorts, $F(3, 269) = 2.84, p = .039$, violating the homogeneity of variance assumption. Therefore, I report Welch’s F, instead of the F-ratio that is usually presented for a one-way ANOVA (see Methods section for explanation).
Table 17  Statistics for Attitudes Toward Teachers Subscale Among the Four Age Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>16-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdn</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>14.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Mdn = median; CI = confidence interval.*

For the third ANOVA that I conducted using Welch’s F demonstrated that there were no significant differences across age cohorts on attitudes toward teachers, $F(3, 142.04) = 1.05, p = .373$.

**Attitudes Towards Caring about Grades in High School**

Prior to running the next analysis, I screened the critical item for outliers, normality, and homogeneity of variance within each age cohort. Table 18 shows statistical measures of dispersion and central tendency of the Attitudes Towards
Caring about Grades in High School scores for all four age cohorts side by side. After examining the sum scores for outliers, the results demonstrated that there were no extreme outliers on this critical item. Next, I assessed for normality and my review of the P-P plots within groups suggested that the majority of the dots were not on the diagonal line, representing potential nonnormality. I also examined the values of skewness and kurtosis, and there were two z-scores that were > 1.96, indicating the within group data potentially does not meet the assumption of normality. Finally, I examined the data to test for homogeneity of variance. The results indicated that the variances were not equal for all four age cohorts, $F(3, 271) = 2.86, p = .037$, violating the homogeneity of variance assumption. Therefore, I report Welch’s F, instead of the F-ratio that is usually presented for a one-way ANOVA.
Table 18  Statistics for Attitudes Toward Caring about Grades in High School Critical Item Among the Four Age Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation; Mdn = median; CI = confidence interval.

For the fourth ANOVA that I conducted using Welch’s F demonstrated that there were no significant differences across age cohorts on attitudes toward caring about grades in high school, $F(3, 142.45) = 2.34, p = .076$.

Attitudes Toward College Readiness

Prior to running the next analysis, I screened the critical item for outliers, normality, and homogeneity of variance within each age cohort. Table 19 shows statistical measures of dispersion and central tendency of the Attitudes Toward
College Readiness scores for all four age cohorts side by side. After examining the data for outliers, the results demonstrated that there were no extreme outliers on this critical item. Next, I assessed the data for normality, and my review of the P-P plots within groups suggested that the majority of the dots were not on the diagonal line, representing potential nonnormality. For additional insight, I examined the values of skewness and kurtosis. While there was only one $z$-score that was $> 1.96$, the P-P plots indicate that the within group data potentially does not meet the assumption of normality. Finally, I examined the data to test for homogeneity of variance. The results indicated that the variances were not equal for all four age cohorts, $F(3, 272) = 3.51, p = .016$, violating the homogeneity of variance assumption. Therefore, I report Welch’s $F$, instead of the $F$-ratio that is usually presented for a one-way ANOVA.
Table 19  Statistics for Attitudes Toward College Readiness Critical Item Among the Four Age Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M )</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdn</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI Lower</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI Upper</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( M \) = mean; SD = standard deviation; Mdn = median; CI = confidence interval.

For the fifth ANOVA that I conducted using Welch’s F demonstrated that there were no significant differences across age cohorts on attitudes toward college readiness, \( F(3, 144.91) = 1.33, p = .266. \)

Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School

Prior to running the next analysis, I screened the critical item for outliers, normality, and homogeneity of variance within each age cohort. Table 20 shows statistical measures of dispersion and central tendency of the Attitudes Toward
Witnessing Fighting in High School. Scores for all four age cohorts side by side. After examining the data for outliers, the results demonstrated that there were no extreme outliers on this critical item. Next, I assessed the data for normality and my review of the P-P plots within groups suggested that the majority of the dots were not on the diagonal line, representing potential nonnormality. For additional insight, I examined the values of skewness and kurtosis. While there was only one z-score that was > 1.96, the P-P plots indicate that the within group data potentially does not meet the assumption of normality. Finally, I examined the data to test for homogeneity of variance. The results indicated that the variances were equal for all four age cohorts, $F(3, 271) = 2.48, p = .061$. 


The sixth ANOVA that I conducted demonstrated that, based on the adjusted level of significance, there were no significant differences across age cohorts on attitudes toward witnessing fighting in high school, $F(3, 271) = 3.80, p = .011$.

### Age Cohort Selection Process Findings

The quantitative phase of this study focused on examining group differences in street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling based on mean scores from the Attitudes Toward Education subscales and
critical items by age cohort. In an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, the quantitative phase is connected to the qualitative phase by selecting participants for the qualitative phase based on quantitative findings. In this study, the majority of participants’ survey responses were not able to be connected with their interviews. In other words, selecting individual participants for the qualitative phase based on their quantitative findings was not an option. However, what was an option was selecting age cohorts for the qualitative phase based on their quantitative findings. Therefore, the purpose of this connecting phase of the study was to determine which age cohorts should be examined in-depth during the second phase, a qualitative phase, of the study based on the quantitative findings. This decision can be based on a variety of factors such as quantitative significant or non-significant results, outlier results, group differences, or confusing or surprising findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Plano Clark & Ivankova, 2016). For this study, I was interested in moving forward with two age cohorts that were different from one another based on significant findings, effect sizes, mean differences, and interesting findings.

Age Cohort Selection Process

Since none of the post hoc tests were significant, I began the process of choosing two age cohorts by examining the effect sizes for each pair of means. An effect size is “an objective and (usually) standardized measure of the magnitude of the observed effect” (Fields, 2013, p. 79). It tells us about the magnitude of an effect (Fields, 2013). It is important to report effect sizes for each pair of means because when sample sizes are small, it is possible to find p-values > .05 but have effect sizes that demonstrate a meaningful relationship (Fields, 2013). I computed an effect size, Cohen’s (1988) $d$, for each pair of means for each of the three subscales and three
critical items (Wickens & Keppel, 2004), see Table 21. Cohen’s $d$ criteria is that a small effect size is classified as $d \geq .20$, a medium effect size is $\geq .50$, and a large effect size is $\geq .80$ (Cohen, 1988). Based on this criteria, there were only small effect sizes identified for some of the pairs of means. I determined that the greatest number of small effect sizes were between the 25-34 and 45-54 age cohorts and the 16-24 and 45-54 age cohorts, with the 25-34 and 45-54 age cohort pairs having the larger effect sizes (e.g., the 25-34 and 45-54 age cohorts had two effect sizes that were $> .40$).

Table 21 Effect Sizes for Each Pair of Means for Each of the Subscales and Critical Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Critical Items</th>
<th>Mean Comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. 25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Quality of Education</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward School Safety</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Teachers</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Caring about Grades in High School</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward College Readiness</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *represents small effect sizes.
Then, I visually examined the group means for each of the subscales and critical items. I found that for 2 out of 3 subscales (i.e., Attitudes Toward Quality of Education and Attitudes Toward Teachers) and 2 out of 3 critical items (i.e., Attitudes Toward College Readiness and Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School), the 25-34 year olds had the lowest (or were within one tenth of a point away from the lowest) and the 45-54 year olds had the highest mean scores, with higher scores representing more positive attitudes. In addition to the subscales and critical items, I also identified this same trend when I examined the overall mean scores across age cohorts for the Attitudes Toward Education Scale, such that the 25-34 year olds had the lowest mean score ($M = 83.67$), followed by the 35-44 year olds ($M = 85.61$), then the 16-24 year olds ($M = 85.88$), and the 45-54 year olds had the highest mean score ($M = 87.69$).

These findings were also interesting when I compared these trends with Payne’s (2008) study with street-identified Black boys and men. The author used a 19-item scale called Attitudes Toward Opportunity that had two subscales, one of which was called Attitudes Toward Educational Opportunity. This subscale included similar items as those on the Attitudes Toward Education scale used in this study and had the same 4-point Likert scale. The results from the study showed that the 45-65 year olds had the lowest mean score and the 16-24 year olds had the highest mean score on the Attitudes Toward Educational Opportunity subscale. While the ages that make up the age cohorts are slightly different between studies, the overall trend was that the street-identified Black boys and men’s attitudes toward their education decreased with age. However, this was not the trend with the street-identified Black American girls and women in this study. These differences highlighted an interesting and important
opportunity to move forward with the 25-34 year old and 45-54 year old age cohorts and to use CRF to truly center how race, class, and gender intersect and affect the schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women, while recognizing the anti-essentialist view that Black girls and women’s experiences are unique from Black boys and men’s. Therefore, based on these results and after consulting with my advisor, I chose to move forward with the 25-34 year old and 45-54 year old age cohorts for the qualitative analysis.

**Phase II: Qualitative Findings**

The purpose of the qualitative phase of this study was to develop an in-depth understanding of the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black women ages 25-34 and 45-54, and to explore differences and similarities in their schooling experiences across the two age cohorts. The results address the following qualitative research questions:

2. In what ways do street-identified Black American girls and women describe their lived schooling experiences?

3. In what ways are street-identified Black American girls and women’s lived schooling experiences different and similar across age cohorts?

First, the interview and demographic characteristics of the sample are presented. Then, the findings for the 25-34 year olds are presented, followed by findings for the 45-54 year olds. Finally, differences and similarities in experiences across age cohorts are examined.

**Interview Characteristics**

The final qualitative sample included nine street-identified Black women ages 25-34 and 11 street-identified Black women ages 45-54. Three women in the 25-34
year old age cohort were excluded from the analysis. One woman was excluded because she lived in the Eastside neighborhood of Wilmington, and therefore did not meet the inclusion criteria, and two women were excluded because of technical difficulties with their interviews.

Among the Black women ages 25-34, eight participated in an individual interview and one participated in a dual interview. Among the Black women ages 45-54, six participated in an individual interview, four participated in a dual interview, and one participated in a group interview and an individual interview. See Table 22 for more detailed information regarding the interview type.
### Table 22  
Participants’ Age Cohort and Interview Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Interview Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaynelle</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kayla</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>w/ Male [Arion]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahogany</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquita</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martai</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Netta</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Basheera</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>w/ Female [Cinda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinda</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>w/ Female [Brenda]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>w/ Female [Lisa T.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janice</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa L.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa T.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>w/ Female [Connie]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natasha B.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Natasha B. and Tosha H. have the first initial of their last name included in this study as a way to be consistent with the primary data set that includes multiple women with the same name.

### Demographic Characteristics

Table 23 provides overall demographic characteristics of the 20 women included in the qualitative analysis. This information was based on what the women stated in their interviews. As previously mentioned, the participants who completed an interview were a subset of the quantitative sample. As seen in Table 23, of the 25-34 year olds, three women lived in the Northside and six lived in the Westside. Of the
participants who stated their highest level of education, three women said that they did not finish high school, one woman graduated with her high school diploma or GED, and two women attended some college. Six women indicated that they were employed, two women said that they were unemployed, and one woman did not discuss her employment status. All nine women stated that they have children.

Of the 45-54 year olds, five women lived in the Northside and six lived in the Westside. Of the participants who discussed their highest level of education, three women stated that they did not finish high school, four women obtained their high school diploma or GED, and one woman attended some college. Five women indicated that they were employed, four women said that they were unemployed, and two women did not discuss their employment status. Ten of the women have children and one of the women does not have any.
Table 23  Qualitative Sample: Demographic Characteristics (N = 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>25-34 (n = 9)</th>
<th>45-54 (n = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Degree Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma or GED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Findings For 25-34 Year Olds

The three main interrelated themes identified embodied the racialized, gendered, and classed schooling experiences of street-identified Black women ages 25-34: (1) Violence in School, (2) Teachers and School Officials, and (3) Home and Family Life. Each theme reflects tenets or principles of CRF as the women describe navigating schooling, as girls, in an educational system beset by race, class, and gender discrimination. Their perspectives highlight their unique intersectional and multidimensional identities as street-identified, low-income Black girls. Furthermore, the salient theme of resilience was embedded throughout their schooling experiences. Several of the women, as girls, engaged in street life as a site of resilience in school,
often through using and/or selling drugs and fighting. Street life was used as a form of economic survival and their involvement can be understood as an adaptive response to their schooling conditions as well as the violent structural conditions in their lives outside of the schooling context.

Outlined below are the perspectives and stories of the women who best demonstrate the various themes that emerged through coding and analysis. While all nine interviews with women ages 25-34 were coded, some women spoke more explicitly and at greater length and depth about their schooling experiences.

**Violence in School**

Interview participants described violence that was perpetuated against them and that they engaged in while at school. The overarching theme of violence in schools was further divided into two subthemes: (1) Structural Violence and (2) Interpersonal Violence. Parsing out the types of violence the women described was necessary to understanding the pervasiveness of violence they encountered as a part of, not separate from, their schooling experiences.

**Structural Violence**

Structural Violence emerged as a theme from participants describing their school environments that espoused institutional inequities related to exclusionary discipline practices and poor schooling conditions. The first form of structural violence that several of the women shared was their experiences with exclusionary discipline practices, such as being expelled and/or suspended from school. Several reported being removed from school through suspension and/or expulsion. For example, Marquita (33), a mother of four children living in the Northside who left
high school in 10th grade, shared that she was expelled from Martin Luther King Elementary School in 4th grade. Marquita said that she was expelled because, “I had a bad attitude and like I didn’t really take no stuff from kids. Nobody. No teachers. Nobody.” When the interviewer asked her to expand on why she was expelled and if other factors played a role in her being expelled, she said: “Yeah, to a certain extent because like I was kind of bad in school, but . . . I had a racist teacher.” Marquita described an experience with a white male teacher who kept her name on his board in his classroom all summer long and into the next school year. When the interviewer asked why he had done that, Marquita replied with:

For detention. And he still had my name on the board throughout the summer, into the next year. He never took my name off it, and then I went down there, I said, I told my mom, I said ‘Mom, you know this principal, this teacher still got my name on there?’ And she’s like ‘That racist mother fucker!’

After Marquita was expelled from Martin Luther King Elementary School, she attended P. S. DuPont Elementary School (referred to as P. S. Elementary School). According to Marquita, switching schools helped her with her education to an extent, but she mentioned that she was expelled from P. S. Elementary School and was forced to repeat a grade level: “When I changed schools. . . I ended up getting expelled and getting kept back, and that kinda, that kinda slowed me down a lot too.” Even so, Marquita was determined and adamant about the fact that “at the end of the day, it is what it is. I still want to further my education. It’s not going to stop me now.”

Similar to Marquita, several of the women described being suspended and/or expelled multiple times. For example, Martai (32), a mother of three children living in the Westside who left high school at 18 years old, shared that she was expelled three times in high school. The various schools she attended continued to expel her, leading
her to attend four different high schools, and as a result, she had to continue repeating the 9th grade:

I went to Glasgow, Newark, McKeans, A. I., got kicked out. . . I got kicked out every time I went to 9th grade. I got kicked out every month so I had to keep repeating for like three years.

Martai said that she was expelled from school because “I liked to smoke weed and I liked to fight. Can’t tell me nothin’.”

In addition to exclusionary discipline, the second form of structural violence the women experienced as girls was characterized by poor schooling conditions such as low expectations, poor quality instruction, and lack of college preparation. For example, Marquita and Martai reported experiencing this form of structural violence, which impacted their opportunities for learning and development and ultimately “pushed” them out of school (M. W. Morris, 2016a). However, in spite of their schooling experiences, they both described how they value learning and their education and have plans to go back to school to pursue their personal educational goals. For example, Martai was pushed out of school when she was 18 and about to have her first child: “I had my daughter when I was 18. I went to school pregnant, then I said, ‘Fuck it, I’m outta here.’” She described being in a school environment where she did not receive the support she needed to stay in school. Despite not being supported and ultimately pushed out of school, at the time of the interview, Martai was back in school earning her GED and had plans to pursue a postsecondary degree, a master’s in business.

Similar to Martai, Marquita left school in 10th grade. While Marquita was attending Christiana High School, she described not having “no issues with no teacher in school, in high school,” and “for the most part, when I was there, I had positive
experiences.” However, during this time, she became pregnant with her first child. She described having block classes and getting “tripped up ’cause I got pregnant.” She also did not receive the support she needed to stay in school. Furthermore, Marquita discussed how she was really interested in history and science classes and that she did not really like math nor was she taught any advanced math. She learned basic math in school such as how to count money, but she was not taught how to do more advanced math, like “decimals, integers. . . and fractions.” As Marquita reflected on her schooling, she shared, “my kids probably know more than me with that.” Marquita said that she wants to learn this math and her desire to continue learning is contributing to her wanting to go back to school.

In addition to Marquita and Martai’s experiences, Kayla (28), a mother of two children residing in the Westside, graduated with her high school diploma and attended some college classes. She said that while she went to school to have fun, she also took her education seriously. Even so, she felt like when she went to college, her schools had not prepared her and taught her what she needed to know to be successful in college. She felt like she essentially had to start over: “I felt like, you know, the material and things that I was taught didn’t really help me in college. I feel like I had to start all over. You know?”

Interpersonal Violence

The theme of Interpersonal Violence emerged as participants discussed violence in their schools related to bullying and fighting. Several of the women described how they engaged in fighting in school as a way to defend and protect themselves and/or family members who were being bullied. For example, Nicole (28), a mother of two children living on the Westside, who graduated high school, and at the
time of the interview was about to begin a degree program in psychology from Wilmington University revealed how school was good during her elementary and middle school years. However, that changed as she transitioned into her adolescence during high school. She described this as a time “when it started to really fall down for me. You know, behavior problems, self-esteem issues.” Nicole described this as a time when the impact of being sexually assaulted as a child was “coming back haunting me, making me angry.” Although she was able to talk to and receive support from her guidance counselor at school, she felt like she did not know how to express herself, in particular her feelings of anger. She was having a hard time coping with these traumas from her childhood. When she did express herself, she felt like her mom did not believe her which caused her to feel discouraged and negatively impacted her mental health. Nicole also discussed the judgment and teasing that occurred in high school: “I got to high school, next thing, I started getting judged and I started reacting in retaliation of being judged at, judged on. That’s where a lot of my behavior came.” Nicole said she was being judged by girls and “outsiders, adults” in school. She noted how among peers, students were bullied as a result of their intersectional identities, and primarily for being economically poor. Nicole stated: “It comes a lot with you know bullying, teasing. People living better than others and having more than others you know. It mainly comes from that.”

Jaynelle (31), a mother of two children living in the Northside who left high school in 9th grade, described her schools as hostile environments where she had to fight to defend and protect her sister who is disabled and who continued to be bullied by peers in school:

I never let nobody do anything wrong to her. . . . They [school administrators] really didn’t do anything and if they didn’t do anything,
I took care of it myself. That’s just how I did it because I’m not taking that ‘cause like I said, I was the mom and dad, the everything for my brothers and sisters right under me, so I didn’t play no games. I don’t play no games at all. I really don’t.

Jaynelle was expelled from H.B. (i.e., Henry B. Dupont Middle School) for beating up a girl who “kicked her [sister] down the steps” and then for jumping the school principal. Jaynelle said that she jumped the principal because she perceived that the principal was being “prejudice” after the principal defended the girl who “kicked her [sister] down the steps.” Jaynelle described the situation:

Me and my sister got sent to her [principal’s] office and she. . . said, ‘Why are you hating on my people?’ And me and my sister looked at each other. My sister went, she spit on her and I was like ‘bop bop bop!’ [animating hitting/punching]. We defended us, we had to defend ourselves. Why you hating on my people? What do you mean? Like, are you [school principal] prejudice or something? So, I took it like that.

Based on the racial dynamics, although not stated explicitly in her interview, this likely was a white female principal that Jaynelle was referring to.

After this incident, Jaynelle and her sister attended an alternative school, the Positive Learning Center (PLC), which she described as having two sides: “they got the bad kids side and they got the kids that’s kinda disabled and slow.” Jaynelle said PLC was an environment where she continued to have to protect and defend her sister as “people used to mess with us all the time.” Furthermore, PLC was an environment where she did not feel supported. She felt like “it helped her [sister], but it didn’t help me:”

I need school. I really did need school, but she really needed it. She completed school, but she’s disabled. She has something called brain damage. She graduated and went to college to maintain and made her money so she could pay her bills and everything like that with her check, and she got her own place and everything now. She’s married and everything.
Jaynelle’s story highlights her fierce commitment to protect and defend her family when school administrators would not, and she continued to fight for her sister who was bullied even though that led her to being expelled. Her narrative also demonstrates how the sacrifices she made for her sister led to her sister being able to support herself (i.e., paying her bills and owning a house) while Jaynelle ultimately did not graduate from high school.

Teachers and School Officials

Teachers and School Officials emerged as a theme as the women discussed their experiences and interactions with teachers and school officials. Although several of the women mentioned having teachers and school officials who cared about and supported them, their collective experiences largely demonstrated that they had teachers and school officials who did not care about or support them. Below, I describe Nicole’s (28) story illuminating her positive and negative experiences and interactions with teachers and school administrators; her story highlights the seemingly contradictory nature of having both. For example, Nicole described having teachers who cared, supported, and believed in her:

All my English teachers and all the teachers that I did get along with, they always told me I had, they always told me. . . . that I would be something very powerful, very motivated speaking. I always talked a lot. I love to write. So, you know they said I have a lot of potential. They can’t see me, they wouldn’t see me doing below. They see me somewhere big. So I always stuck with that.

Nicole explicitly discussed a white male history teacher she had in 8th grade who “made sure that we understood slavery.” This was the first time in her life she had heard about Emmett Till. Nicole recalled her teacher explicitly acknowledging his
position as a white male and the impression that left on her: “He was white, so I gave him all the power because he acknowledged that to us.”

Nicole also described negative experiences and interactions with teachers and school officials that ultimately led to her being expelled from two different high schools:

I started at Dickinson, got kicked out of Dickinson, 9th grade. I end up going to Newark for 9th and 10th and 11th, no 10th, and got kicked out of Newark and went to Kingswood and been there and graduated from Kingswood but walk [walked across the stage at graduation] with Glasgow High School.

While at Dickinson High School, Nicole said that her school principal continued to accuse her of being in the hall. Even though she was in class and the principal was confusing her with another girl in school, he suspended her for this behavior that he falsely accused her of. As a result of his false accusations, she described doing “some really disrespectful things” to him that ultimately led to her being expelled from Dickinson. She said:

It’s so embarrassing but I did something very crazy to the principal. He kept accusing me of being in the hall. Of course you have a look [a]likes but he kept saying he seen me. . . And umm, he suspended me, tried to suspend. And I was like ‘well, since you want to suspend me, might as well, I’m going to give you something to suspend me for.’ And when I did what I did, he ended up expelling me. I didn’t really care, I really. . . I really, it wasn’t. . . I didn’t like going to that school anyway.

Nicole did not share what exactly she did to the principal because her children were in the room for this portion of the interview. It was clear from her hesitation that even after all of these years, she did not want them to know what she had done, and at one point after briefly describing the situation, one of her children heard what she said and Nicole stated, “You weren’t supposed to hear that. Maybe after you graduate from
Although Nicole was disrespected by the principal and her response was appropriate given her age and circumstances, she did not want her children to engage in that way, demonstrating her high regard and value for education.

Similar to the false accusations at Dickinson, at Newark High School, she was falsely accused of “stealing a white girl’s cell phone.” Nicole said that her teacher notified the principal of this accusation who then asked the SRO to remove Nicole from class. Then, Nicole said they proceeded to “strip searched me” and “searched my locker, everything.” After they finished searching her and her belongings and did not find the white girl’s cell phone, she realized that “they didn’t even call my mom or nothing and ask them if they could search me or anything” — a direct violation of Nicole’s rights. Nicole explicitly tied her experiences of being expelled to being a direct consequence of her intersecting identities as a low-income Black female. She stated that if the white girl who falsely accused her of stealing her cell phone “was Black, they wouldn’t gave a hell.” Nicole recognized a prevailing narrative about Black girls presumed guilt and white girls presumed innocence as well as the ways that teachers and school officials listen to and believe white girls, but not Black girls.

Home and Family Life

Several of the participants described the impact of their home and family life on their schooling experiences. Their insights and experiences shed light on the relationship between structural violence outside of school and street-identified Black American girl’s in-school behavior. For example, Jaynelle (31), when asked about her family life growing up, responded by saying “my family sucked.” She explained that both of her parents struggled with substance use. As the oldest child, Jaynelle had to
take care of her and her siblings; she “had to grow up fast.” She started providing for her family when she was 14 years old. She said:

I’ve been working so much since I was like 14 years old, and when I mean by working, I mean jobs. I mean dancing. I mean dating. I mean doing things that I didn’t really wanna do in order to take care of my siblings and make sure they was good, you know what I’m saying? So, I’ve experienced a serious life. I can honestly say I’ve experienced some serious things in life.

While she was taking care of her siblings, Jaynelle attended PLC (i.e., the Positive Learning Center). She described PLC as “really fun” and as “a good school”:

You got teachers that give you the easiest work in the world and you just pass and flying aces. . . . We had a couple teachers that gave us snacks all the time, like they didn’t just like so we could be good, because we were really bad kids. They were like, they used to take us on smoke breaks for cigarettes.

Jaynelle said that PLC was a school that “I could’ve made it all the way through there, but instead somebody told them I had weed.” She was “expelled for selling marijuana” in school and said that she was doing so because she “was trying to provide.” She described her familial responsibilities that eventually led to her leaving school in 9th grade:

I left school at the grade of 9th grade ‘cause I had so much responsibilities, putting them on the bus stop. Taking my sister, she’s handicapped, so I had to put her on a bus in front of the house. It was just like a lot to deal with. I had surgery on my foot because I stepped on one of my mom’s, my mom’s thing [drug needle]. It got stuck in my foot, so they had to do surgery on my foot when I was younger. It’s a lot. I dealt with a lot. I probably need counseling and all that shit, but you know. It is what it is. I’m dealing with it.

Mahogany (32), a mother of six children and a grandmother of one grandchild residing on the Westside who maintains a desire to return to school to obtain her GED, also had home and family life conditions that influenced her schooling experiences.
She grew up in a family that she described as “almost always us, family.” She said that these values stick with her and “that’s why I’m so hardened on the ‘family first’.” Growing up, Mahogany remembered living in overcrowded conditions with her mom, aunt, uncle, brothers, and cousins all in a two-bedroom house. Even with these conditions, she said that they had structure: “I would go out and play and stuff, but it was still structure in the home. We ate dinner every night. I still had a curfew, streetlights come on, I had to be indoors.” She also grew up in a family that was actively involved in street life selling drugs in and out of the home, and Mahogany’s house got raided by police looking for drugs. The police arrested her mom along with several of her brothers, uncles, cousins, and an aunt. After the raid, Mahogany and her siblings who were not arrested in the raid bounced around from their grandmothers to their aunts, and eventually to foster care:

We didn’t go straight to foster care from there because my grandma was only living in the high rise, but she had been there so long that the management had allowed her to let us live with her for some time. But then, other tenants in the high rise started to complain, like we were being too noisy, and, ‘That’s not fair. We have rules.’ And, ‘You allowed her to move all her grandchildren,’ and... My grandma had to tell the social worker that she wasn’t able to keep us, anymore. So then, we went to my aunt’s for a short stay, but my aunt was due to go to incarceration. ... My mom’s sister, the one who got arrested with my mom at the time. She was due to go do her time for incarceration, and at that time the state had to come.

Mahogany went to foster care at age 12. She described her family dynamic as being “ripped apart” and how that greatly impacted her both in and outside of school:

Oh, that triggered something in me. I went into a rage. ... A rage. I didn’t like no one, at all. Not even myself. It was really bad. I was horrible at school. I was mistreating the other children at the foster home. I didn’t want anything but to be with my family.
Mahogany’s story suggests that her behavior in school was the result of her family being “ripped apart” given the survival and coping mechanisms her family employed to address the adverse structural conditions that continually harm low-income Black families.

Qualitative Findings for 45-54 Years Olds

Similar to the 25-34 age cohort, the three main interrelated themes identified embodied the racialized, gendered, and classed schooling experiences of street-identified Black women ages 45-54: (1) Violence in School, (2) Teachers and School Officials, and (3) Desegregated Schooling. The first two themes were similar to the 25-34 age cohort, while the third theme in this age cohort diverged. Their perspectives highlight their unique intersectional and multidimensional identities as low-income street-identified Black American women. Furthermore, resilience was a salient theme and as such was embedded throughout the women’s schooling experiences. Many of the women engaged in street life as a site of resilience in school and was used as an adaptive response and form of survival in response to the schooling conditions they were required to navigate.

While all 11 interviews with women ages 45-54 were coded, some of the women spoke more explicitly and in greater length about their schooling experiences. Below, the perspectives and stories of the women are highlighted who best demonstrate the various themes.

Violence in School

Violence in School emerged as a theme as the street-identified Black women in this age cohort described their experiences with interpersonal forms of violence by
peers and by teachers and school officials as well as the ways in which institutions perpetuate violence against low-income, Black women. As such, their experiences were divided into two subthemes: (1) Structural Violence and (2) Interpersonal Violence.

Structural Violence

Structural Violence emerged as a theme as the women described their schooling environments that espoused institutional inequities related to exclusionary discipline practices and poor schooling conditions. These forms of structural violence are demonstrations of power and social control that negatively impact Black girl’s experiences.

Structural violence in the form of exclusionary discipline practices emerged as the women recalled being expelled and/or suspended from school. For example, Connie (53), a mother of two residing in the Northside, completed the 11th grade, but did not graduate from high school. She was expelled for fighting. Connie attended Mount Pleasant High School, located outside the City of Wilmington in the northern suburbs, where she talked about defending and protecting her sister, Tracy, by fighting white girls in the school who were “messing with [her]”. Connie recalled fighting at school, and as a result of defending her sister, she continued to be suspended:

I used to fight all the time. . . I started riots and everything at Mount Pleasant, yeah. But, my sister Tracy didn’t say or do nothin’, but I would, and the white girls would get smart with her. She was real timid and stuff. Didn’t want to be there, no way. So I would fight for her, yeah so they would always suspend me. When I get suspended they would jump on her [Tracy], the white girls would beat her up and not come back. . . White girl got her. Bit her finger, tore her ass up. I come outta school, I got suspended again. I tear they asses up again. I kicked the bathroom doors open, take their money, tell her I like the coat, take their ski vests and all that. Come home with different coats and stuff.
Even though Connie’s experiences were characterized by fighting to defend and protect her sister, she still described herself as “one of them bad kids.” After being expelled from Mount Pleasant, Connie explicitly recalled school officials telling her, “don’t come back to school no more.” She was sent to Albert’s Center, an alternative school, which she described as an environment where kids were fighting too. She said, “I just wouldn’t go to the bus,” and her grandma and mom would try to take her to school, but she just did not want to go.

Structural violence in the form of poor schooling conditions emerged as some of the women described their schooling environments characterized by low expectations, lack of college preparation, and use of standardized tests that perpetuate white supremacy. For example, Tosha H. (47), a mother of eight children living on the Westside, attended Chester High School, a public high school located in Chester, PA, and left school in the 12th grade. Tosha H. explicitly described going to school in an environment where she felt like the school did not care about her or her education. She talked broadly about how the education system pushes Black students along from grade to grade and shared how this contributes to Black students graduating from high school with the equivalence of a 3rd grade education. She said specifically that the system did the same to her: “they pushed me too.” In 8th grade, she had a conversation with her principal, who was considering holding Tosha H. back and told him that he should let her advance to 9th grade, or she was “ready to show ‘em what I do and I’m gonna wreak havoc.” The principal did exactly what she requested. He did not hold her back, but rather “pushed” her to 9th grade. In addition to being pushed along without concern for her education, Tosha H. also said that the schools she attended had low academic expectations of students and did not push them to learn more. She
also described her experience of asking to be placed in a basic math class instead of
taking Algebra, a more advanced math class:

I get to Claymont, had Algebra, told them, ‘I don’t want Algebra. I
want my basic math back.’ And they gave it to me. ... They never cared
about us or our education. ... You know, so if you was gonna give me
... Tell me say I want, I don’t want Algebra. I want basic math. They
just gave it to me. Like it was nothing. ... take your basic math. Be
basic. We never wanted you to get your education anyway. But that’s
what you asked me for, I got you.

In addition to her school environments characterized by low academic
expectations, her schools were also not preparing her to be successful in college nor
were they even helping her understand what a college education could do for her.
Tosha H. said that her grandmom really cared about her continuing her education and
going to college, and that her grandmom was going to pay for four years of college.
Despite her grandmoms offer to pay, Tosha H. did not go. She expressed that she did
not understand what a college education would do for her and felt like her grandmom
did not really explain it to her, but neither did anyone at her school. The one thing that
Tosha H. did understand about the college process was the need to take the SAT. An
exam that she did not want to take because from her perspective it is biased against
Black folks who live in urban areas:

I damn sure didn’t like these SAT tests they give me, ‘cause they
biased. ‘Cause who in the hell know what a brook is? We know about
creeks and ponds. What the fuck is a brook. ... This is a trick question
here. We in the hood. We don’t know nothing about no damn brook.
We don’t have brooks here. ... We got stuff with cans in it and and
needles and stuff and that’s a creek. ... So I was never interested in
school.
Interpersonal Violence

Interpersonal Violence emerged as a theme as the women revealed their experiences and interactions with bullying and fighting in school. Several of the women described how their peers bullied them at school as a result of their intersectional identities of being low-income Black girls. Some of the women also recalled fighting in school as a way to defend and protect themselves and/or family members who were being bullied. For example, Tosha H. (47) described experiences of being teased at school about how she dressed. She said that being teased about her clothing influenced her to begin boosting (i.e., buying and selling stolen goods; McCurn, 2018) clothes: “You could not out-dress my ass. I’m telling you, you couldn’t. And so you better not say nothing to me ‘cause I’m gonna go from head to toe on you.” Tosha H’s interest in school was to go to school and “out dress everybody.” She described the importance of designer clothing, while also acknowledging how she feels about designer clothing being a disguise:

This TV makes it believe that if I look a certain way when I come out the door that I have to have this name brand on. You call it designer, I call it disguises. . . .You know, ‘cause you’re disguising something. . . . I was too, when I was in school, when I was trying to be the best, the best dressed.

In addition to being bullied about her clothes, Tosha H. also said she was called names in school because of her weight and the light color of her skin: “not only was I ‘fat’, but I was not just a ‘fat bitch’, but I was a ‘fat, light-skinned, bitch.’” She said that she got tired of being called names, so in response to being bullied about her weight, the father of her child introduced her to crack cocaine. She described her mentality at that time: “Y’all call me names, I’m gonna do drugs. I’m gonna get on drugs because this is gonna help me lose weight. A lot of people do that.” In terms of
being bullied for the light color of her skin, she said “in school, as light skinned, I had to go through it.” She recalled that in 6th grade, some of her classmates asked her, “What breed are you?” Tosha H. said she had to look up the word breed because she did not know what that meant. She soon realized that her classmates really meant to ask her “what nationality am I?” but they just did not know the correct term to use. She continued to talk about how “light skinned girls have it bad. Especially if you mixed, you really get it bad.” She described not only is she light skinned, but she also has hair that “is little bit different than y’alls”:

I don’t need that perm you need. I just need mine done and do this and put some water on it and it’s gonna flow. And when I move, my hair gonna move just like that. . . I don’t have to do all that. This is a wig, but when my hair is out and my hair flow, my hair flow with the wind. When I, when I walk my hair move. I don’t have to do a little extra to make it move. It just does it because it’s thin and it is what it is. So you gotta go through that. You gotta go through, you think you cute.

Lisa T. (51), an aunt and sister living on the Westside who graduated with her high school diploma also recalled instances of bullying in high school. She is the youngest of three girls and recalled being mad because she had to go to school by herself and her older sisters were not there to protect her. Lisa T. said that there was a girl who bullied her at school whose nickname was Muhammad Ali. She used to push her friends into Lisa T., but she would never do anything directly to Lisa T., just indirectly by pushing her friends. Lisa T. said that she would come home and tell her mom and sisters about this girl bullying her, but she would never do anything back. She said: “I would never fight her ‘cause I wanted to graduate from school. I know if I really dug in her ass, I woulda really messed her up.” But she said that after months of not saying or doing anything, on the last day of school, “me and her went at it” and it
took three principals to pull Lisa T. off her. Lisa T. knew that if she said or did anything to this girl, that would have prevented her from graduating.

**Teachers and School Officials**

Interactions with Teachers and School Officials arose as a theme as the women shared their experiences with teachers and school officials that were primarily negative and violent against some of the women. One of the women, Natasha B. (47), a mother of five children and grandmother of five grandchildren residing on the Westside who attended Wilmington High School, briefly mentioned that she loved her teachers in high school. However, this was not how many of the other women described their experiences. For example, Lisa L. (51), a mother of six children living on the Westside, revealed how when she was going to school, students used to be able to be paddled: “Back in the day. . . you go to the Dean, and he would use the paddle [when] you got out a lot of line, and then tell your mother.” Similar to Lisa L., Connie (53) described her experiences in school with interpersonal violence where teachers used to tell students, “I’ll beat you.” Even though her grandma and mother told the teachers they did not want them to use the paddle on Connie, they would try anyway. She said:

> So, back in the day, teachers used to paddle you back in the day, and my grandma and mother didn’t go for that, like, you don’t put your hands on. . . Then I correct her, but they used to really put it on you back in the day.

One of Connie’s sisters, Lisa T., who interviewed with Connie also recalled her getting beat at school. Lisa T. said: “Yeah, she’d come home all beat. They [grandma and mother] wonderin’ why she’s red.” Furthermore, Connie referred to a teacher in school who she “didn’t get along [with].” She recalled a specific incident of
violence against her where she had to protect and defend herself: “I knew that he was gay, and he had beat me with a pointer stick and I grabbed that thing, I took, threw a chair, knocked the glasses off him.”

In addition to these experiences of violence perpetrated against Black girls, Connie also recalled an extremely negative, violent experience in 4th grade with a female teacher at Martin Luther King Elementary School who made her sit in a trash can and put a white, plastic bag over her head. When one of the interviewers asked her what led to this, Connie put the blame on herself by saying she is, “one of them bad kids. . . I was bipolar anyway. I’m one of them bad kids. I forgot to tell you that. . . . I was bad from the womb.” She recalled going home to tell her mom about the incident: “I got up and went home and told her that I wouldn’t sit there with the thing, or anything so she put me out.” After Connie’s teacher perpetuated this violence against her, Connie recalled that the only thing that the school did was remove her from the teacher’s class.

Desegregated Schooling

The theme of desegregated schooling arose from the women who described their experiences of having to attend desegregated schools as well as their experiences getting bussed to and from their new schools and their experiences within the school environment. Of all the street-identified Black women ages 45-54 in the study, Cinda (54), a mother living on the Westside who left school in 11th grade, talked the most extensively about her experiences with desegregation and the ways desegregation negatively affected her. For junior high school, Cinda attended Warner (i.e., Emalea Pusey Warner Junior High School) and was expecting to attend P. S. (i.e., duPont High School), a Black school, where all of her siblings had graduated from. She
described P. S. as a school where she also wanted to go. However, as a result of state desegregation legislation requiring Delaware to comply with the Brown v. Board of Education ruling, she attended and was bused to John Dickinson High School, which was previously a predominantly white school located outside the City of Wilmington. While on her home-to-school commute on the bus, she recalled that white people would “throw stuff at the bus when we was getting on,” and said that white people would spit on her as she walked past them. She stated: “Ain’t nobody going through that mess. Like shit, this ain’t slavery.”

Once Cinda got off the bus at school, Cinda was forced to attend high school in an environment that was predominantly white where she described the teachers and students as being “prejudiced.” She recalled negative experiences with her teachers that were related to her multiple identities as a low-income Black girl. She recalled attending school on Mondays to retrieve her assignments for the week, and she would not come back to school until Friday so that she could take her test. When she passed, her teachers would question her about how she passed and would accuse her of cheating. However, Cinda noted how when white girls did the same thing, the teachers never questioned or accused them of anything:

Cinda: I’d go there Monday, get my work . . . Friday, come back, take my test. I pass but yet I’m not supposed to be smart enough to pass this test because I wasn’t there all week. Whereas a white girl who wasn’t there all week, but they aren’t asking them how they passed and such.

Interviewer: I got you. So, they were questioning you?

Cinda: Yeah, like how did you pass, you gotta cheat sheet or something?
One of the reasons that Cinda wanted to attend P. S., which was the Black school that her siblings attended for high school, was because of the Black teachers who taught there. She said that the Black teachers at P. S. cared about her siblings in a way that she did not experience at Dickinson. She recalled that when her siblings did not show up to school, their teachers would call the house to check in: “Yeah, they used to call up when my sisters and them were [playing] hooky from school. Darn right they would call.” However, the teachers at Dickinson would not. She said the teachers “didn’t give a rip.”

Being in this school environment where she did not feel supported or cared for and being discriminated against because she was Black contributed to her leaving school: “I just got fed up. I don’t even want to deal with them . . . It just made me feel uncomfortable.” Cinda recalled that each morning when it was time to wake up, she thought: “man, I don’t feel like going there and dealing with them [white] people.” When Cinda made the decision to leave high school, she also did not feel like the school supported her at all. According to Cinda when she left school, they did not try to call and get her to come back. They did “absolutely nothing.”

Similar to Cinda, Sheila (52), a mother of four sons living on the Westside who graduated with her high school diploma, attended a desegregated high school, William Penn High School, as a result of the Brown v. Board decision and subsequent state desegregation legislation. Sheila graduated with her high school diploma from William Penn and was able to obtain her driver’s license as well, but she also expressed having her share of difficult times at William Penn. She described a school environment that was predominantly white and filled with racial “tension.” Sheila said that Black students from Riverside and New Castle attended William Penn and that the
school thought that the Black students “were gonna clash, but we didn’t.” Sheila said that despite being from different sides of the city, the Black students all knew each other. Instead, she said there was tension with the white students:

They be standing there like this [arms folded]. And you would say, you said ‘Good morning.’ They wouldn’t say nothing, but they know how, how to get you in trouble, shoot. Cause that school was so big if you looked for me, if I was down that way and they say, they say ‘here they come.’ They like, ‘Forget y’all,’ and we’d be all the way down the other, all the way and they couldn’t catch us.

Although Cinda and Sheila discussed negative experiences at their desegregated high schools, it is important to note that was not necessarily every woman’s experience. Like Sheila, Lisa T. (51) also attended William Penn High School. She described the student body as a mix of Black and white students. She said: “It was mixed. It was beautiful. I loved William Penn. . . . I loved the people that was there.” According to Lisa T., she felt like William Penn had “more stuff to do” and they had “more educating classes” compared to the Black high schools. She elaborated on these feelings to say that as a result of being at William Penn, she was able to enroll in a sewing class and she participated in a co-op program where she was able to receive her nursing certification. Lisa T. believes that she would have continued to work as a nursing aid if she had not started selling weed and cocaine in school. Lisa T. started selling drugs in high school as a way of coping with growing up poor as well as a way to support her own drug use. She described growing up with her mom, grandma, and two sisters and not having a lot of money. She said that her mom was “a hustler” who boosted and as a result was in and out of jail. One of Lisa T.’s older sisters, Connie, began selling drugs to provide, and ultimately Lisa T. did the same. She said that she always had in her mind that “if I’mma do it, then I’mma sell it” as a
way to “keep my habit going.” She continued being involved in the streets as a way to provide for herself as well as for her two sisters and their children.

Qualitative Findings Comparing and Contrasting Experiences

The section answers the following qualitative research question “In what ways are street-identified Black American girls and women’s schooling experiences different and similar across age cohorts?” by comparing and contrasting the women’s schooling experiences across the two age cohorts. Even though all of the women who participated in the study are low-income, street-identified Black Americans, it is important to demonstrate that they are not a homogenous group, but rather have diverging experiences. Furthermore, comparing and contrasting their schooling experiences situates their narratives within a historical context. Below, I begin by discussing some of their differences in their schooling trajectories, and then describe areas of similarity while also highlighting nuances within those similarities.

One of the most notable differences in their experiences by age cohort was desegregation for the street-identified Black American women ages 45-54. The oldest women in this age cohort were 54 years old in 2018; therefore, they were born in approximately 1964, roughly 10 years after the Brown v. Board decision, and many of the women recalled transitioning to desegregated schools in high school. For example, Cinda (54) stated that she was expecting to attend P. S. DuPont High School after junior high school, just like her siblings. However, based on state desegregation legislation requiring Delaware to comply with the Brown v. Board ruling, she had to get bused out to John Dickinson High School. It is estimated that the oldest woman in the 25-34 age cohort was 33 years old in 2017; therefore, she was born in approximately 1984, roughly 30 years after Brown. Although the women did not
explicitly talk about desegregation, there were still changes that occurred to school
districts that would have impacted students living in Wilmington while they were in
school that were the direct result of desegregation (see Discussion section for more
information).

In addition to desegregation, another significant difference in schooling
experiences based on age cohort is the Home and Family Life theme among the 25-34
year old women. This theme sheds light on the effects of structural violence outside of
school and in particular how structural violence uniquely related to street-identified
Black American girl’s in-school behavior. For example, Mahogany (32) described
growing up in a home where many of her family members were selling drugs as a
means of survival and a form of resilience. The police raided her home and her mother
and other family members were arrested. Mahogany bounced around from her
grandmothers to her aunts, and eventually to foster care. This experience of having her
family “ripped apart” greatly impacted her both in and outside of school. Although
this theme was not identified in the data for the 45-54 year old women, this does not
necessarily mean that their home and family life, and in particular, the effects of
structural violence outside of school, did not impact their schooling. It can only be
concluded that this was not discussed during their interviews.

There were also similarities between the women’s school experiences based on
age cohort, such as experiences related to structural and interpersonal violence. In
terms of structural violence, women in both age cohorts recalled their experiences as
Black girls with exclusionary discipline practices and poor schooling conditions.
However, within each of these forms of structural violence, there are nuances in the
women’s schooling experiences. For example, Connie (53) recalled being expelled
from one school, while Martai (32) and Marquita (33) discussed being expelled from multiple schools.

In terms of poor schooling conditions, women in both age cohorts described their experiences in school as being characterized by low expectations, poor quality instruction, and lack of college preparation. For Marquita (33) and Martai (32), these punitive schooling conditions ultimately pushed them out. Also, interesting enough, both Marquita and Martai were pregnant at the time they decided to leave school. Martai said that she could not recall whether she felt like her teachers and administrations at school supported or cared about her, and Marquita described being taught basic math, but not learning more advanced math in school. In the older age cohort, Tosha H. (47) described similar environments with low expectations and lack of care and support, and she also expanded upon these poor schooling conditions when she discussed the use of standardized tests. Attending school in these types of hostile, unsupportive environments led to Marquita, Martai, and Tosha H. leaving school. Furthermore, both Kayla (28) and Tosha H. described not feeling like they were prepared for college. Kayla described feeling like what she was taught in school did not help her in college and she had to “start all over.” Although Tosha H. did not attend college, she still felt like school officials did not help her understand the value of college and what it could do for her and her future.

In addition, women in both age cohorts shared their stories of interpersonal violence related to bullying and fighting. In terms of bullying, both women in the younger and older age cohorts described being bullied as a direct result of how others viewed their intersectional identities, and in particular being economically poor. For example, Nicole (28) described how when she got to high school, she started getting
judged and “starting acting in retaliation of being judged” by peers and adults. She said that among peers, a lot of the bullying occurs because of “people living better than others and having more than others.” Tosha H. (47) also described how she was bullied at school because of how she dressed. This ultimately led her to boost clothes so that no one could out dress her at school. For both women, being economically poor and being bullied for it caused Nicole to retaliate and Tosha H. to begin engaging in an illegal activity, boosting.

In addition to bullying, women in both age cohorts described how they engaged in fighting as a way to defend and protect themselves and/or family members. For example, Jaynelle (31) described defending and protecting her sister who is disabled and continued to be bullied by peers in school, which ultimately led to her being expelled from school. Lisa T. (51) also said that she had to protect herself from a girl bullying her at school by not engaging with her. She knew that if she did fight her, the consequences of those actions would lead her to not graduate. The interpersonal violence that these women experienced in school also intersects with structural violence in the form of exclusionary discipline.

Furthermore, women in both age cohorts revealed their experiences and interactions with teachers and school officials. However, a major difference in their experiences and interactions is that the women in the older age cohort almost exclusively discussed their teachers and school officials and their violent, negative experiences and interactions. For example, Lisa L. (51) and Connie (53) both described being paddled, a form corporal punishment, by teachers and school officials in school as a means of discipline. The use of corporal punishment, intentionally inflicting physical pain as a form of discipline, in schools was banned in Delaware in
Although women in the younger age cohort did not mention being subjected to such discipline, they would have been in school prior to when corporal punishment was banned.

Women in both age cohorts talk about other negative experiences and interactions with teachers and school officials, demonstrating a lack of care and support. For example, in the older age cohort, Connie (53) recalled an extremely negative experience with a teacher who made her sit in a trash can with a bag over her head in class. Then, in the younger age cohort, Nicole (28) recalled the time she was falsely accused of “stealing a white girl’s cell phone.” She described how the SRO strip searched her and searched her locker for the white girl’s cell phone, which the SRO never found. Nicole stated that if the white girl who falsely accused her of stealing her cell phone “was Black, they wouldn’t gave a hell.” This was Nicole’s second experience with being falsely accused of something in school that ultimately led to her being expelled.

Women in both age cohorts shared some positive experiences and interactions with teachers who they felt cared about and supported them. For example, Natasha B. (47) said that she loved her teachers at Wilmington High School, and Nicole (28) stated that all of her English teachers and the other teachers she got along with told her that she had a lot of potential and “would be something very powerful.” Although the women in the older age cohort did not provide as many examples of these positive experiences and interactions, their experiences highlight that not all experiences and interactions with teachers, school officials, and Black girls are negative.
Mixed Methods Integrative Results

The purpose of the mixed methods integrative analysis was to determine how the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women help to explain and add additional insight and nuance to their self-reported attitudes toward schooling. This analysis addressed the following mixed methods integration research question:

4. In what ways does the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women help to explain their self-reported attitudes towards schooling?

Below, I present a joint display that served two purposes: (1) to demonstrate the links between the three subscales and three critical items and the participant’s experiences and (2) to identify subscales and critical items that did not have sufficient qualitative data for integration. Then, I describe an additional mean score calculation that I conducted to contextualize the group mean scores. Then, I provide an explanation of the additional insight and nuance that was gained about the quantitative findings based on the qualitative themes as part of the integrative analysis. I also include an explanation for the quantitative findings that could not be integrated based on insufficient qualitative data. Finally, I present a statistics-by-themes joint display that includes each quantitative subscale and critical item with sufficient data for integration.

Connecting Subscales and Critical Items and Participant’s Experiences

I began my mixed methods integration analysis by developing a joint display that links the items on each of the quantitative subscales and critical items with participant’s experiences. The corresponding qualitative themes in which the participants’ experiences are presented in the qualitative findings section, see Table
24. Since the qualitative themes identified through the coding process were interrelated, I chose to connect items on the subscales and critical items with participant’s stories in order to facilitate mixed methods integration and understand how the qualitative findings add additional insight and nuance to the quantitative findings. The purpose of this joint display in the integration process was to act as a writing tool. For this integration process, I did not count up all of the women who helped me draw the conclusions, but rather I have highlighted the perspectives and stories of the women highlighted in the Qualitative Results section who best demonstrate the themes from the quantitative subscales and critical items.
Table 24  Joint Display Connecting Quantitative Subscales and Critical Items and Qualitative Themes and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Subscales and Critical Items</th>
<th>Qualitative Themes and Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34 year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54 year olds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Quality of Education</td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I was in high school, every student had an equal chance of getting into the best classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My high school was not as good as it should have been in providing equal educational opportunities for students of color.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sometimes I couldn’t relate or identify with the subject taught to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My teachers knew their subject matter well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My teachers taught well, so that students understood the material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I was challenged in high school by my schoolwork.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In my high school, all students could have achieved if they tried hard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kayla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tosha H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desegregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaynelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Family Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaynelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and School Officials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attitudes Toward School Safety
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.  
30. I felt safe at my high school.  
31. The police or security officers in my school made the school safer.

### Attitudes Toward Grades in High School  
9. I cared a lot about grades in high school.  

### Attitudes Toward Teachers  
12. If I messed up in high school, teachers were willing to give me a second chance.  
13. My teachers really knew and understood me.  
14. Teachers, in general, cared about the students in my high school.  
17. Teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity.  
29. I felt comfortable talking to teachers in school about a problem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers and School Officials</th>
<th>Teachers and School Officials</th>
<th>Structural Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Marquita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natasha B.</td>
<td>Martai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa L.</td>
<td>Martai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Desegregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquita</td>
<td>Martai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward College Readiness</td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My high school prepared me as well for college as any other student in the United States.</td>
<td>Kayla</td>
<td>Tosha H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School</td>
<td>Interpersonal Violence</td>
<td>Interpersonal Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I often saw physical fights at my high school.</td>
<td>Jaynelle</td>
<td>Lisa T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
<td>Structural Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martai</td>
<td>Connie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contextualizing the Mean Scores

During the mixed methods integration process, I wanted to contextualize the group mean scores for the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education, Attitudes Toward Teachers, and Attitudes Toward School Safety subscales. All three subscales were composed of more than one item and therefore were originally created by developing a sum score of all the items in the subscale and calculating a mean of those sum scores for each age cohort (i.e., mean of sum scores). Instead of using the average of the sum scores, I decided to calculate a mean score by dividing participant’s sum score for each subscale by the number of items in the subscale (i.e., mean of item scores). Then, I calculated the mean of those mean scores for each age cohort.

It should be noted that the mean of item scores and the mean of sum scores are perfectly correlated with one another. The difference is related to the interpretation of the scores. For example, on the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education section, the mean of item scores enables me to provide a mean score for each age cohort on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) as compared to the mean of sum scores which enables me to provide a mean score on a scale from 10 to 40. I did not have to calculate the mean of items scores for Attitudes Toward Caring About Grades in High School, Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting, and Attitudes Toward College Readiness because they only have one item.

Explanations for Quantitative Findings Based on Qualitative Findings

Two of the subscales, Attitudes Toward Quality of Education and Attitudes Toward Teachers, and two of the critical items, Attitudes Toward Caring About Grades in High School and Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School, had
sufficient data for integration, see Table 25. Below, I present the quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA for each subscale and critical item along with the mean of item scores for both age cohorts. Then, I describe the qualitative findings and how the qualitative findings help to explain and add additional insight and nuance to their self-reported attitudes toward schooling by age cohorts.

**Attitudes Toward Quality of Education**

This subscale consisted of 10 items on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*), reference Table 14 for subscale items. The quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA demonstrated that although the women ages 45-54 years old had a higher mean score ($M = 27.72, SD = 3.11$; i.e., more positive attitudes toward the quality of education) compared to the 25-34 years old age cohort ($M = 26.08, SD = 4.64$), there were no statistically significant differences in means scores on the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education subscale between age cohorts.

In order to contextualize the mean scores, I calculated the following mean of item scores for the two age cohorts: 45-54 age cohort ($M = 2.78, SD = 0.31$) and 25-34 age cohort ($M = 2.61, SD = 0.46$). These mean scores for both age cohorts of women show that their mean responses to the items fell between ‘disagree’ and ‘agree’ and were leaning more towards ‘agree’. Figure 11 shows the distribution of the mean of item scores for both age cohorts.
The qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews indicated that a few of the women revealed positive aspects regarding the quality of their education. For example, Nicole (28) described having a white male history teacher who wanted to make sure that Nicole and her classmates understood slavery. Also, Lisa T. (51) described loving her high school that was desegregated because there was “more stuff to do” (i.e., sewing class and co-op nursing program). However, their collective experiences largely demonstrated that they shared their stories related to poor schooling conditions such as a lack of challenging coursework, lack of college
preparation, low academic expectations, lack of equal educational opportunities, and poor quality of instruction.

The quantitative and qualitative findings were consistent with one another in that there were no statistically significant differences in mean scores and participants in both age cohorts described similar types of schooling conditions. The qualitative findings provide additional insights into the quantitative findings and particularly insight into the poor schooling conditions the women experienced. For example, in the 25-34 age cohort, Jaynelle (31) discussed attending PLC, an alternative school, and how she was not challenged by her coursework and their low academic expectations of students. She described how her teachers gave her and the other students “the easiest work in the world and you just pass.” Tosha H. (47), in the 45-54 age cohort, shared how she also attended schools in similar environments as Jaynelle by letting her take a basic math class instead of taking Algebra, a more advanced math class. Integrating these findings provides additional insights into the quantitative findings and why some of the girls and women would have selected ‘disagree’ or even ‘strongly disagree’ on some of the items in the subscale. Furthermore, integration allows for more context on how low-income street-identified Black American girls are experiencing these conditions within their schools and how these types of conditions have continued to occur over time.

**Attitudes Toward Teachers**

This subscale consisted of five items on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*), reference Table 14 for subscale items. The quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA indicated that although the women ages 45-54 year old had a higher mean score ($M = 14.13$, $SD = 2.06$; i.e., more positive attitudes
toward their teachers) compared to the 25-34 year old age cohort ($M = 13.42, SD = 2.68$), there were no statistically significant differences in means scores on the Attitudes Toward Teachers subscale between age cohorts.

In order to contextualize the mean scores, I calculated the following mean of item scores for the two age cohorts: 45-54 age cohort ($M = 2.83, SD = 0.41$) and 25-34 age cohort ($M = 2.68, SD = 0.54$). These mean scores for both age cohorts of women show that their mean responses to the items fell between ‘disagree’ and ‘agree’ and were leaning more towards ‘agree’. Figure 12 shows the distribution of the mean of item scores for both age cohorts.

![Figure 12](image)

**Figure 12** Distribution of the Mean of Item Scores for the Attitudes Toward Teachers Subscale by Age Cohort
The qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews indicated that the women had teachers and school officials who cared about and supported them. However, their collective experiences largely demonstrated that they had negative experiences and interactions with teachers and school officials, demonstrating a lack of care and support.

The quantitative and qualitative findings were consistent with one another in that there were no statistically significant differences in mean scores and participants in both age cohorts described similar types of experiences with teachers. The qualitative findings provide an intersectional and more nuanced understanding of the quantitative findings and insight into the women’s negative experiences. Furthermore, the qualitative findings provide more insight into their relationships with school officials. For example, Nicole was born in approximately 1990 and attended schools as the use of zero-tolerance policies in schools expanded in the mid to late 1990s (Addington, 2019; Howard, 2016; Skiba, 2014). She was one of the few women who described an interaction with her teacher, principal, and SRO when she was falsely accused of stealing a white girl’s cell phone in high school. The SRO strip searched her and searched her locker without talking to her mom—a direct violation of Nicole’s rights. Nicole explicitly tied her experiences of being expelled to being a direct consequence of her intersecting identities as a low-income Black female. She stated that if the white girl who falsely accused her of stealing her cell phone “was Black, they wouldn’t gave a hell.”

Furthermore, Cinda was born in approximately 1964 and talked most extensively about her experiences with desegregation. One story she shared was about being accused of cheating by her white teachers. Cinda recalled going to school to
retrieve her assignments on Monday and would come back on Friday to take her test. When she passed, her teachers would question her about how she passed and accuse her of cheating, but when white girls did the same thing, the teachers never questioned or accused them of anything. Although Nicole and Cinda were born approximately 26 years apart and attended schools in different historical contexts (i.e., zero-tolerance policies and desegregation, respectively), integration shows how their experiences still have common threads related to their identities as low-income street-identified Black American girls and how their teachers viewed them as “guilty,” but not the white girls.

**Attitudes Toward Caring About Grades in High School**

This critical item was scored on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*), reference Table 14 for item. The quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA showed that although women ages 45-54 years old had a slightly higher mean score ($M = 2.98, SD = 0.66$; i.e., more positive attitudes toward caring about grades in high school) compared to the 25-34 years old age cohort ($M = 2.95, SD = 0.83$), there were no statistically significant differences in means scores on Attitudes Toward Caring About Grades in High School between age cohorts.

Since this critical item consisted of one item on a 4-point Likert scale, if a participant selected ‘strongly agree’, their score would be 4. If a participant selected ‘agree’, their score would be 3. The mean scores for both age cohorts was approximately 3, indicating that, on average, they agreed that they cared about their grades in high school. Figure 13 shows the distribution of the mean of item scores for both age cohorts.
The qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews indicated that the women did not talk about their grades in either age cohort. This was not necessarily surprising given that there was not a question in the qualitative interview protocol that explicitly asked about caring about grades in high school. However, what did emerge from the interviews, also without being explicitly asked, was how some of the women in the 25-34 age cohort expressed that they were optimistic about being able to further their own education. For example, Marquita described getting expelled in elementary school and ultimately having to repeat a grade. Even so, Marquita said she was determined and adamant about the fact that “at the end of the day, it is what it is. I still
want to further my education. It’s not going to stop me now.” Therefore, the qualitative findings expand upon the quantitative findings. Integrating these complementary findings suggests that street-identified Black women in both age cohorts, on average, cared about their grades in high school and that the women in the 25-34 age cohort expressed that they cared about and valued furthering their education.

**Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School**

This critical item was scored on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 4 (*strongly disagree*), reference Table 14 for item. The quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA demonstrate that although the women ages 45-54 years old had a higher mean score ($M = 2.24, SD = 0.63$; i.e., less likely to have witnessed fighting in high school) compared to the 25-34 years old age cohort ($M = 1.95, SD = 0.64$), there were no statistically significant differences in mean scores on Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School between age cohorts.

Since this critical item consisted of one item on a 4-point Likert scale, if a participant selected ‘strongly agree’, their score would be 4. If a participant selected ‘agree’, their score would be 3. However, this item was reverse scored, and therefore the interpretation was reversed. Since the mean scores of both age cohorts were hovering around a mean of 2, prior to reverse scoring, the mean scores would have been approximately 3. This indicates that, on average, participants ‘agree’ that they often witnessed fighting in high school. Figure 14 shows the distribution of the mean of item scores for both age cohorts.
The qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews indicated that, as girls, the women fought to defend and/or protect themselves or family members. Therefore, the quantitative and qualitative findings complement each other in that they provided two different perspectives regarding fighting in high school. Integrating these complementary findings suggests that street-identified Black women in both age cohorts were attending schools in environments where they witnessed fighting in high school and where they were engaged in fighting as a form of self-defense for themselves or family members.
Insufficient Explanations for Quantitative Findings Based on Qualitative Findings

Based on this process, I identified one subscale, Attitudes Toward School Safety, and one critical item, Attitudes Toward College Readiness, that had insufficient data for integration. Below, I describe the quantitative findings for the subscale and critical item along with why there was insufficient qualitative data for integration. In other words, I describe why the quantitative and qualitative findings were not integrated.

**Attitudes Toward School Safety**

This subscale consisted of three items on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree), reference Table 14 for subscale items. The quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA demonstrate that although the women ages 45-54 years old had a slightly higher mean score ($M = 8.22, SD = 1.40$; i.e., more positive attitudes toward school safety) compared to the 25-34 years old age cohort ($M = 8.11, SD = 2.05$), there were no statistically significant differences in means scores on the Attitudes Toward School Safety subscale between age cohorts.

In order to contextualize the mean scores, I calculated the following mean of item scores for the two age cohorts: 45-54 age cohort ($M = 2.74, SD = 0.47$) and 25-34 age cohort ($M = 2.70, SD = 0.68$). These mean scores for both age cohorts of women show that their mean responses to the items fell between ‘disagree’ and ‘agree’ and were leaning more towards ‘agree’.

The qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews indicated that the women in both age cohorts did not talk explicitly about their safety in school. Although some of the women in both age cohorts discussed attending schools in environments where they were bullied and/or had to fight to defend themselves and
family members and felt like their teachers and school officials did not care about them, since they did not mention safety explicitly, there was insufficient evidence for integration.

**Attitudes Toward College Readiness**

This critical item was scored on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*), reference Table 14 for item. The quantitative findings from the one-way ANOVA demonstrated that although the women ages 45-54 years old had a slightly higher mean score ($M = 2.72, SD = 0.67$; i.e., more positive attitudes toward college readiness in high school) compared to the 25-34 years old age cohort ($M = 2.47, SD = 0.78$), there were no statistically significant differences in means scores on Attitudes Toward College Readiness between age cohorts.

Since this critical item consisted of one item on a 4-point Likert scale, if a participant selected ‘strongly agree’, their score would be 4. If a participant selected ‘agree’, their score would be 3. Therefore, these mean scores for both age cohorts show that, on average, their responses to the item averaged between ‘disagree’ or ‘agree’ but the 45-54 age cohort was leaning more towards ‘agree’.

The qualitative findings that emerged from the interviews indicated that two women talked briefly about college readiness. Given that the college readiness item was also included in the Attitudes Toward Quality of Education subscale and therefore integrated for that analysis, integrating that same data again did not add any value to the findings. Therefore, I concluded that there was insufficient evidence for integration.
### Table 25  Joint Display with Findings and Meta Inferences by Age Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Exemplar Quotes</th>
<th>Meta Inferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Quality of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>2.61 (0.46)</td>
<td>Jaynelle (31): “You got teachers that give you the easiest work in the world and you just pass and flying aces. . . . We had a couple teachers that gave us snacks all the time. . . . They used to take us on smoke breaks for cigarettes.”</td>
<td>Consistent findings: There were no statistically significant differences in mean scores by age cohort and women in both age cohorts described similar schooling conditions. The qualitative findings provide additional insights into the quantitative findings related to the poor schooling conditions the women experienced, such as low academic expectations, poor quality instruction, and lack of college preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>2.78 (0.31)</td>
<td>Tosha H. (47): “I get to Claymont, had Algebra, told them, ‘I don’t want Algebra. I want my basic math back.’ And they gave it to me. . . They never cared about us or our education. . . You know, so if you was gonna give me ... Tell me say I want, I don’t want Algebra. I want basic math. They just gave it to me. Like it was nothing. . . take your basic math. Be basic. We never wanted you to get your education anyway. But that’s what you asked me for, I got you.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nicole (28): “All my English teachers and all the teachers that I did get along with, they always told me I had, they always told me... that I would be something very powerful, very motivated speaking. I always talked a lot. I love to write. So, you know they said I have a lot of potential. They can’t see me, they wouldn’t see me doing below. They see me somewhere big. So I always stuck with that.”

Nicole (28): “No, it was more they accused me of stealing a white girl’s cell phone... which they never found... Strip searched me for a telephone.”

Interviewer: “So she accused you, she gets the teacher involved and the teacher gets the principal involved.”

Nicole: “They get the officer to come get me, remove me from class. White girl. I say if she was black they wouldn’t gave a hell.”

Consistent findings: There were no statistically significant differences in mean scores by age cohort and women in both age cohorts described similar types of experiences with teachers. They had teachers who cared about and supported them, but their collective experiences largely demonstrated that they had teachers who demonstrated a lack of care and support. The qualitative findings provide an intersectional and more nuanced understanding of the quantitative findings and insight into the women’s negative experiences with teachers and school officials, such as teachers and school officials who falsely accused the women and presumed that they were “guilty.”

Natasha B. (47): “I loved my teachers [at Wilmington High School]”

Cinda (54): “I’d go there Monday, get my work... Friday, come back, take my test. I pass but yet I’m not supposed to be smart enough to pass this test because I wasn’t there all week. Whereas a white girl who wasn’t there all week, but they aren’t asking them how they passed and such... like how did you pass, you gotta cheat sheet or something?”

Complementary findings: Integrating these findings suggests that street-identified Black American women in both age cohorts cared about their grades in high school and that several of the women in the 25-34 age cohort expressed that they cared about and valued furthering their education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Attitude Score</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1.95 (0.64)</td>
<td>Jaynelle (31): “I never let nobody do anything wrong to her. . . . They [school administrators] really didn’t do anything and if they didn’t do anything, I took care of it myself. That’s just how I did it because I’m not taking that ‘cause like I said, I was the mom and dad, the everything for my brothers and sisters right under me, so I didn’t play no games. I don’t play no games at all. I really don’t.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>2.24 (0.63)</td>
<td>Connie (53): “I used to fight all the time. . . I started riots and everything at Mount Pleasant, yeah. But, my sister Tracy didn’t say or do nothin’, but I would, and the white girls would get smart with her. She was real timid and stuff. Didn’t want to be there, no way. So I would fight for her, yeah so they would always suspend me.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complementary findings:
Integrating these findings suggests that street-identified Black American women in both age cohorts were attending schools in environments where they witnessed fighting and where they were engaged in fighting as a form of self-defense or to protect a family member.
Chapter 5
DISCUSSION

This study was an exploration of the self-reported attitudes toward schooling and lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington, Delaware. In this chapter, I provide a summary and discussion of the findings in relation to the literature. Next, limitations of the study are presented and recommendations for future research are discussed. Finally, I conclude the chapter with implications gleaned from this research.

Summary and Discussion of Major Findings

In this section, findings are organized by each research question. I begin with the quantitative strand and inferences related to the quantitative research question followed by the findings related to connecting the quantitative findings with the qualitative methods by selecting participants for the qualitative phase based on quantitative findings. Then, a description of the qualitative strand and inferences related to the qualitative research questions are described. Lastly, I present the meta-inferences related to the integration of the findings and the mixed methods integration research question.

Quantitative Inferences

The purpose of the first phase of the study was to examine the self-reported attitudes toward schooling of street-identified Black American girls and women across four age cohorts. The results addressed the following quantitative research question:
1. What are the group mean differences in street-identified Black American girls and women’s self-reported attitudes towards schooling based on the Attitudes Toward Education subscales and critical items by age cohort?

In order to answer this research question, an EFA was conducted to examine the underlying structure of the Attitudes Toward Education scale. The model fit and common criteria suggested varying factor solutions. However, the factor solutions were not interpretable based on the principles of CRF, SOR’s framing of resilience, the foundations of Street PAR, and the relevant literature. It was therefore concluded there was no discernible factor structure. This finding was not necessarily surprising because this was one of the first times that an EFA had been conducted with this scale and with this population (Boateng et al., 2018). Furthermore, the scale was originally designed for high school students as part of a PAR project with researchers from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and youth from local urban and suburban high schools (Fine et al., 2004). Given that most of the participants in this study were not in high school and some had been out of high school for over 30 years could have also impacted the underlying factor structure.

**Theory-Driven Sequential Integration**

Based on collaborations with committee members and referencing the principles of CRF, relevant literature, and Street PAR framework, I developed three subscales (i.e., Attitudes Toward Quality of Education, Attitudes Toward School Safety, and Attitudes Toward Teachers) and identified three critical items (i.e., Attitudes Toward Grades in High School, Attitudes Toward College Readiness, and Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School) from the Attitudes Toward Education scale. These subscales and critical items were used to analyze group differences based on mean scores. The results from the series of six one-way
ANOVAs showed that there were no statistically significant findings. Although the women in the oldest age cohort, 45-54, overall had higher mean scores compared to the other age cohorts, and overall, the women in two youngest age cohorts, 16-24 and 25-34, had lower mean scores, the findings demonstrated that they were not statistically significant. One potential explanation for the non-significant findings was that the study was under-powered. The sample used for analyses was large enough to detect medium effect sizes. It is possible that in fact there was a statistically significant difference in the population, but the sample size was not large enough to detect the effect.

The quantitative results suggested an intergenerational trend cutting across the sample in this study such that street-identified Black American girls and women’s attitudes toward schooling remained largely the same. As previously discussed in the Age Cohort Selection Process: Connecting the Quantitative and Qualitative Phases section, these findings were different from those identified by Payne (2008) which demonstrated that younger street-identified Black boys and men had more positive attitudes toward their education as compared to the older men within the street-identified Black boys and men surveyed. Although a lot of the same questions were used in this study and in Payne’s (2008) study, they were not identical. One potential explanation for this variability is that the divergence in questions between the two studies were driving these differences. Since Payne’s study was more focused on attitudes toward educational opportunities, it is possible that we would have seen similar results if all of the questions were the same. Furthermore, applying a CRF lens highlights the importance of centering Black girls and women’s experiences and not engaging in racial essentializing research. One of the central principles of CRF is that
the experiences of women of color are unique from men of color and white women (A. P. Harris, 1990; Wing, 1997, 2003). By focusing on the street-identified Black American girls and women as subsample of the larger Street PAR Health Project, I was able to focus on understanding the unique attitudes toward schooling of these girls and women. These findings highlight the importance of continuing to center the attitudes and experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in future research.

Age Cohort Selection

The purpose of this phase of the study was to determine which age cohorts should be examined in-depth during the second phase, a qualitative phase, of the study based on the findings from the first phase, a quantitative phase, of the study. I selected two age cohorts, 25-34 and 45-54 years old, because they had the largest effect sizes, the largest group mean differences, and the findings were interesting when compared with Payne’s (2008) study with street-identified Black boys and men. These differences highlighted an interesting and important opportunity to use CRF to highlight anti-essentialism, to center the intersections of race, gender, and class, and to explore the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in two of the age cohorts, 25-34 and 45-54.

Qualitative Inferences

The purpose of the second, qualitative phase of this study was to develop an in-depth understanding of the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black women ages 25-34 and 45-54, and to explore differences and similarities in their
schooling experiences across the two age cohorts. The results addressed the following qualitative research questions:

2. In what ways do street-identified Black American girls and women describe their lived schooling experiences?

3. In what ways are street-identified Black American girls and women’s lived schooling experiences different and similar across age cohorts?

In order to answer these research questions, I analyzed in-depth, semi-structured qualitative interviews with street-identified Black women in the 25-34 and 45-54 year old age cohorts. I used directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) which enabled me to center principles of CRF and SOR’s framing of resilience during the coding and theme development process. The discussion below focuses on the intergenerational similarities and differences of the street-identified Black American girls and women’s lived schooling experiences while also providing discussion of the findings for each age cohort. This discussion centers on the themes that were identified related to the first qualitative research question, while highlighting the similarities and differences between the findings across age cohorts in order to address the second qualitative research question. It also centers on the application of CRF and SOR’s framing of resilience to make meaning of their lived schooling experiences.

Participants shared their stories related to exclusionary discipline practices, such as being suspended and expelled, and several in the 25-34 year old age cohort shared that they were disciplined for subjective, non-violent infractions. For example, Marquita said that she was suspended from elementary school for her “bad attitude.” But when the interviewer further inquired, she revealed how she had a racist, white male teacher who kept her name on his board for detention all summer long and into the next school year. This teacher’s action of keeping her name physically on the
board, demonstrates how Black girls in schools are viewed as “perpetually guilty.”
The theme, Structural Violence, about exclusionary discipline and street-identified Black American girls in school supports previous research suggesting that Black girls are more likely to be disciplined for a range of subjective, non-violent behaviors, such as “talking back” and “having an attitude” (Blake et al., 2011; E. W. Morris & Perry, 2017; Wun, 2016a, 2016b). Black girls are more often disciplined for behaviors that are viewed as parallel to controlling images of Black women, for example, as angry, loud, and aggressive (Evans-Winters & Girls for Gender Equity, 2017; E. W. Morris, 2007). Using a CRF lens provides an understanding of how these school policies that on the surface appear to be color- and gender-blind and seem to operate using objective standards are in fact not. Instead, teachers and school personnel’s perceptions of Black girls’ behaviors and identities are often impacted by stereotypes, controlling images, and implicit biases, and their subjective readings of Black girls’ behaviors and the resulting disciplinary action are often based on standards of white femininity that teachers and school personnel force upon and expect of Black girls in schools. Teachers and school personnel upholding white femininity subjects street-identified Black American girls to policing and hyper surveillance.

Furthermore, the findings related to school discipline show how street-identified Black American girls are often positioned as “perpetually guilty” (Wun, 2016b), this was seen in Marquita’s case. Her name remained on the board, even when she was on summer break and not in school. Their stories reflect the treatment of Black girls in schools. They are often not believed or are ignored, and this treatment was in stark contrast to the experiences of white girls who are often believed, listened to, and protected. Participants in both age cohorts shared stories about being falsely
accused by teachers, school personnel, and their white female peers of doing things they did not do and being places they were not. Such as in the case of Cinda (54) who continued to be accused of cheating by her white teachers, but those same white teachers never questioned or accused Cinda’s white female peers of cheating even after they engaged in the same behavior (i.e., attending school on Mondays to retrieve her assignments for the week and not coming back to school until Friday so that she could take her tests). CRF highlights the racialized, gendered, and classed schooling experiences of street-identified Black girls and using CRF specifically allows for the avoidance of gender essentialism. It helps us to understand that Black girls’ experiences are different from white girls’ experiences and how their experiences are different as a result of the teachers and school personnel’s gendered, racialized, and classed interpretations of their behaviors and identities. Applying CRF illuminated what Carter Andrews and colleagues (2019) called “the impossibility of being perfect and white” (p. 2562) and how the notion of the Black juvenile has been scripted out of their girlhoods in manners similar to what scholars have found for boys (Bernstein, 2011; Carey, 2019a; Dumas & Nelson, 2016; A. A. Ferguson, 2000).

Teachers and school personnel’s gendered, racialized, and classed interpretations of Black girls’ behaviors and identities can be internalized by Black girls. Several of the women in both age cohorts described themselves and their behavior in school in ways that signify how they internalized negative messages from their teachers and school officials. For example, Marquita (33) said that she “was kind of bad in school” and Connie (53) also described herself as “one of them bad kids.” Marquita’s comment about herself was in response to an interviewer asking her why she was expelled in elementary school. She attributed her expulsion primarily to the
fact that she “was kind of bad in school” and only in part that she “had a racist teacher.” Connie’s comment about herself was in response to an interviewer who asked her what led to her 4th grade teacher making her sit in a trash can with a plastic bag over her head. She attributed this extremely negative and violent experience to the fact that she was “one of them bad kids.” These findings support previous research that has shown that these oppressive, negative messages can be internalized by Black students, and these messages can be embedded and conveyed via, for example, books, curriculum, school policies, and laws (Boutte et al., 2008; Boutte, 2016). The subjective readings of Black girls’ behaviors often based on standards of white femininity that teachers and school personnel force upon and expect of Black girls in schools can send a message that students who are not behaving in these “white” feminine ways are “bad kids” rather than recognizing their resiliency to such appalling conditions. CRF helps us to uncover that policies such as zero-tolerance which enable teachers and school personnel to inflict harm on students, contribute to the continued mistreatment and marginalization of Black girls and their families. Furthermore, this emphasizes the ways that these messages from teachers and school officials shift the onus onto Black girls and away from the power relations and oppressive systems and structures that allow for these dynamics in schools to continue.

The findings also revealed that women in the 25-34 year old age cohort were suspended and expelled more frequently than the 45-54 year old age cohort. This difference in the number of expulsions by age cohort could be a result of the passage of the Guns-Free Schools Act in 1994 which prompted the expansion of zero-tolerance policies and school’s over reliance on exclusionary discipline (Addington, 2019; Howard, 2016; Skiba, 2014). While the impetus for this Act was mass school
shootings occurring in white suburban communities, it has been utilized for increased surveillance, control, and discipline of poor Black and Brown students in urban areas (Curan, 2016; Noguera, 2008; Rios, 2011; Skiba, 2014; Welsh & Little, 2018; Wun, 2016a, 2016b, 2018). The fact that women in the 45-54 year old age cohort discussed being suspended and expelled was an interesting finding given that they attended school prior to the passage of the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994. Their experiences support previous research that has shown that exclusionary discipline was being used in school prior to this Act as a way to control and neutralize Black students in schools (Children’s Defense Fund, 1975; Skiba et al., 1997; Sojoyner, 2013).

In addition to expanding the use of zero-tolerance policies in schools, this Act also expanded the use of security personnel or SROs in schools along with increasing the use of strip and locker searches. The first security personnel in schools can be traced to the 1970s in some urban high schools (Addington, 2009), and the use of them in schools is related to legislation that was in place before the Columbine shooting that occurred in 1999 (Mallett, 2016). The use of security personnel continued to increase after the Columbine shooting (Addington, 2009; Robers et al., 2015), even though research has not shown that they are effective at reducing school violence. Instead, SROs disproportionately punish and harm Black girls (Addington, 2019; Crenshaw et al., 2015); this was evidenced by Nicole’s story of being strip searched and having her locker and belongings searched when a white girl falsely accused Nicole of stealing her phone. This was a direct violation of her rights based on New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) which was in place at the time of the incident. This case allowed school officials to search students and their belongings if school officials had reasonable
suspicion that the student had violated a school rule or a law, which was based on an accusation, a false accusation (New Jersey v. T.L.O., 1985).

The participants’ interviews revealed the uneven application of school discipline and rules enforced upon and targeting street-identified Black American girls and women in the name of school “safety” and likely a reflection of flawed school policy. CRF draws from legal traditions and provides a lens to examine the racialized and gendered dynamics embedded within these school policies and the uneven application of school discipline by teachers and school personnel based on Black girls’ marginalized identities. It also demonstrates how policies, such as zero-tolerance, ultimately contribute to the oppression of Black girls and women and subject them to various forms of violence. As Nicole acknowledged in her interview, the violence inflicted upon her by the white female peer, teacher, principal, and SRO would not have happened if she were a white girl. If she were a white girl, she likely would not have been denied her right to privacy and been illegally strip searched.

Several of the women in both age cohorts described how as girls they engaged in fighting in school as a way to defend and protect themselves and/or family members who were being bullied. Previous research affirms this finding, reinforcing that Black girls engage in fighting in school as a means of defending themselves and family (Esposito & Edwards, 2018; Jones, 2009; E. W. Morris, 2007), not simply because they lack discipline or are “bad.” Also, previous research related to fighting among street-identified Black girls and women in the inner-city uncovered that fighting is an adaptive response to settling conflict and is often a way to protect oneself and to gain respect (Hitchens, 2019; Jones, 2009). In addition, their stories highlighted the ways that street-identified Black American girls are bullied in school as a result of their
intersectional identities, most significantly this was for being economically poor. In response to being economically poor and being bullied, several of the women turned to street life and began “boosting.” SOR provides an alternative framing of how street-identified Black American girls demonstrate their resilience in the face of oppositional forces in schools. This form of adaptive survival can help students in the short-term stave off emotional, psychological, and physical distress from bullying.

The stories shared by the women illuminate it is the school’s subjective response to their behaviors that contributes to their negative school experiences. For example, when the women spoke out against the bullying and talked to school personnel, they were generally not supported. When the participants took matters into their own hands to stick up for themselves and/or family members, they were often punished for doing so. The findings highlight the unequal power dynamics in schools between street-identified Black American girls and in particular principals, and how “principals serve as key disciplinary decision makers” (DeMatthews et al., 2017, p. 519). As explained by the participants, many of the principals disciplined them, rather than inquiring about the antecedent of Black girls’ behaviors. Again, CRF acknowledges the subjectivity inherent in school personnel decisions regarding the treatment and discipline toward Black girls and women in schools and racialized-gendered undertones of such decisions. CRF also helps us understand how these educational systems and structures inflict violence upon street-identified Black girls. When Black girls defend themselves, teachers and school officials reprimanded them. Their adaptive responses and multiple consciousnesses (Wing, 2003) that they embody to survive in a system steeped in whiteness are viewed as “guilty” rather than sites of resilience and resistance.
The participants also described their experiences with street life in their respective schools. Participants shared how they attended schools with low academic expectations, poor quality instruction, and a lack of college preparation. These types of environments have been documented in previous research with Black students as well as Black street-identified students (T. M. Brown, 2016; Payne & Brown, 2016, 2017). In response to these schooling conditions, some participants engaged in street life expressed through fighting, smoking weed, and selling drugs as an adaptive response. Their acts of resistance and expressions of resilience were often punished, and many students were pushed out of school because of these conditions. SOR illuminates the ways in which the women as girls embodied a street-identity within schools and how they accessed physical aggression or consumption of and selling drugs in order to survive. It also provides a framework to demonstrate that their responses are reasonable given the violent conditions they experience inside their schools and should not be viewed as poor adaptation or coping.

Street life in school was also connected to street life and structural violence outside of school. Women in the 25-34 year old age cohort shared how factors or family/community dynamics outside of school impacted them and their interactions and behaviors in school. Their experiences build upon previous work that has demonstrated that what happens outside of school matters and that it can impact students in school (Evans-Winters, 2011; Milner et al., 2015; Wun, 2018). This theme sheds light on the influences of structural violence and street life outside of school and how it relates to street-identified Black girl’s in-school behavior. Several of the women described how their parents and family’s involvement in street life as a result
of the violent structural conditions in their communities, influenced them in school, underscoring the intergenerational nature of street life and its ripple effects.

Many of the women in the 25-34 year old age cohort grew up in the 80s and 90s, during the height of the crack cocaine era. It was during this time that instead of allocating money for resources and treatment, Congress passed the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986, which established mandatory minimum sentences for people who were convicted of possessing cocaine. These sentences were significantly greater for possessing crack cocaine as compared to powder cocaine, commonly referenced as the 100-to-1 ratio (L. S. Walker & Mezuk, 2018). These sentencing disparities impacted hundreds of thousands of people, particularly Black men and women, who were subsequently sentenced to prison for minor drug violations (Palamar et al., 2015). The impact of this criminalization and hyper surveillance continues to impact Black communities today evidenced by disproportionate rates of incarceration, probation, and parole (Phelps, 2020; Phelps & Curry, 2017). This punitive approach has resulted in long-term impacts on families—often separating mothers and fathers from their children, denying them the treatment and support needed to confront their addiction. This dynamic was exemplified by Jaynelle’s situation, when she stepped up to take care of her siblings.

Street-identified Black women in the 45-54 year old age cohort shared their unique experiences with desegregation. As noted in the Results section, despite the Brown v. Board of Education ruling in 1954, the state of Delaware was very slow to desegregate its schools (T. J. Davis, 2017). This stalling explains how women born approximately 10 years after the ruling experienced transitioning from segregated schools to desegregated schools. In the late 1970s when some of the women were
beginning high school, several northern Delaware school districts came together to form the New Castle County School District. The only school district serving Wilmington students, the Wilmington School District, was dismantled (T. J. Davis, 2017). In its place, a plan was implemented whereby students from Wilmington were bused to schools in the suburbs for Grades 1-5 and 9-12 while students from the suburbs would be bused to Wilmington for Grades 6-8 (T. J. Davis, 2017). These busing policies provide context for when Cinda (54) described her negative experiences on her home-to-school commute. The racial discrimination she experienced was all too common for Black students on their home-to-school commute, and during the transition from segregated to desegregated schools (Alleyne, 2021). Although other participants did not specifically address this, Cinda’s account of her home-to-school commute contributes to the limited research that has used critical race theories and in particular storytelling as a way to center Black students’ stories about their home-to-school commute pre- and post-Brown (Alleyne, 2021).

Furthermore, the findings from this study highlight Black girls’ stories about attending segregated and desegregated schools and the transition between the two. Some of the women described that they liked their desegregated high schools because they had more opportunities, such as sewing class and co-op programs, than were offered at segregated Black high schools in the area. However, as stated by Vanessa Siddle Walker (1996), “to remember segregated schools largely by recalling only their poor resources presents a historically incomplete picture” (p. 3). Several of the women revealed how they did not want to attend desegregated schools and instead wanted to continue attending segregated schools because of the Black teachers. They described Black teachers in Wilmington as supportive and caring of Black students, and how this
was in stark contrast to white teachers’ negative and even hostile treatment of Black students. These findings support the ever-growing body of counternarratives about Black schools and the support, care, and sense of community that was cultivated within them among the teachers, students, families, and the community (J. D. Anderson, 1988; D. A. Bell, 1983; Horsford, 2009; J. E. Morris, 2001, 2008; V. S. Walker, 1996, 2000).

Although women in the 25-34 year old age cohort did not talk about desegregation, there was still state legislation enacted while they were in school that would have been a direct result of desegregation. For example, in 2000, the Delaware General Assembly passed the Neighborhood Schools Act, which brought a return to neighborhood schools and an end to the long-distance busing. This Act required that each of the four Delaware school districts in New Castle County (i.e., Brandywine, Colonial, Christina, and Red Clay) send students to the grade-appropriate school that is closest to where they live (Neighborhood Schools Act, 2000). However, this Act did not alter where schools were located, so students still might have to travel long distances to go to school. For example, Martai (32) described attending four different high schools (i.e., Glasgow, Newark, Thomas McKean, and A.I. duPont) all of which are located outside of the City of Wilmington and in two different Delaware school districts. Glasgow and Newark High Schools are located in Delaware’s Christiana School District, and Thomas McKean and A.I. duPont High Schools are located in Delaware’s Red Clay Consolidated School District. Even with this return to neighborhood schools, Martai still had to be bused outside of her neighborhood, traveling at least 10 miles from her home to go to each of the high schools that she attended. Martai’s story highlights that in addition to being expelled on the basis of her
marginalized identity and for her resilience manifested through her street identity, she was forced to attend schools further away from her home. Physically putting more space between Martai and school.

**Mixed Methods Meta-Inferences**

The purpose of the mixed methods integrative analysis was to determine how the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women help to explain and add additional insight into and nuance their self-reported attitudes toward schooling. This analysis addressed the following mixed methods integration research question:

4. In what ways does the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women help to explain their self-reported attitudes towards schooling?

In order to answer this research question, I drew meta-inferences from findings from interviews and group mean differences among participants. I used joint displays to support the analysis and writing process.

The findings revealed that two subscales (i.e., Attitudes Toward Quality of Education and Attitudes Toward Teachers) and two critical items (i.e., Attitudes Toward Caring About Grades and Attitudes Toward Witnessing Fighting in High School) had sufficient data for integration. In addition, one subscale (i.e., Attitudes Toward School Safety) and one critical item (i.e., Attitudes Toward College Readiness) had insufficient data for integration.

**Quality of Education**

The results from the mixed methods integrative findings related to quality of education demonstrated that the quantitative and qualitative findings were consistent
with one another in that there were no statistically significant differences in mean scores and participants in both age cohorts described similar schooling conditions. The qualitative findings provided additional insights into the quantitative findings including insight into the poor schooling conditions that women in both age cohorts experienced. Furthermore, integration allowed for more context on how low-income street-identified Black American girls have been experiencing these conditions in schools as well as how these schooling conditions have persisted over time.

These findings indicate an intergenerational trend showing that street-identified Black American girls and women have been attending schools with similar conditions for generations—a reflection of the structural racism and violence embedded in schools. Conversely, several of the women shared positive aspects regarding the quality of their education and the mean of item scores showed that the women also had positive and negative attitudes toward their schooling. However, the majority of what they shared in their interviews were related to poor schooling conditions. This supports previous research that has shown that low-income Black students are more likely to be tracked into lower-level courses, placed into special education, and feel less prepared for college (Giersch, 2018; Grindal et al., 2019; Welton & Martinez, 2014), and are more likely to attend schools with less qualified teachers and lower academic expectations (Gershenson et al., 2016; Goldhaber et al., 2015).

For example, Nicole who expressed her optimism that her white male teacher “cared” and as a result wanted to ensure her and her peers learned about slavery. While learning about slavery is an important aspect of American history to understand, it is often taught in a way that deems Black Americans as “less” than. Rarely are students taught about slave rebellions or other significant ways in which Black
Americans organized and resisted against white slave owners in their efforts to protect their families and preserve their humanity (Shuster, 2018). If taught, this history is often relegated to Black History Month, and even then, it is “white-washed” (L. J. King & Brown, 2014; Tosolt, 2020) to mute and/or justify the inhumane condition and actions of white Americans. In this context, it pushes us to consider what other contributions made by Black Americans were Nicole and her classmates exposed to? Nicole’s interest in learning about the historical experiences of Black Americans reflects her caring about school, particularly in relation to better understanding her own history. Unpacking her reflection allows for the exploration of the content and framing of school curriculum to understand the quality, or lack thereof, that students are exposed to.

The similar experiences shared by participants across generations of street-identified Black American girls and women indicate that schools have been upholding educational inequities and white supremacy and therefore have not been adequately addressing the needs of street-identified Black American girls and women. For example, Kayla and Tosha H. described not being prepared for college. Kayla shared how she did not feel like her schools prepared her to be successful in college and felt like she “had to start all over.” While Tosha H. felt like no one explained to her what a college education could do for her, what she did understand was that as part of the college process she needed to take the SAT. Similar to previous work, Kayla and Tosha H’s experiences demonstrate the ways in which their postsecondary educational pathways were blocked as a result of institutional and societal barriers and how college readiness is highly racialized and classed (P. Aronson, 2008; Carey, 2018; Perez-Felkner, 2015). These institutional and societal barriers have significant impacts
on Black girls and women and their families. As these violent conditions have been pushing them out of school and blocking them from educational opportunities and degrees, institutions are also blocking them from employment opportunities as the rise of neoliberalism has increased the number of degrees needed to access higher paying, higher quality employment opportunities (Carnevale et al., 2018).

Teachers

The results from the mixed methods integrative findings showed that women in both age cohorts had similar attitudes towards their teachers and described similar experiences with them. For both age cohorts, the qualitative findings provided an intersectional and more nuanced understanding of the quantitative findings and insight into the women’s negative experiences. Furthermore, the qualitative findings provide more insight into their relationships with school officials.

These findings indicate an intergenerational trend showing that teachers have been treating street-identified Black American girls and women in similar ways across generations. As previously mentioned, one example of this was highlighted with Nicole and Cinda’s stories of having teachers view them as “guilty” and not believing them, but then treating their white female peers as “innocent” and believable. These similar experiences across generations of street-identified Black American girls and women shows that teachers and school officials have continued to view street-identified Black American girls in these ways and therefore continue to not address the academic, emotional, and social needs of this population. Viewing these findings through a CRF lens also illuminates the racial hierarchy prevalent in schools that continually centers whiteness, providing protection and support to white female
students while simultaneously inflicting harm upon Black female students. This is especially prevalent among street-identified Black students.

**Caring About Grades**

The results from the mixed methods integrative findings showed that the qualitative findings expanded upon the quantitative findings. Integrating these complementary findings suggests that street-identified Black women in both age cohorts, on average, cared about their grades in high school and that the women in the 25-34 age cohort expressed that they cared about and valued furthering their education.

These findings support previous research demonstrating that street-identified Black boys, girls, men, and women hold positive attitudes toward learning and education, but are frustrated that their schools were not meeting their needs and were excluding them (T. M. Brown, 2016; Mateu-Gelabert & Lune, 2007; Payne & Brown, 2010). These findings provide a counter-narrative to dominant arguments that frame street-identified youth from a deficit perspective arguing that they do not place any value on learning and formal education (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; E. A. Stewart & Simons, 2010). They also indicate that street-identified Black American girls and women care about and value education in ways beyond grades. Although the women in the 45-54 year old age cohort did not talk about furthering their education, which could be a product of their age, the findings show that there are additional ways that street-identified Black American girls and women care about and value education and learning that should be explored. For example, Marquita described wanting to learn more advanced math as the primary contributing factor to her desire to go back to
school. Future research could explore this and other ways that street-identified Black American girls and women care about and value learning and education.

**Fighting in School**

The results from the mixed methods integrative findings indicated that the quantitative and qualitative findings complement each other in that they provided two different perspectives regarding fighting in high school. Integrating these complementary findings suggests that street-identified Black women in both age cohorts were attending schools in environments where they witnessed fighting in high school and where they were also engaged in fighting. They were fighting as a form of self-defense or to protect a family member and as a way to cope with and survive the hostile school environments and poor schooling conditions.

These findings indicate an intergenerational trend showing that street-identified Black American girls and women have been attending schools where they are witnessing violence and fighting to defend themselves and/or family members for generations. SOR’s framing of resilience acknowledges their actions as a form of resilience and how street-identified Black American girls and women have been contending with schooling conditions that elicit this form of coping for generations. It also illustrates the pride and commitment that street-identified Black American girls and women have when it comes to supporting and protecting their families. For example, Jaynelle described how she would always protect her sister, who she said has a disability and was bullied for it. As a result of protecting her from students who bullied her, Jaynelle continued to be expelled from school and her actions to protect her sister were punished rather than understood as a protective mechanism by school personnel. CRF can be used to help us understand their commitment to their families.
as assets, skills, and abilities that street-identified Black American girls bring with them to school, rather than enacting punitive and harmful measures against them.

**School Safety**

The results from the mixed methods integrative findings indicated that women in both age cohorts did not talk explicitly about safety in school. Although some of the women in both age cohorts discussed going to school in environments where they were bullied and/or had to fight to defend themselves and family members and felt like their teachers and school officials did not care about them, there was insufficient evidence for integration because they did not mention safety explicitly. Therefore, in order to make any such claims about school safety among this population, it would have required me to apply a definition of school safety to their stories. This was inappropriate because I did not want to make assumptions about their safety in school.

The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments (2022) defines school safety as “schools and school-related activities where students are safe from violence, bullying and harassment, and the influence of substance use” (para. 1). The findings once again challenge narrow definitions of school safety, problematizing said framing because of the ways students are criminalized for falling outside of the definition. Based on the qualitative findings and previous research, street-identified Black American girls engage in fighting in school to defend themselves and/or family members—it is a mechanism for survival. They also engage in fighting, drug use, and drug sales etc. as a means to cope and survive the hostile school environments and poor schooling conditions. These findings call for the definition of school safety to be reframed from one focused on students as the primary actors in shaping school safety to one focused on the structural conditions and systems within the school that
negatively impact student safety. Furthermore, using a CRF lens, this definition should also be reframed in light of the findings that demonstrate the power dynamics between students, teachers, and school personnel, and in particular the violence enacted against street-identified Black American girls at the hands of teachers and school personnel.

**Limitations**

Although this study provided valuable findings related to the self-reported attitudes toward schooling and the lived schooling experiences of street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington, there were several limitations. First, there were a few limitations related to the Attitudes Toward Education scale. One limitation was that there were no survey items related to Black girls and women’s intersectional identities. For example, Item 17 asks participants to rate on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*) whether teachers treated students differently based on race/ethnicity. However, it does not ask about other aspects of one’s identity such as gender and class. Another limitation of the survey was that some of the items included a specific time in school such as high school while others did not. For questions that did not include high school, there was a limited ability to draw conclusions because it was not clear what time frame participants were referring to when they answered those items. This was important after analyzing the qualitative data and learning about several of the women’s experiences with transitioning from a segregated middle school/junior high school to a desegregated high school.

Second, this study was limited by not being able to connect participant’s survey responses with their interviews. This limited the conclusions that could be drawn during the mixed methods integrative analysis because it did not allow me to
determine how each interview participant scored on the survey. This information would have provided a better context for the interview participants and would have provided additional information that could have been used during the mixed methods integrative analysis. Future mixed methods research projects should connect the quantitative and qualitative data at the participant level to enhance the use of secondary data sets and the potential for drawing conclusions.

Finally, there were a few limitations related to the qualitative interviews and interview questions that influenced my ability to draw conclusions. One limitation was that only one interview was conducted with participants. If multiple interviews had been conducted, more in-depth information about their lived schooling experiences could have been collected. Another limitation was that since this was a secondary data analysis, I was not able to follow-up with participants in terms of member checking and for clarification. For example, in Jaynelle’s interview when she was referring to the principal, it seems like the principal was a white female, however she did not explicitly state the principal’s race and the interviewers did not specifically ask her. Another limitation was that due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, not all participants were asked questions from the Education section of the interview protocol. Out of the nine women ages 25-34 who were interviewed, three women (i.e., Vanity, Jasmine, and Mahogany) were not asked any of the questions from the Education section of the interview protocol. Out of the 11 women ages 45-54 who were interviewed, two women (i.e., Lisa L., and Martha) were not asked any of the questions from the Education section of the interview protocol. However, given the semi-structure nature of the interviews, and the topics of health, opportunity and violence explored, for some of the participants this allowed for an in-depth exploration
of other more prominent aspects of their lives in the context of the primary study. While for the participants featured here, their lived schooling experiences were more prevalent, suggesting schooling experiences as a significant aspect of their lives.

**Future Research**

There are several areas for future research with street-identified Black American girls and women that could supplement the findings from this study. Overall, this study would benefit from future on-the-ground community-based research projects with street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington. Previous Street PAR projects have recruited street-identified Black boys and men to be involved with the project. As a function of the girls and women’s positionality, they might ask different questions and may also suggest other areas of inquiry based on their lived experiences and perspectives. Outlined below are suggested areas for future research that could be beneficial as part of future Street PAR projects with street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington, Delaware.

One area for future quantitative research would be to further develop the Attitudes Toward Education scale in collaboration with street-identified Black American girls and women. As cited in Payne (2008), the scale could benefit from advanced psychometric work and scale development. Given the findings from this study the scale could benefit from having street-identified Black American girls and women actively participate in this process in order to have their perspectives, experiences, and intersectional identities represented in the scale. This development would make a significant contribution to understanding street-identified Black American girls and women’s attitudes toward schooling. It would also be an
opportunity to re-write and add additional questions to the scale, such as additional questions related to caring about and valuing education and learning as well as questions about false accusations made by teachers, school officials, and peers.

An area for future qualitative research would be to conduct interviews with street-identified Black American girls and women specifically about their schooling experiences. Since their schooling experiences were not the main focus of the interviews, sometimes there was not enough time to ask the women all of the questions or not enough time to ask any of the questions. This would be an opportunity for the girls and women to talk even more extensively about their schooling experiences, providing an opportunity to learn from street-identified Black American girls and women whose voices are often rendered invisible in the education literature. Below, I describe three areas of future research that could benefit from conducting interviews with street-identified Black American girls and women specifically about their schooling experiences.

The first area that could benefit from a more in-depth understanding is related to college-going supports and career-awareness programs. For example, this exploration could delve into the ways in which families and schools are fostering, inspiring, and promoting future mindsets, such as “postsecondary future selves” (Carey, 2015, 2022), among Black girls. It should also seek to understand how an exploration of their experiences would help us better understand the manner in which families, educators, schools, and communities are influencing street-identified Black American girls and women’s understanding of college and careers as well as how these supports and programs can be bolstered and re-imagined to more robustly support their educational trajectories.
The second area that could benefit from a more in-depth understanding is related to fighting in school and the intersections of gender, race, and class. Future research should investigate and develop a more in-depth understanding of why street-identified Black American girls and women fight in school. Although the findings from this study suggest that the girls and women fought to defend and protect themselves and/or family members as an adaptive response, previous research has shown that street-identified Black girls and women also fight for respect and for their reputation (Hitchens, 2019; Jones, 2009). Building upon these findings and developing a more nuanced understanding of why they fight should be examined through an intersectional lens because of teachers’ and school personnel’s readings of Black girls’ behaviors and the resulting disciplinary action are often based on standards of white femininity.

Finally, the third area that could benefit from a more in-depth understanding is related to women’s experiences in the older age cohort who attended segregated and desegregated schools and described their transition between the two. Conducting future research with street-identified Black American girls and women in Wilmington, Delaware is important given that two legal cases (i.e., Belton v. Gebhart and Bulah v. Gebhart) from Wilmington were included in Brown v. Board of Education (1954), and there is limited research about the lived experiences of desegregation from the perspectives and voices of this population. Building off this study’s findings to understand more about their stories and the impacts of this ruling would have the potential to provide additional evidence of participant’s counternarratives related to the quality of their education both pre- and post-Brown.
In addition, an area for future qualitative and/or mixed methods research would be to build off this work to understand more about the intergenerational transmission of schooling between street-identified Black women and their children. As previously mentioned, several studies have examined this transmission among Black grandmothers, mothers, and daughters (Carothers, 1990; J. L. Daniel & Effinger, 1996; Sealey-Ruiz, 2007; Willie & Reddick, 2003) as well as among Black grandfathers, fathers, and sons (Hucks, 2014; Polite & Davis, 1999; J. W. Scott, 1997). We saw a glimpse of this transmission in Nicole’s (28) interview during which her children were present for part of it. Nicole described doing “some really disrespectful things” to the principal in response to him continuing to falsely accuse her of being in the hallway and ultimately suspending her on these falsities. Although Nicole was disrespected by the principal and her response was appropriate given her age and circumstances, she did not want her children to engage in that way, reflecting her high regard for or valuing of education, in particular for her children. This will introduce a unique perspective about the impact of intergenerational familial relationships among street-identified Black American girls and women and center their identities and experiences within this context. It could also be an opportunity to further explore how street-identified Black women and girls reconcile their negative schooling experiences and still promote education for their children as a form of protection and future possibility, as well as to better understand their positive experiences and how those also influence how they discuss and frame school and education with their children.
Implications

This section explores the implications of this study’s findings related to research, policy, and practice. I begin by describing the implications of this work for teacher preparation programs followed by the implications of this work for family science scholars. Then, I describe how this work can facilitate collaborations in the Wilmington, Delaware area to promote educational equity and action within the local context.

This study’s findings have implications for the ways that teacher preparation programs prepare pre-service teachers to educate and support Black girls, and specifically focusing on the preparation of white female pre-service teachers. Given the subjective disciplinary practices and readings of street-identified Black girl’s behaviors by their white female teachers, this study calls for teacher education programs to provide opportunities for educators to engage in critical reflexivity around their own preconceived notions of femininity and what it means to “act like a lady” within a school setting. It calls for reflexivity in general regarding what they consider “appropriate behaviors” as well as what they consider “appropriate ways of coping.” Then, these notions of appropriateness should be interrogated and these ways of knowing and taken-for-granted assumptions should be disrupted. This process should not just be undertaken as part of one teacher preparation course in one semester, but rather schools of education that continue accepting large numbers of white female students must commit to these types of interrogations woven throughout the required coursework as one approach to disrupt whiteness in schools and as a core mission of their programs.

This study also has implications for family science scholars. Although this study did not directly examine the attitudes and experiences of members of the same
family across generations, there were still important findings related to family
dynamics in schools and impacts of intergenerational schooling experiences. As
previously described, women in both age cohorts described engaging in fighting as a
way to defend and protect their family members within the context of school,
illustrating their fierce commitment to the well-being and safety of their families. The
women continued to defend their family even when they were expelled and/or
suspended as a result. This has implications for how family science scholars view and
approach research related to Black families in schools, and how we should be viewing
Black girls and women’s commitment to their families as assets, skills, and abilities
that street-identified Black American girls bring with them to school, rather than
punishing them for such. The field should extend this work by considering family
dynamics related to street-identified Black American girls and women in schools.
Furthermore, this study also has implications for family scholars related to the
intergenerational schooling findings. Family scholars could extend this work by
examining the direct impacts of these intergenerational experiences and attitudes and
how they relate to intergenerational wealth, social mobility, health, and well-being
among street-identified Black American girls and women. This work is not only
important in terms of highlighting the impacts of these structural inequities but also in
highlighting the impact of resilience and resiliency across generations. This could also
inform the expansion of Masten’s work on resilience to include coping that is deemed
adequate and appropriate for the social context students and families encounter.

In addition, as we consider schools as spaces of communities, it is also
important for family sciences researchers to think about collaborations with schools
and community-based educational programs to train the teachers, school personnel,
and community partners who work in them. Frameworks have been developed for human service preparation programs, often housed within family science programs. For example, Aviles (2022) called for a paradigm shift regarding the preparation of human and social service students, who similar to pre-service teachers, are predominantly white, female, and middle/upper income. The author identified three frameworks/concepts (i.e., *The Racial Contract*, Mills, 1997; *Structural Competency*, Metzl & Hansen, 2014; and *The Nonprofit Industrial Complex*, Incite!, 2007; Raventos & Wark, 2018) that should be employed to create awareness and understanding among students through an examination of systems and structures that create and perpetuate inequitable conditions for Black and Brown families and their respective communities. These frameworks would also support the reflection of educator’s positions of power and privilege within schools and to interrogate what that means in terms of their interactions with students and their families and communities based on the intersections of race, class, and gender.

This study also has implications for action through partnerships in the Wilmington community. Organizations such as the Wilmington Center for Education Equity and Policy (WCEEP) that are advocating and organizing around their mission and vision: “To ensure that each student and educational entity of the city of Wilmington has access to top-notch services benefiting the full range of student potential, needs and interests, in the service of their sustained success” (WCEEP, 2020, para. 1).

WCEEP has three main focus areas: (1) advocacy, (2) community organizing, and (3) research. I believe that there would be opportunities to use these findings to support their efforts, especially given the high-quality and rigorous nature of the data.
collected by the Street PAR Health Project team. Rather than duplicating their efforts, I aim to present my research to WCEEP’s leadership team and see in what ways they believe that it can contribute to their ongoing advocacy and organizing efforts. As part of their advocacy mission, WCEEP (2020) seeks “to advocate for policy and practice at all levels that directly impacts the education of Black and Brown students” (para. 2). One area related to policy and practice that my research uncovered that directly impacted Black and Brown students is related to exclusionary policies. While Latina/o/x students’ experiences in school was not the focus of this work, given their similar experiences in school (J. D. Finn & Servoss, 2014; Orfield et al., 2016), this work should also consider street-identified Latina/o/x populations. This study exposes a need to revisit and revise disciplinary policies in the school districts serving Black and Brown students who live in the city of Wilmington. A revision of these policies would provide Black and Brown students an opportunity to learn, explore, and question without the harmful impacts of control, surveillance, and discipline. This type of revision would benefit from the collaborations with WCEEP leadership, school personnel, teachers, and Black and Brown students.

**Conclusion**

This study contributes to our understanding of street-identified Black American girls and women by examining their intergenerational schooling experiences and attitudes. Understanding their experiences and attitudes through a CRF lens and SOR’s framing of resilience has important implications for developing, funding, and implementing effective policies and practices for this population in school. Furthermore, it provides an understanding of the ways in which their lived schooling experiences converge or diverge across generations of street-identified Black
American girls and women from their own voices—a much needed perspective. This research provided evidence for intergenerational trends related to schooling for this population. Future research on this topic should consider building off this work and conducting community-based intergenerational research projects with street-identified Black American girls and women to better understand their experiences and attitudes as well as the intergenerational transmission of schooling. Investing in these areas of research and nuances across generations will provide a more comprehensive understanding of schooling, its impact on this population, and a more robust action plan to better support this population.

In addition, this study makes an important methodological contribution to the field of mixed methods research by serving as an example study for how to design a mixed methods study using secondary data. It illustrates the research process and steps necessary to conduct an explanatory sequential mixed methods study using secondary data. This study also highlights the importance of and need for developing a participant-level connection between quantitative and qualitative data to enhance secondary data analyses and the potential for drawing conclusions.
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Appendix A

THE STREET PAR HEALTH PROJECT SURVEY

Information About Participation

Greetings:
We, The Wilmington Street PAR Health Project, would like you to complete a survey that asks questions about health, opportunity and violence in Wilmington. This 45-page survey will take approximately 45 minutes to an hour to complete. Also, taking this survey is strictly voluntary. We do not want any identifying information.

Specifically, this study examines how Black youth and adults describe relationships with: (1) family; (2) violence; (3) employment and educational opportunity; (4) living/health conditions; (5) local leadership (religious leaders, policy makers, service providers, etc.); (6) law enforcement; and (7) community re-entry from prison. You will receive $40 cash and a resource package for completing this survey.

The only possible risk involved in participating in the survey is that feelings of anxiety may develop as a result of thinking about sensitive or negative experiences.

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY

- Please read each item carefully.
- Select or write the appropriate answer for each item, as directed.
- When answering questions that require marking a box or line, please use an “X”.
- If you need to change an answer, cross out the wrong answer and mark the correct answer.

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Please do not skip any items, unless directed by the survey or if answering makes you uncomfortable.
- If you have any questions or confusion, ask a survey administrator.
- Do not write your name anywhere on this form. We don’t need any contact information from you. Your answers will be anonymous or no one will know these are your answers.

❖ If you would like a copy of the study, please provide us with your contact information on a separate sheet of paper and a copy of the study will be sent to you in the future.

❖ If you have any questions about this research, contact Dr. Yasser Payne at (302) 831-6815.

❖ If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Board at (302) 831-2137.
Thank You!!!!

Date survey was completed: ______________________                Start Time: ______________________

Franklin Psychological Well-Being Index

1. In general, how satisfied are you with your life these days? (Please mark one)
   Very Satisfied   Somewhat Satisfied   Not Very Satisfied   Not Satisfied At All

2. All things considered, how happy would you say you are these days?
   Very Happy   Somewhat Happy   Not Very Happy   Not Happy At All

3. How satisfied are you with your family life: the time you spend/things you do with family members?
   Very Satisfied   Somewhat Satisfied   Not Very Satisfied   Not Satisfied At All

4. I am a useful person to have around. (Please mark the box that indicates how often you feel this is true).
   Almost Always True   Often True   Not Often True   Never

5. I am a person of worth.
   Almost Always True   Often True   Not Often True   Never

6. I am a productive person.
   Almost Always True   Often True   Not Often True   Never

7. I feel I can’t do anything right.
   Almost Always True   Often True   Not Often True   Never

8. I feel my life is not very useful.
   Almost Always True   Often True   Not Often True   Never

9. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
   Almost Always True   Often True   Not Often True   Never

10. How often do you feel bad about yourself? (Please mark one)
    Very Often   Fairly Often   Not Too Often   Never
11. How do you think you are doing financially, as compared to three (3) years ago?
   Better  About the Same  Worse  Much Worse

12. How much do you worry that your total family income will not be enough to meet your family’s expenses and bills?
   A Great Deal  A Lot  Only A Little  Not At All

13. Given the chances you have had, how well have you done taking care of your family’s wants and needs?
   Very Well  Fairly Well  Not Too Well  Not Too Well At All

14. Given the chances you have had, how well have you done in the work or jobs you’ve had?
   Very Well  Fairly Well  Not Too Well  Not Too Well At All

15. Given the chances you have had, how well have you done at being a good friend – a person your friends can count on? (Please mark one)
   Very Well  Fairly Well  Not Too Well  Not Too Well At All

**Health Status**

1. In general, would you say your health is: (Please mark one)
   Excellent  Very Good  Good  Fair  Poor

2. Compared to one year ago, how would you rate your health in general now?
   Much better now than one year ago  Somewhat better now than one year ago  About the same  Somewhat worse now than one year ago  Much worse now than one year ago

3. The following items are about activities you might do during a typical day. Does your health now limit you in these activities? If so, how much?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes, limited a lot</th>
<th>Yes, limited a little</th>
<th>No, not limited at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Vigorous activities, such as running, lifting heavy objects, participating in strenuous sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Moderate activities, such as moving a table, pushing a vacuum cleaner, bowling, or playing basketball.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Lifting or carrying groceries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Climbing several flights of stairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3e. Climbing one flight of stairs  
3f. Bending, kneeling, or stooping  
3g. Walking more than a mile  
3h. Walking several blocks  
3i. Walking one block  
3j. Bathing or dressing yourself

4. During the past 4 weeks, to what extent has your physical health or emotional problems interfered with your normal social activities with family, friends, neighbors, or groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. How much bodily pain have you had during the past 4 weeks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very mild</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Very severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. During the past 4 weeks, how much did pain interfere with your normal work (including both work outside the home and housework)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. These questions are about how you feel and how things have been with you during the past 4 weeks. For each question, please give the one answer that comes closest to the way you have been feeling.

How much of the time during the past 4 weeks...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>A good bit of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>A little of the time</th>
<th>None of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7a. Did you feel full of energy?  
7b. Have you been a very nervous person?  
7c. Have you felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?  
7d. Have you felt calm and peaceful?  
7e. Did you have a lot of energy?  
7f. Have you felt downhearted and blue?
7h. Did you feel worn out?  
1 2 3 4 5 6

7i. Have you been a happy person?  
1 2 3 4 5 6

7j. Did you feel tired?  
1 2 3 4 5 6

8. How TRUE or FALSE is each of the following statements for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely true</th>
<th>Mostly true</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Mostly false</th>
<th>Definitely false</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a. I seem to get sick a little easier than other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. I am as healthy as anybody I know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c. I expect my health to get worse.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d. My health is excellent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you have any kind of health care coverage, including health insurance, prepaid plans such as HMOs, government plans such as Medicare, or Indian Health Service?  
Yes No

10. Do you have one person you think of as your personal doctor or health care provider?  
Yes No

11. Was there a time in the past 12 months when you needed to see a doctor but could not because of cost?  
Yes No

12. About how long has it been since you last visited a doctor for a routine checkup? (A routine checkup is a general physical exam, not an exam for a specific injury, illness, or condition.)  
___ about a week ago ___ about 6 months ago ___ between 1 and 2 years ago  
___ about a month ago ___ about 9 months ago ___ between 3 and 5 years ago  
___ about 3 months ago ___ about a year ago ___ more than 5 years ago

13. On average, how many hours of sleep do you get in a 24-hour period?  
___ less than 1 hour ___ about 5 to 6 hours ___ more than 10 hours  
___ about 1 to 2 hours ___ about 7 to 8 hours  
___ about 3 to 4 hours ___ about 9 to 10 hours
14. Has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional EVER told you that you had any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a. A heart attack?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b. A stroke?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c. Asthma?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d. Cancer?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15e. Arthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, gout, or lupus?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15f. A depressive disorder, including depression, major depression, dysthymia, or minor depression?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15g. Kidney disease? (Do NOT include kidney stones, bladder infection or incontinence)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15i. Diabetes?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. (If you selected “Yes” for #15i): How old were you when you were first told that you had hypertension or high blood pressure? Age: ____________

16a. Because of your hypertension/high blood pressure, have you ever been told to take prescribed medicine?
   Yes          No

17. How long has it been since you last visited a dentist or a dental clinic for any reason?
Include visits to dental specialists, such as orthodontists.
   ___about a week ago   ___about 6 months ago   ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago  ___about 9 months ago  ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago    ___more than 5 years ago

18. How many of your permanent teeth have been removed because of tooth decay or gum disease? Include teeth lost to infection, but do not include teeth lost for other reasons, such as injury or orthodontics.
   ___None   ___3   ___6 or more
   ___1   ___4
**African Self-Consciousness Scale**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I don’t necessarily feel like I am also being mistreated in a situation where I see another Black person being mistreated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black people should have their own independent schools that consider their African heritage and values an important part of the curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blacks who trust Whites in general are basically very intelligent people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Blacks who are committed and prepared to uplift the Black race by any means necessary (including violence) are more intelligent than Blacks who are not this committed and prepared.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Blacks in America should try harder to be American rather than practicing activities that lift them up from their African cultural heritage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regardless of their interests, educational background and social achievements, I would prefer to associate with Black people than with non-Blacks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is not such a good idea for Black students to be required to learn an African language.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is not within the best interest of Blacks to depend on Whites for anything, no matter how religious and decent they (the Whites) purport to be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blacks who place the highest value on Black life (over that of other people) are reverse racists and generally evil people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Black children should be taught that they are African people at an early age.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Being involved in wholesome group activities with other Blacks lifts my spirits more so than being involved in individual oriented activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. As a good index of self-respect, Blacks in American should consider adopting traditional African names for themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A White/European or Caucasian image of God and the “holy family” (among others considered close to God) are not such bad things for Blacks to worship.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Blacks born in the United States are Black or African first, rather than American or just plain people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Black people who talk in a relatively loud manner, show a lot of emotions and feelings, and express themselves with a lot of movement and body motion are less intelligent than Blacks who do not behave this way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Racial consciousness and cultural awareness based on traditional African values are necessary to the development of Black marriages and families that can contribute to the liberation and enhancement of Black people in America.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In dealing with other Blacks, I consider myself quite different and unique from most of them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Blacks should form loving relationships with and marry only other Blacks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I have difficulty identifying with the culture of African people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is intelligent for Blacks in America to organize to educate and liberate themselves from White-American domination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There is no such thing as African culture among Blacks in America.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is good for Black husbands and wives to help each other develop racial consciousness and cultural awareness in themselves and their children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Africa is not the ancestral homeland of all Black people throughout the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It is good for Blacks in America to wear traditional African-type clothing and hairstyles if they desire to do so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel little sense of commitment to Black people who are not close friends or relatives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. All Black students in Africa and America should be expected to study African culture and history as it occurs throughout the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Black children should be taught to love all races of peoples, even those races who do harm to them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Blacks in America who view Africa as their homeland are more intelligent than those who view America as their homeland.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If I saw Black children fighting, I would leave them to settle it alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. White people, generally speaking, do not respect Black life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Blacks in America should view Blacks from other countries (e.g. Ghana, Nigeria, and other countries in Africa) as foreigners rather than as their brothers and sisters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. When a Black person uses the terms “Self, me and I,” his/her reference should encompass all Black people rather than simply him/herself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Religion is dangerous for Black people when it directs and inspires them to become self-determining and independent of the White community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Black parents should encourage their children to respect all Black people, good and bad, and punish them when they don’t show respect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Blacks who celebrate Kwanzaa and practice the “Nguzo Saba” (the Black Value System), both symbolizing African traditions, don’t necessarily have better sense than Blacks who celebrate Easter, Christmas, and the Fourth of July.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. African culture is better for humanity than European culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Black people’s concern for self-knowledge (knowledge of one’s history, philosophy, culture, etc.) and self (collective determination) makes them treat White people badly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The success of an individual Black person is not as important as the survival of all Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. If a good/worthwhile education could be obtained at all schools (both Black and White), I would prefer for my child to attend a racially integrated school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. It is good for Black people to refer to each other as “brother” and “sister” because such a practice is consistent with our African heritage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Being involved in wholesome group activities with other Blacks lifts my spirits more so than being involved in individual oriented activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. It is not necessary to require Black/African studies courses in predominately Black schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Racialistic Contents Scale**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. African Americans are born with higher sex drives than White people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Racial differences explain why African Americans don’t live as long as Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Differences in family inheritance is a main reason why African Americans and Whites should remain separated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Black men have greater sexual drive than White men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. African Americans are born with greater physical strength and endurance than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When it comes to amount of money, African Americans seldom are able to measure up to Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Whites are superior to African Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Racial differences explain why Europeans are technologically more advanced than Africans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Genetic inferiority explains why more African Americans than Whites drop out of school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The school dropout problem among African Americans is due to their not having the mental power of Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>African Americans are born with more musical talent than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>The Black race is mentally unable to assume positions of high responsibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>African Americans are just as smart as Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>There are more African Americans in jail because they are born with criminality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Whites are better at using reason than African Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Black people are born with greater rhythm than White people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The inborn physical ability of African Americans makes it hard to beat them in athletics.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Race is an important factor in explaining why Whites have succeeded more than African Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The high incidence of crime among African Americans reflects a genetic abnormality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Black men are better at sex than White men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The Black man’s body is more skillful than his mind.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The large number of African Americans addicted to hard drugs suggests a form of biological weakness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Black women are more sexually open and willing than White women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>African Americans are superstitious.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. African Americans can be accepted as intimate friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attending a dinner party in honor of a famous Black person would be fun.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is difficult to tell one Black person from another Black person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Voting for a Black politician seems only right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Making physical love with a Black person can be exciting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is more embarrassing to lose a game to a White person than to a Black person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is easy to work for someone Black.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African Americans are welcome at my house.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. African Americans are harder workers than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. African Americans should have more voting privileges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The ideas of African Americans are to be admired.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Eating in a Black person’s home can be interesting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. African Americans are more sportsmanlike than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. African Americans are more sloppy than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. African Americans act alike.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Working for a Black person would be acceptable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. African Americans are less reliable than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. African Americans are more religious than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Being in the company of a large number of African Americans can be frightening.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Being partners with a Black in an athletic or card game is O.K.  
22. African Americans are more ignorant than Whites.  
23. Working for a Black person would create inner tension.  
25. Giving a Black person top priority for employment seems only fair.

8. How TRUE or FALSE is each of the following statements for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Definite True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Mostly False</th>
<th>Definite False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a. I seem to get sick a little easier than other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. I am as healthy as anybody I know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c. I expect my health to get worse.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d. My health is excellent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Do you have any kind of health care coverage, including health insurance, prepaid plans such as HMOs, government plans such as Medicare, or Indian Health Service?
   Yes  No

10. Do you have one person you think of as your personal doctor or health care provider?
    Yes  No

11. Was there a time in the past 12 months when you needed to see a doctor but could not because of cost?
    Yes  No

12. About how long has it been since you last visited a doctor for a routine checkup? (A routine checkup is a general physical exam, not an exam for a specific injury, illness, or condition.)
    ___about a week ago  ___about 6 months ago  ___between 1 and 2 years ago
    ___about a month ago  ___about 9 months ago  ___between 3 and 5 years ago
13. On average, how many hours of sleep do you get in a 24-hour period?
   ___less than 1 hour       ___about 5 to 6 hours       ___more than 10 hours
   ___about 1 to 2 hours     ___about 7 to 8 hours
   ___about 3 to 4 hours     ___about 9 to 10 hours

14. Has a doctor, nurse, or other health professional EVER told you that you had any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a. A heart attack?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b. A stroke?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c. Asthma?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d. Cancer?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15e. Arthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, gout, or lupus?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15f. A depressive disorder, including depression, major depression, dysthymia, or minor depression?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15g. Kidney disease? (Do NOT include kidney stones, bladder infection or incontinence)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h. Diabetes?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15i. Hypertension or high blood pressure?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. (If you selected “Yes” for #15i): How old were you when you were first told that you had hypertension or high blood pressure? Age: ____________

16a. Because of your hypertension/high blood pressure, have you ever been told to take prescribed medicine?
   Yes  No

17. How long has it been since you last visited a dentist or a dental clinic for any reason? Include visits to dental specialists, such as orthodontists.
   ___about a week ago       ___about 6 months ago       ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago      ___about 9 months ago      ___between 3 and 5 years ago

357
18. How many of your permanent teeth have been removed because of tooth decay or gum disease? Include teeth lost to infection, but do not include teeth lost for other reasons, such as injury or orthodontics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**African Self-Consciousness Scale**

Please rate the following statements from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I don’t necessarily feel like I am also being mistreated in a situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where I see another Black person being mistreated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black people should have their own independent schools that consider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their African heritage and values an important part of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blacks who trust Whites in general are basically very intelligent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Blacks who are committed and prepared to uplift the Black race by any</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means necessary (including violence) are more intelligent than Blacks who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are not this committed and prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Blacks in America should try harder to be American rather than</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practicing activities that lift them up from their African cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heritage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Regardless of their interests, educational background and social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievements, I would prefer to associate with Black people than with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is not such a good idea for Black students to be required to learn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an African language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is not within the best interest of Blacks to depend on Whites for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anything, no matter how religious and decent they (the Whites) purport to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blacks who place the highest value on Black life (over that of other people) are reverse racists and generally evil people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Black children should be taught that they are African people at an early age.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Being involved in wholesome group activities with other Blacks lifts my spirits more so than being involved in individual oriented activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. As a good index of self-respect, Blacks in American should consider adopting traditional African names for themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A White/European or Caucasian image of God and the “holy family” (among others considered close to God) are not such bad things for Blacks to worship.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Blacks born in the United States are Black or African first, rather than American or just plain people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Black people who talk in a relatively loud manner, show a lot of emotions and feelings, and express themselves with a lot of movement and body motion are less intelligent than Blacks who do not behave this way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Racial consciousness and cultural awareness based on traditional African values are necessary to the development of Black marriages and families that can contribute to the liberation and enhancement of Black people in America.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In dealing with other Blacks, I consider myself quite different and unique from most of them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Blacks should form loving relationships with and marry only other Blacks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I have difficulty identifying with the culture of African people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. It is intelligent for Blacks in America to organize to educate and liberate themselves from White-American domination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. There is no such thing as African culture among Blacks in America.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is good for Black husbands and wives to help each other develop racial consciousness and cultural awareness in themselves and their children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Africa is not the ancestral homeland of all Black people throughout the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It is good for Blacks in America to wear traditional African-type clothing and hairstyles if they desire to do so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I feel little sense of commitment to Black people who are not close friends or relatives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. All Black students in Africa and America should be expected to study African culture and history as it occurs throughout the world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Black children should be taught to love all races of peoples, even those races who do harm to them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Blacks in America who view Africa as their homeland are more intelligent than those who view America as their homeland.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. If I saw Black children fighting, I would leave them to settle it alone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. White people, generally speaking, do not respect Black life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Blacks in America should view Blacks from other countries (e.g. Ghana, Nigeria, and other countries in Africa) as foreigners rather than as their brothers and sisters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. When a Black person uses the terms “Self, me and I,” his/her reference should encompass all Black people rather than simply him/herself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Religion is dangerous for Black people when it directs and inspires them to become self-determining and independent of the White community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Black parents should encourage their children to respect all Black people, good and bad, and punish them when they don’t show respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Blacks who celebrate Kwanzaa and practice the “Nguzo Saba” (the Black Value System), both symbolizing African traditions, don’t necessarily have better sense than Blacks who celebrate Easter, Christmas, and the Fourth of July.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. African culture is better for humanity than European culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. Black people’s concern for self-knowledge (knowledge of one’s history, philosophy, culture, etc.) and self (collective determination) makes them treat White people badly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. The success of an individual Black person is not as important as the survival of all Black people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. If a good/worthwhile education could be obtained at all schools (both Black and White), I would prefer for my child to attend a racially integrated school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

40. It is good for Black people to refer to each other as “brother” and “sister” because such a practice is consistent with our African heritage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

41. Being involved in wholesome group activities with other Blacks lifts my spirits more so than being involved in individual oriented activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

42. It is not necessary to require Black/African studies courses in predominately Black schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Racialistic Contents Scale**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Racism**

1. African Americans are born with higher sex drives than White people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Racial differences explain why African Americans don’t live as long as Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Differences in family inheritance is a main reason why African Americans and Whites should remain separated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Black men have greater sexual drive than White men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. African Americans are born with greater physical strength and endurance than Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. When it comes to amount of money, African Americans seldom are able to measure up to Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Whites are superior to African Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Racial differences explain why Europeans are technologically more advanced than Africans.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Genetic inferiority explains why more African Americans than Whites drop out of school.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. The school dropout problem among African Americans is due to their not having the mental power of Whites.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. African Americans are born with more musical talent than Whites.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. The Black race is mentally unable to assume positions of high responsibility.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. African Americans are just as smart as Whites.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. There are more African Americans in jail because they are born with criminality.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Whites are better at using reason than African Americans.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. Black people are born with greater rhythm than White people.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17. The inborn physical ability of African Americans makes it hard to beat them in athletics.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Race is an important factor in explaining why Whites have succeeded more than African Americans.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. The high incidence of crime among African Americans reflects a genetic abnormality.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Black men are better at sex than White men.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. The Black man’s body is more skillful than his mind.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. The large number of African Americans addicted to hard drugs suggests a form of biological weakness.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. Black women are more sexually open and willing than White women.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. African Americans are superstitious.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. African Americans can be accepted as intimate friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Attending a dinner party in honor of a famous Black person would be fun.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is difficult to tell one Black person from another Black person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Voting for a Black politician seems only right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Making physical love with a Black person can be exciting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is more embarrassing to lose a game to a White person than to a Black person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is easy to work for someone Black.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African Americans are welcome at my house.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. African Americans are harder workers than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. African Americans should have more voting privileges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The ideas of African Americans are to be admired.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Eating in a Black person’s home can be interesting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. African Americans are more sportsmanlike than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. African Americans are more sloppy than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. African Americans act alike.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Working for a Black person would be acceptable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. African Americans are less reliable than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. African Americans are more religious than Whites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Being in the company of a large number of African Americans can be frightening.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Being partners with a Black in an athletic or card game is O.K. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
22. African Americans are more ignorant than Whites. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
23. Working for a Black person would create inner tension. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
24. African Americans are carefree, happy-go-lucky. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4
25. Giving a Black person top priority for employment seems only fair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4

**Attitudes toward Baggy Jeans**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think Black men should not wear baggy jeans that fall off of their waist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think Black men should not wear skinny jeans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think Black men should not wear skinny jeans that fall off their waist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wearing shorts or pants that fall off your waist is a way for Black men to show their rage toward larger society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think wearing shorts or pants that fall off of your waist is cool.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Baggy clothes are in style.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like baggy clothes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like close fitting clothes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wearing shorts or pants that fall of your waist is a way for people to demonstrate their identity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wearing clothes that fall off your waist is a way to disrespect people who think they are better than me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I like to wear skinny jeans that fall off my waist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Baggy clothes were fashionable for the 1990’s generation and early 2000’s generation, but baggy clothes are not fashionable now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wearing pants or shorts that fall off my waist is a way to represent the street’s way of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I’m tired of mainstream society dictating how young Black people should dress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fashion companies are trying to feminizing Black men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Media outlets (i.e., movies, music videos) are trying to feminizing Black men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Hip-Hop artists are playing a role in feminizing Black men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. “Stand-up” heterosexual (or straight) Black men are perceived to be a threat by mainstream society.

**Experiences with Violence**

Below are questions about various kinds of violence and things related to violence that you may have experienced, seen, or heard about. For each question, mark the option that best describes your experience.

Please mark only one answer unless otherwise indicated.

DO NOT INCLUDE THINGS YOU HAVE SEEN OR HEARD ABOUT ONLY ON TV, RADIO, THE NEWS, OR IN THE MOVIES.

**Being Chased**

1. On how many incidents have you **yourself** been chased by gangs or individuals?
   - never (skip to #2) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   - 1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

   1a. When was the last time you **yourself** were chased by gangs or individuals?
   - ___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   - ___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   - ___between 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

2. How many people have you seen being chased by gangs or individuals?
   - none (skip to #3) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   - 1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

   2a. When was the last time you **saw someone else** being chased by gangs or individuals?
   - ___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   - ___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   - ___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

3. On how many incidents have you **heard about someone** being chased by gangs or individuals?
   - never (skip to #4) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   - 1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

   3a. When was the last time you **heard about someone** being chased by gangs or individuals?
   - ___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   - ___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   - ___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago
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Drug Activity

4. On how many incidents have you seen someone else using or selling illegal drugs?

never (skip to #5)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times       9 to 12 times       Don’t Know

4a. When was the last time you saw someone else using or selling illegal drugs?

___ about a week ago  ___ about 6 months ago  ___ between 1 and 2 years ago
___ about a month ago  ___ about 9 months ago  ___ between 3 and 5 years ago
___ about 3 months ago  ___ about a year ago  ___ more than 5 years ago

5. On how many incidents have you yourself actually been asked to use marijuana?

never (skip to #6)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times       9 to 12 times       Don’t Know

5a. When was the last time you yourself were asked to use marijuana?

___ about a week ago  ___ about 6 months ago  ___ between 1 and 2 years ago
___ about a month ago  ___ about 9 months ago  ___ between 3 and 5 years ago
___ about 3 months ago  ___ about a year ago  ___ more than 5 years ago

6. On how many incidents have you yourself actually been asked to use illegal drugs stronger than marijuana?

never (skip to #7)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times       9 to 12 times       Don’t Know

6a. When was the last time you yourself were asked to use illegal drugs beyond marijuana?

___ about a week ago  ___ about 6 months ago  ___ between 1 and 2 years ago
___ about a month ago  ___ about 9 months ago  ___ between 3 and 5 years ago
___ about 3 months ago  ___ about a year ago  ___ more than 5 years ago

Arrests

7. On how many incidents have you yourself been picked up, arrested, or taken away by the police?

never (skip to #8)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times       9 to 12 times       Don’t Know

7a. When was the last time you yourself were picked up, arrested or taken away by the police?
8. On how many incidents have you seen someone else being picked up, arrested, or taken away by the police?
   never (skip to #9) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know
8b. When was the last time you saw this happen to someone else?
   ___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

9. On how many incidents have you heard about someone else being picked up, arrested, or taken away by the police?
   never (skip to #10) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know
9a. When was the last time you heard about this happening to someone else?
   ___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

Forced Entry

10. On how many incidents has your house or apartment been broken into when you weren’t home?
   never (skip to #11) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know
10a. When was the last time your home or apartment was broken into when you weren’t home?
   ___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago
11. On how many incidents have you heard about someone else’s house or apartment being broken into?

- never (skip to #12)
- 5 to 8 times
- approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
- 1 to 4 times
- 9 to 12 times
- Don’t Know

11a. When was the last time this you heard about someone else’s house or apartment being broken into?

- about a week ago
- about 6 months ago
- between 1 and 2 years ago
- about a month ago
- about 9 months ago
- between 3 and 5 years ago
- about 3 months ago
- about a year ago
- more than 5 years ago

### Threats

12. On how many incidents were you actually threatened with serious physical harm by someone?

- never (skip to #13)
- 5 to 8 times
- approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
- 1 to 4 times
- 9 to 12 times
- Don’t Know

12a. When was the last time you were actually threatened with serious physical harm by someone?

- about a week ago
- about 6 months ago
- between 1 and 2 years ago
- about a month ago
- about 9 months ago
- between 3 and 5 years ago
- about 3 months ago
- about a year ago
- more than 5 years ago

13. On how many incidents have you seen someone else being threatened with serious physical harm?

- never (skip to #14)
- 5 to 8 times
- approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
- 1 to 4 times
- 9 to 12 times
- Don’t Know

13a. When was the last time you saw someone else being threatened with serious physical harm?

- about a week ago
- about 6 months ago
- between 1 and 2 years ago
- about a month ago
- about 9 months ago
- between 3 and 5 years ago
- about 3 months ago
- about a year ago
- more than 5 years ago

14. On how many incidents have you heard about someone else being threatened with serious physical harm?

- never (skip to #15)
- 5 to 8 times
- approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
- 1 to 4 times
- 9 to 12 times
- Don’t Know

369
14a. When was the last time you heard about someone else being threatened with serious physical harm?

___about a week ago  ___about 6 months ago  ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago  ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago  ___more than 5 years ago

**Slapping, Hitting, Punching**

15. On how many incidents have you been slapped, punched or hit by someone?

never (skip to #16)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: ________

1 to 4 times  9 to 12 times  Don’t Know

15a. When was the last time you actually been slapped, punched or hit by someone?

___about a week ago  ___about 6 months ago  ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago  ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago  ___more than 5 years ago

16. On how many incidents have you heard about someone being slapped, punched or hit by someone?

never (skip to #17)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: ________

1 to 4 times  9 to 12 times  Don’t Know

16a. When was the last time you heard about this happening? (mark only one)

___about a week ago  ___about 6 months ago  ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago  ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago  ___more than 5 years ago

**Beatings and Muggings**

17. On how many incidents have you been beaten up or mugged?

never (skip to #18)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: ________

1 to 4 times  9 to 12 times  Don’t Know

17a. When was the last time you yourself actually were beaten up or mugged?

___about a week ago  ___about 6 months ago  ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago  ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago  ___more than 5 years ago

18. On how many incidents have you seen someone else getting beaten up or mugged?

never (skip to #19)  5 to 8 times  approximate # of times if more than 12: ________
18a. When was the last time you saw someone else getting beaten up or mugged?
   ___about a week ago       ___about 6 months ago       ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago      ___about 9 months ago       ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago     ___about a year ago        ___more than 5 years ago

19. On how many incidents have you only heard about someone else being beaten up or mugged?
   never (skip to #20)       5 to 8 times               approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times              9 to 12 times              Don’t Know

19a. When was the last time you heard about someone else being beaten up or mugged?
   ___about a week ago       ___about 6 months ago       ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago      ___about 9 months ago       ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago     ___about a year ago        ___more than 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago     ___about a year ago        ___more than 5 years ago

**Fighting**

20. On how many incidents have you been involved in a physical fight?
   never (skip to #21)       5 to 8 times               approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times              9 to 12 times              Don’t Know

21. On how many incidents have you seen someone else involved in a physical fight?
   never (skip to #22)       5 to 8 times               approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times              9 to 12 times              Don’t Know

22. On how many incidents have you only heard about someone else being involved in a physical fight?
   never (skip to #23)       5 to 8 times               approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times              9 to 12 times              Don’t Know

**Serious Injury**

23. On how many incidents have you been seriously injured after an incident of violence?
   never (skip to #24)       5 to 8 times               approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
   1 to 4 times              9 to 12 times              Don’t Know

23a. When was the last time you actually saw a seriously injured person?
   ___about a week ago       ___about 6 months ago       ___between 1 and 2 years ago
   ___about a month ago      ___about 9 months ago       ___between 3 and 5 years ago
   ___about 3 months ago     ___about a year ago        ___more than 5 years ago
24. On how many incidents have you actually seen a seriously injured person after an incident of violence?

never (skip to #25) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

24a. When was the last time you actually saw a seriously injured person?

___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

25. On how many incidents have you only heard about a person seriously injured after an incident of violence?

never (skip to #26) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

25a. When was the last time you heard about a seriously injured person?

___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

**Knife Attacks**

26. On how many incidents have you been attacked or stabbed with a knife?

never (skip to #27) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

26a. When was the last time you were actually attacked or stabbed with a knife?

___about a week ago ___about 6 months ago ___between 1 and 2 years ago
___about a month ago ___about 9 months ago ___between 3 and 5 years ago
___about 3 months ago ___about a year ago ___more than 5 years ago

27. On how many incidents have you only heard about someone else being attacked or stabbed with a knife?

never (skip to #28) 5 to 8 times approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
1 to 4 times 9 to 12 times Don’t Know

27a. When was the last time you heard about someone else being attacked or stabbed with a knife?
Shootings

28. On how many incidents have you been shot with a gun?

- never (skip to #29)
- 1 to 4 times
- 5 to 8 times
- 9 to 12 times
- more than 12 times
- Don’t Know

28a. When was the last time you yourself actually been shot with a gun?

- about a week ago
- about 6 months ago
- about 9 months ago
- about 1 year ago
- between 1 and 2 years ago
- between 3 and 5 years ago
- more than 5 years ago

29. On how many incidents have you only heard about someone else getting shot with a gun?

- never (skip to #30)
- 1 to 4 times
- 5 to 8 times
- 9 to 12 times
- more than 12 times
- Don’t Know

29a. When was the last time you heard about someone else getting shot with a gun?

- about a week ago
- about 6 months ago
- about 9 months ago
- about 1 year ago
- between 1 and 2 years ago
- between 3 and 5 years ago
- more than 5 years ago

30. Have you ever had a relative killed with a gun? (circle one)   Yes    or    No (skip to #30)

30a. If yes, at what age were you first aware of a relative being killed with a gun?

- Age:

30b. Who was that relative (e.g. a brother, a cousin, etc.)?

_______________________________

31. Have you ever had a friend killed with a gun? (circle one)   Yes    or    No

31a. If yes, how old were you when you first had a friend killed with a gun? Age:

Sexual Assault

32. On how many incidents have you been sexually assaulted or raped?

- never (skip to #33)
- 1 to 4 times
- 5 to 8 times
- 9 to 12 times
- more than 12 times
- Don’t Know
33. On how many incidents have you only heard about someone else being sexually assaulted or raped?

- never (skip to #1)
- 1 to 4 times
- 5 to 8 times
- 9 to 12 times
- approximate # of times if more than 12: __________
- Don’t Know

**Attitudes Toward Violence**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I could see myself committing a violent crime within 5 years.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It’s okay to use violence to get what you want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I try to stay away from places where violence is likely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People who use violence get respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lots of people are out to get you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Carrying a gun or knife would help me feel safer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If a person hits you, you should hit them back.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It’s okay to beat up a person for badmouthing me or my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It’s okay to carry a gun or knife if you live in a rough neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It’s okay to do whatever it takes to protect myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It’s good to have a gun.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Parents should tell their children to use violence if necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. If someone tries to start a fight with you, you should walk away.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If someone disrespects me, I have to fight them to get my pride back.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Carrying a gun makes people feel powerful and strong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wish there weren’t any guns in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes Toward Fighting**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parents who let their children engage in fighting are teaching their children how to defend themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is never okay for a parent to help their child win a fist fight.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engaging in a one-on-one fist fight is a fair way to settle disputes between two people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fighting is okay if someone feels threatened by another person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents who allow their children to engage in fighting are protecting their children from more serious forms of violence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A &quot;fair&quot; fight is just as respected than a &quot;dirty&quot; fight.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is respected to use a weapon during a one-on-one fight.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Girls are more likely to fight than boys.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Schools treat students who fight the same.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Boys usually fight more violently than girls.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Attitudes Towards Abortion and Contraception**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The government makes certain that birth control methods are safe before they come onto the market.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The government is trying to limit Blacks and other people of color by encouraging the use of birth control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The government and public health institutions use poor people and people of color as guinea pigs to try out new birth control methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pregnancy should be planned.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have all of the information I need to avoid an unplanned pregnancy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It does not matter whether you use birth control or not; when it is your time to get pregnant, it will happen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is mainly a woman’s responsibility to make decisions about birth control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Drug companies don’t care if birth control is safe, they just want people to use it so they can make money.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I do not believe in abortions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Abortions are destroying the Black community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Black women should have more abortions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe in Black women having the opportunity to “choose” whether they should have an “abortion” or “pregnancy.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I think Planned Parenthood helps my community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. I think we should do more to help young women who become pregnant.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. People who get sexually transmitted diseases are irresponsible.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Free condoms should be made more available.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I believe sexually transmitted diseases are created by the government.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. People who get sexually transmitted diseases deserve to get them.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. HIV/AIDS was developed to hurt poor Black people.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes Toward Civic Leadership**  
Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

| 1. I think most non-profit organizations set up to help poor Black people are doing a bad job.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. I think most non-profit leadership care about the community.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. I think most non-profit organizations have enough resources to help poor Black people.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. I think most non-profit organizations are taking advantage of poor Black people.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. Most people who work for non-profit organizations care about the community.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes Toward Religious Leadership**  
Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

| 1. Religion is taking advantage of poor Black people.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religious organizations help more poor Black people than they hurt Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe in God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People in my neighborhood should believe in God and not in a religion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. God will guide poor Black people out of oppression.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I believe in spirituality but not religion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I like the religious leadership in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Muslim leadership in my city genuinely cares about poor Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Nation of Islam does good work in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sunni Muslim Leadership does good work in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sunni Muslim’s and the Nation of Islam should work more closely together to help poor Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Nation of Islam is doing a good job in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Black Christian churches work positively with poor Black people in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I think Black pastors help a lot of people in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I think Black Christian leadership is taking advantage of poor Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I wish religious leadership would become more united to help poor Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes Toward Political Leadership**

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like the political leadership in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I think the Mayor is doing a good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think the Governor is doing a good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think the political leadership in Wilmington is sincerely interested in providing quality jobs to poor Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I know who the president of City Council is.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know who my city council representative is.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I know who the Attorney General of Delaware is.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel political leadership has worked hard to improve employment in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I think the political leadership in Wilmington is sincerely interested in helping poor Black people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I think the Mayor is sincerely interested in doing a good job for poor Black people in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I think the Governor is sincerely interested in doing a good job for poor Black people in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I think City Council in Wilmington is sincerely interested in doing a good job for poor Black people in Wilmington.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel political leadership has worked hard to improve education and schools for children in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I want to be a politician one day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I think politicians really want to make positive change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I think it is difficult for politicians to make a lot of positive change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attitudes Toward Spirituality**

Please rate the following statements from **Strongly Disagree** to **Strongly Agree** – circle a number from 1 to 4.
### Attitudes Toward Marijuana

Please rate the following statements from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree* – circle a number from 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marijuana is good for your health.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Marijuana helps people to cope with depression.  1  2  3  4
3. Marijuana should be legalized.  1  2  3  4
4. People should not be incarcerated for selling marijuana.  1  2  3  4
5. I am happy marijuana was decriminalized in Delaware.  1  2  3  4
6. Marijuana is bad for your health.  1  2  3  4
7. I like smoking marijuana.  1  2  3  4
8. Using marijuana makes you lazy and unproductive.  1  2  3  4
9. Smoking marijuana is a spiritual act for me.  1  2  3  4
10. Marijuana should be illegal.  1  2  3  4
11. Most Black youth smoke marijuana for social reasons.  1  2  3  4
12. Marijuana allows me to deal with life problem.  1  2  3  4
13. Hip-Hop music has a lot to do with why Black youth are smoking marijuana.  1  2  3  4

14. Do you smoke or use marijuana?  (Circle) Yes or No
   14a. How often do you smoke or use marijuana?
       Per Day: ______________________  Per Week: ______________________
   14b. How much money do you spend on marijuana?
       Per Day: ______________________  Per Week: ______________________
   14c. At what age did you first start using marijuana? ________________

DEMOGRAPHIC INVENTORY

Section of Wilmington, DE survey was completed in:

Neighborhood of Wilmington participant currently lives in:

Neighborhood of Wilmington participant was raised in as a child:

City and State where participant was raised, if other than Wilmington, DE:

________________________
(1) Age? _______ (2) Gender? Male or Female
(3) Race? (a) Black/African American (b) Hispanic/Latino (c) White (d) Asian/Pacific Islander (h) other_________________

(3a) Please write out what ETHNIC GROUP you personally identify with (i.e., African-American Jamaican, Ghanaian, Puerto Rican, Dominican, etc.)?

RESIDENTIAL INFORMATION
(4) How would you describe your current living quarters? – Please circle one.
(a) low-income apartment complex (d) condominium (g) shelter
(b) mid-income apartment complex (e) private home (h) car
(c) multi-family home (f) other ______________ (i) abandoned building

(4b) How many people live in the space you are currently living in?

(4c) Who are they? Please do not list names of people, just note their relationship to you (i.e., brother, mother, son, girlfriend, acquaintance, etc.)

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
(5) Last grade or educational level completed: ______________________________
(6) If you have an educational degree, what type is it?
(a) high school diploma (b) G.E.D. (c) B. A. (d) Other ____________________

(7) Do you have any trade experience? Yes or No (7a) If so, what kind?

(8) What educational degree does your mother hold? __________________________
(9) What educational degree does your father hold? __________________________

EMPLOYMENT STATUS
(8) How would you describe your current employment status? (circle one)
(a) employed full time (35 hours or more per week)
(b) employed part time (less than 35 hours per week)
(c) unemployed and looking for work
(d) unemployed and not looking for work

(8a) If you are employed, please briefly describe what type of employment you have below.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
(9) Have you ever been arrested before? Yes or No (skip to Familial Relations section)

(9a) Total number of arrest in your life: ______________

(10) Have you ever been incarcerated before? Yes or No (skip to Familial Relations section)

(10a) Total number of incarcerations in your life: ______________
(10b) Primary hustle prior to last incarceration: ______________________
(10c) Charges(s) that led to last incarceration: ______________________
(11) Gang involvement prior to incarceration? Yes or No
(11a) If yes, what was the name of the gang? ______________________
(12) In what correctional facility were you last incarcerated? ________________
(12a) How would you classify this facility’s security level?
    (a) minimum level security          (b) medium level security          (c) maximum level security
(13) What was the length of your last incarceration? __________________
(13a) What was the release date of your last incarceration? ________________
(14) Are you currently on probation? Yes or No (14a) If so, for how long? ______
(15) Are you currently on parole? Yes or No (15a) If so, for how long? ______

FAMILIAL RELATIONSHIPS
(16) What is your current marital status? – Circle all that apply.
    (a) single without a significant partner  (b) single with a significant partner  (c) legally married
    (d) living together (cohabitation)       (e) common law marriage  (f) married but separated
    (g) widowed
(17) Have you ever been divorced before? Yes or No
(18) Do you currently have any children? Yes or No (18a) If so, how many? ______
(18b) If you have children, do they live with you? Yes or No
(18c) How many of your children live with you? ________________

HEALTH
(19) Do you have health insurance? Yes or No
(19a) If so, what kind? ______________________
(20) Do you have Medicaid? Yes or No
(21) When was the last time you had a routine or specialized examination with a medical doctor?

(22) Do you have any chronic or serious health issues? Yes or No
(22a) If so, what kind?
(23) Have you ever been to the emergency room due to an act of violence? Yes or No
(23a) If so, for what reason(s) did you have to go to the emergency room?

End Time: ____________
Appendix B

THE STREET PART HEALTH PROJECT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol
Wilmington Street PAR Project
4/23/18

Demographic and Community
1. What is your name? Age? Gender?
2. What part of the Westside/Northside are you from?
3. How long have you lived in the Westside/Northside?
4. Tell me about where you live (i.e., apartments, house, two-family home, subsidized housing, a shelter)? PROMPT: How consistent is this living situation for you?
5. How do you feel about the Westside/Northside? Do you have a good relationship with your neighborhood?
6. In what ways do you feel safe in your neighborhood? PROMPT: Where do you feel most safe or most unsafe in your neighborhood?
7. Where do you go for peace of mind/safety?
8. What are some of the problems related to housing that people face in your community? PROMPT: food, space, crime, infestation?
9. How would you describe the home life for youth and young adults in the Westside/Northside, particularly those who engage in violence and/or the streets overall?

Family

Key Questions:
1. Can you tell us about growing up in your neighborhood?
2. How would you describe your family?
3. Can you talk a little about your relationship with your family? Your parents? Siblings?
   a. Was your father/mother in your life?
   b. What did your parents do for a living?
4. Do you have children? If so, how many and how old are they? Do they live with you?
   a. Are your children’s father/mother in their lives?
5. What is it like to raise your children in Northside or Westside?
6. What are some of the challenges you face as you raise your kids? PROMPT: The environment/danger? The lack of support? Role of fathers?
   a. Do Black men love their children?
   b. Why do so many Black fathers live outside of the home?

Street Life and Structural Violence

Key Questions:
1. So let’s talk a little bit about life in your community.
2. What is street life? Can you describe street life?
3. Has street life played a role in your life? In what ways?
a. At what points in your life were you involved in street life?

b. At what age did you get involved in the streets?

4. How does a street identity develop?

5. Can you tell me what it means to have or embody a street identity? PROMPT: What does someone “from the streets” or with a “street identity” look like? Do men with a street identity act or look differently than women with a street identity? In what ways?

6. Have you ever been incarcerated or spent time in jail? Can you tell us about that experience?

7. How would you describe “the system?” How do you feel about “the system?”

8. What is the system? How do you feel about the system?

9. In what ways do you think “the system” (or institutions like the government, the criminal justice system, the workforce, or schools) plays a role in creating street life?

10. Is there a relationship between violence and money/resources in Wilmington? Explain.

11. What is the relationship between poverty/being poor and participating in violence or crime?

12. Do opportunity or lack or opportunity play a role in the development of street life?

13. How did you deal with the pressures of street life throughout your life? In what ways did you do things differently in your teens, twenties, and so on?

**Re-Entry Questions** (for those who talked about being in prison)

1. How would you describe re-entry services in Wilmington?

2. What would you like re-entry services to primarily focus on?

3. What is it like in general for someone returning home from prison?

**Street Life as a Racial-Ethnic Identity**

1. How does race and ethnicity inform the streets?

2. What is the dominant racial-ethnic group in Wilmington?
   a. Where do Afro-Caribbean live in Wilmington? Are they in the streets?
   b. Where do Latino live in Wilmington? Are they in the streets?
   c. Where do white people live in Wilmington? Are they in the streets?

**Street Love**

1. What does “Street Love” mean? PROMPT: How do people in the streets bond?

2. Do poor Black residents in the Northside/Westside love their communities?

3. Have you ever noticed someone in the streets giving back in positive ways to the local community? If so, in what ways?

4. Where do people who are street gather and socialize (e.g., bar, club, private homes)?

**Street Masculinity**

1. What does it mean to be a Black man in the United States?

2. Do Black boys go to the streets early (e.g. 11 or 12 years of age for example) to support themselves and other family members? If so, why would they do this?

3. Is it important for Black boys and Black men to acquire respect from their communities? If so, how do they do this? What does respect mean for the streets of Wilmington?
4. Is it important for street identified Black boys and men to be loyal to their crews, families and communities? Does this loyalty have anything to do with respect?
5. Why do Black men, particularly those in the streets, speak so highly of their neighborhoods or equate their identities with their neighborhood (e.g. “I’m from River” or “I rep North”)?
6. Is it important for Black men to be a protector? What does being a protector mean?
7. Is it important for Black men to be a provider? What does being a provider mean?
8. Can Black men in the streets be good fathers?
9. What are your thoughts about skinny jeans and baggy jeans? Do you think Black boys and Black men are being effeminized on TV and in urban music?

Street Femininity
1. What does it mean to be a Black woman in the United States?
2. Are Black women involved in street life?
3. How would you describe Black women who participate in street life?
4. Why do Black women engage in street life?
5. What roles do Black women play in the streets?
6. How does age influence when and how black women go to the streets?
7. What are some expectations of Black women in the streets?
10. What does a THOT mean? Is this a fair description of some women? Is this a harmful or empowering term? Should we be more concerned about framing Black women in this way?
11. Does the code of violence apply to Black women in the streets? How?
12. Can Black women be in the streets but still be a provider or protector? Explain.
13. Can Black women in the streets be good mothers?

Violence

Key Questions:
1. What does violence mean to you?
3. What causes violence in Wilmington? Why do people engage in violence (e.g. fighting, gun violence, homicide, assaulting someone)?
4. What makes youth and young adults engage in community violence in Westside/Northside?
5. Can you talk about times you ever witnessed or observed violence in your community?
6. Can you talk about any time you have ever been a victim of violence? PROMPT: How did you recover?
7. Does being violent make sense at all? Is there any good reason to be violent? Is it possible to be in the streets and not be violent?
8. In what ways do loyalty, trust, and enemies/ops play a role in the beef or violence that exists in Wilmington?
9. In what ways does someone’s age play a role in their participation in violence?
10. In what ways has violence changed in Wilmington now versus when you were growing up? PROMPT: Discuss what/how things have changed? Talk to me about how it was “back in the day?”

11. Where does violence take place in Wilmington (e.g. neighborhoods, sections, street blocks, parties, local park, bars)?

12. Does social media play a role in the violence we see in Wilmington?

13. Does the size of Wilmington as a city play a role in the violence, whether it is in the actual violent act or the aftermath?

14. What do you think about the fact that people call Wilmington “Murder Town USA?”

15. In what ways does witnessing and hearing about violence influence you?

Secondary Questions (Follow Ups):

16. Did you hear about the death of Amy Joyner-Francis at Howard High School? What are your thoughts about that case? Is fighting in school a problem? What are your thoughts on fist fighting versus using guns to settle conflict?

17. Can you talk about any time you ever attended the funeral of someone who was shot and killed or suffered violence? PROMPT: Can you tell me what that was like?

18. How would you suggest reducing or preventing gun violence taking place in your community?

**Crime**

Key Questions:

1. Is there a difference between violence and crime?

2. What does crime or criminal activity mean to you?


4. Why do people engage in crime?

5. What types of crime do people in the streets engage in? Are these hustles different than other cities?

6. Is Wilmington crime the same now as it was when you were younger? Explain.

7. Is crime different in wealthier parts of Wilmington (e.g. North Wilmington, Greenville, etc.)? If so, how?

**Police**

Key Questions:

1. What are your thoughts about policing in Wilmington? What do you think of the police?

2. What good or bad things have you noticed about policing in Wilmington?

3. Do you think police respect the residents they serve?

4. Can you talk about the relationship between police and local Black residents?

5. Have you ever been in trouble with the police? What happened?

6. Can you talk about times when you have been bothered by the cops? What usually happens?

7. Have you ever been assaulted by police? What happened?

8. When the cops come are they doing it as part of their rounds or did someone call them? How do you know?
9. Can you talk about any times your friends have been in trouble with the police?
10. Can you tell me about any times you ever witnessed or observed someone being stopped and frisked, arrested, or harassed by the police?
11. How do you feel about talking to the police?
12. Can you talk about a time you called the police to report a crime or incident of violence?
13. What does it mean to be a snitch?
14. Is snitching a problem in Wilmington?
15. What does it mean to “Stop Snitching”?
16. What are your thoughts about the shooting of Jeremy “Bam Bam” McDole?

Secondary Questions (Follow Ups):
17. Thinking about recent cases of police brutality or police violence, have any case(s) touched you and why?
18. How do you feel about observing police murders of Black people on social media?
19. What are your thoughts about the Sandra Bland case? Is police violence against Black women an issue? How?
20. How can police improve what they do in your neighborhood?
21. What should be done to address police violence?

**Education**

Key Questions:
1. What grade did you reach in school? What is the educational status of your siblings, children and parents?
2. How would you describe public education or schools for youth in the Westside/Northside?
3. What were your experiences in school or with the educational system? What kinds of positive or negative experiences did you have?
4. What was valuable or enjoyable about those experiences?
5. What type of education do poor Black youth receive in the Westside/Northside?
6. In what ways do students from your neighborhood take school seriously?
7. Do they receive a quality education in the Westside/Northside?
8. How do teachers treat poor Black youth from the Westside/Northside?
9. In what ways do teachers respect students from the Westside/Northside?
10. Are poor Black children from these Westside/Northside prepared for college?

**Employment**

Key Questions:
1. Are you employed? If so, what job do you have? How long have you been employed?
2. What are the employment status of your siblings, children and parents?
3. What is your employment history?
4. What are employment opportunities like for youth and young adults in the Northside and Westside?
5. Do poor Black men and women want to work?
6. Do street identified Black men and women want to work?
7. Do Black men returning home from prison want to work?
8. Do Black women returning home from prison want to work?
9. Why do you think poor Black men and women in Wilmington have trouble finding work?

**Health**

Key Questions:
1. Do you have health care and dental coverage?
2. Do you have and/or ever had any health issues (i.e., hypertension, heart problems, blood pressure, strokes, diabetes, cancer, STI’s)?
3. How often do you visit a doctor?
4. Do you have a personal physician? Where do you go to visit your doctor? Do you have trouble covering the finances of your medicine?
5. How would you describe your diet? (breakfast, lunch dinner, holidays)?
6. What kinds of health issues are dominant in your family (grandparents, parents, siblings, children)?
7. Do your family members visit a doctor and dentist regularly (1x year for doctor and twice a year for dentist)?
8. Where do you typically go to buy groceries? What is the quality of food you have access to?

Secondary Questions (Follow Ups):
1. What are the dominant drugs used by street identified Black men and women in Wilmington?
2. What are your thoughts about abortion? How do abortions affect the Black community?
3. What do you know about Planned Parenthood? What do you think about Planned Parenthood?
4. What do you know about the LARK program?
5. What are your thoughts about the prevalence of STI’s in poor Black communities?

**Political & Civic Leadership**

1. What do you think about political leadership in Wilmington?
2. How do you feel about the Mayor, City Council, County Council or the Governor’s office?
3. What is the name of your city council person?
4. Are there any local politicians that you have great respect for? If so, whom and why?
5. What are your thoughts about former President Barack Obama? Has his presidency adequately served poor Black people?
6. How do you think President Trump will impact the Black community?
7. Why do you think few poor young Black people don’t vote or get involved in the political process?
8. What is the role of non-profit organizations in Wilmington? Are they helping or hurting the community?
**Religious Leadership**

1. What is your religious preference or belief? How strong would you say your faith is?
2. Do you believe in God?
3. What is the difference between religion and spirituality?
4. Are you formerly a part of a religion?
5. What are your thoughts about religion in general?
6. What religions are dominant in the Westside/Northside? Why?
7. What role does the Church play for poor Blacks in Wilmington?
8. What are your thoughts of the church? Does the church help or hurt poor Black people in Wilmington?
9. What are your thoughts about the Nation of Islam and Sunni Muslims in Wilmington?
10. Why is there a tension between these Muslim faiths?
11. Should religious leaders (across religions) work better together to serve the community?

**Debriefing Questions**

1. How do you feel?
2. Did this interview make you feel uncomfortable in any way?
3. Are there any questions that you suggest we ask or ask differently?
4. Is there anything that you suggest we do differently?
5. Is there anyone you suggest we interview?

Thank you for your time!

[Give participants employment, educational and counseling information. Then give them cash incentive. Also, remind participants of how we can be contacted.]
## Appendix C

### MEMBERS OF THE STREET PAR HEALTH PROJECT TEAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yasser A. Payne, PhD</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroi Hicks, MD, MPH</td>
<td>Co-Principal Investigator and Funder at Christiana Care Health System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Medinilla, MD, MPH</td>
<td>Trauma Surgeon at Christiana Care Health System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Chen, MD, MPH</td>
<td>Internal Medicine and Pediatric Hospitalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann M. Aviles, PhD</td>
<td>Co-Principal Investigator at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklynn Hitchens, PhD</td>
<td>Co-Project Director/Lead Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Chambers, MA</td>
<td>Co-Project Director/Doctoral Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coley Harris</td>
<td>Lead Street PAR Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Wilson, PhD</td>
<td>Chief of Staff/Doctoral Student at Wilmington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrice Gibbs</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Blood Pressure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daroun Jamison</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey/Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontal Copeland</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Miller</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey/Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubard McGriff, BA</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey/Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Price</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Cornish</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick Chambers</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandville Brown</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corie Priest</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corry Wright</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR member (Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha McNeil</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Street PAR honorary member (Interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akilah Alleyne, PhD</td>
<td>Research Assistant/ Doctoral Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen McCallops, MS</td>
<td>Research Assistant/ Doctoral Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nefetaria Yates</td>
<td>Research Assistant/ Doctoral Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadisha Downs, MS</td>
<td>Research Assistant/ Doctoral Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven Lewis, MA</td>
<td>Research Assistant/ Doctoral Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Baumgardner</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Undergraduate Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Groman</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Undergraduate Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Martinez</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Undergraduate Student at UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Marine</td>
<td>Research Assistant/Undergraduate Student at UD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Table adapted from Hitchens (2020).*