Outcome Evaluation of Programs Offering Youth Leadership Training

2002 – 2004

Prepared for

The State of Connecticut
Office of Policy and Management

By

Ronald M. Sabatelli
Stephen A. Anderson
Jennifer Trachtenberg
Julie Liefeld

April 2005

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a two-year evaluation of youth leadership activities within community youth development programs in Connecticut. Four different types of youth programs were included in the evaluation. Despite offering different programming content, all programs were required to provide youth with leadership opportunities. The participating programs included Combating Underage Drinking, Juvenile Review Boards, Youth Advisory Committees, and Title V: Delinquency Prevention.

A youth leadership program was defined as one that offered young people supports and opportunities to participate actively in the planning, decision-making, and implementation of the programs in which they participated; and engaged youth in frequent and regular contact with adults who modeled responsible behavior and provided ongoing validation and support for youth's active involvement. Youth involved in leadership activities were contrasted with a comparison group of youth who participated in a variety of in-school or out-of-school activities that did not include leadership programming.

Youth involved in the leadership programs generally found their experiences to be very rewarding. When asked to retrospectively report on their year in the program, a large majority felt safe, involved, supported by the staff and stimulated by the activities.

Youth involved in the leadership programs reported an improved sense of support from their local communities compared to youth in the comparison group. That is, youth involved in leadership programs viewed their neighborhoods as offering more support, help, and protection, and they saw people working more closely together. Leadership training also appeared to offer an added benefit to males. Males who participated in leadership activities reported significant improvements in their social self-efficacy when compared to other subgroups of youth (females in leadership groups, youth in comparison groups). Social self-efficacy refers to a belief in one's capacities to organize and execute the actions needed to manage interpersonal and social situations.

Another important finding was that youth who participated in the leadership programs appeared to be a uniquely talented group of individuals. They scored higher initially on a variety of youth outcome measures when compared to youth who participated in the comparison group.

Despite the generally high level of functioning of participants overall, there was a subgroup of youth engaged in leadership activities that was less socially and emotionally skilled. It was this subgroup that was most likely to report positive changes over the evaluation period. Those who started the year at a lower level of overall functioning on a general index of youth development were most likely to report significant improvements on such outcomes as social self-efficacy, self-assertive efficacy, engagement in neighborhood activities, and an increased presence of caring adults in their lives.

Separate analyses of the different types of programs involved in the youth leadership evaluation showed some differences across the different program types. Implications of the findings and recommendations for youth programs and future evaluation efforts are also presented.

Introduction

The Center for Applied Research was contracted to evaluate a group of youth programs funded by the State Of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management, all of which included a youth leadership component. The evaluation was conducted between September 2002 and August 2003 and between September 2003 and August 2004. It was intended to examine the widely held view among youth development specialists that youth who engage in community-based leadership training and activities are more likely than youth who do not engage in youth leadership activities to achieve positive developmental outcomes. The programs included Combating Underage Drinking, Juvenile Review Boards, Youth Advisory Committees, and Title V: Delinquency Prevention. To be selected for inclusion, the program had to be offering leadership training to a selected group of youth between the ages of 12 and 18 years on a regular basis. A detailed list of participating communities is provided below.

Youth Leadership

According to Northhouse (1997), **leadership** is an influence process that assists groups of individuals toward goal attainment. According to a task force initiated by the Michigan State University Extension Service (Sandmann & Vendenberg, 1995), leadership involves three common themes: (1) **shared leadership** assumes that everyone has leadership qualities that can be pooled and drawn upon as needed when working with others on a common goal; (2) **leadership as relationship** describes a network of relationships that is built upon concepts of empowerment, participation, partnership, and service; and (3) **leadership in community** envisions the community as the setting in which leadership relationships take place. Underlying these themes is the view that leadership development is the growth of individuals' capacities to facilitate community and organizational development.

The key distinction between youth leadership and other youth development programming is that youth leadership programs offer young people supports and opportunities to (1) participate actively in the planning, decision-making, and implementation of the programs in which they participate, and (2) engage in frequent and regular contact with adults who model responsible behavior, and provide ongoing validation and support for youth's active involvement. Skills such as brainstorming, decision-making, setting goals, and working with others are frequently taught (Boyd, 2001). Experiential learning, or learning by doing, also is thought to be an important element of leadership development. This kind of learning blends participation in the experience with opportunities to share, discuss, process relevant thoughts and feelings, generalize these into principles and guidelines for living (i.e., life skills), and apply what has been learned to other situations (Boyd, 2001).

All youth development programs attempt to offer a variety of important features such as a safe setting, appropriate structure, supportive relationships, opportunities to belong, positive social norms, and skill building opportunities (Eccles & Gootman, 2002). These

programs often blend meaningful relationships with staff with an array of recreational, academic (after-school, mentoring, tutoring), arts, social (e.g., trips, clubs, dances) or community service experiences, in which youth develop various competencies such as social, academic, cultural, or life skills (Larson, 2000; McLaughlin, 2000). However, in non-youth leadership programs, contacts with staff may be limited to specific activities or informal socializing as opposed to opportunities to work with staff and other community leaders in a focused way that involves taking on an active leadership and decision-making role (Hawkins, Arthur, & Olsen, 1998).

This evaluation focused specifically on whether the direct involvement by youth in youth leadership programs offered benefits over and above those experienced by youth who do not participate in youth leadership programming. The focus of this evaluation was driven by the need for researchers in the field of youth development to examine which of the various youth development program components account for the positive benefits these programs have been shown to produce. Available research has demonstrated that youth development programs can produce significant benefits to youth participants (c.f., Eccles & Gootman, 2002). However, researchers have also consistently pointed out that research has yet to identify which specific aspects of these programs are most effective for any particular outcome or population group (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 2002; Roth et al, 1998).

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design included pre-testing and post-testing of youth who were engaged in youth leadership activities in the participating communities. Each program was asked to target a minimum of 20 youth who had participated in leadership activities in their program. Programs were also asked to administer the same pre-tests and post-tests to a comparison sample of youth who had not participated in youth leadership activities in their program. The comparison samples were drawn from a variety of sources. Several of these comparison groups were drawn from local high schools, such as a homeroom class or English class, or by randomly selecting children in cafeterias during their lunch periods. A high school band was also used. Snowball sampling was used as a method of recruiting one comparison group; youth in the leadership program were asked to have a friend/classmate who were not in the program complete a comparison group survey.

The evaluation sought to answer the following question: **Do youth who participate in youth leadership activities report more positive developmental outcomes than youth who do not participate in youth leadership training and activities?**

A second evaluation question was added after the first year of data collection. Staff members in each program were asked to describe **how their program defined youth leadership**. This was felt to be necessary because it was not clear after the first year of the evaluation whether programs were targeting similar or different leadership skills with the youth they served. Telephone interviews were conducted to gather this information.

Participating Communities

The communities that participated in the evaluation are listed below and categorized by the type of program that was offered.

Combating Underage Drinking	Bloomfield
	East Lyme
	Glastonbury
	Ledge Light Health District
	Madison
	New Milford Community Action Network
	Newtown
	Rocky Hill
	Torrington
	Vernon
	Waterford
	Westbrook
	Westport
	Wethersfield
	Woodbridge/Orange
Juvenile Review Boards	Cheshire
	Stonington
Youth Advisory Committees	Bloomfield
	Torrington
	Westport-Weston
Title V: Delinquency Prevention	Norwich
	Stonington
	Stratford
	Waterbury
	Windham

In the next section, a brief description of each of the above types of programs is presented.

Descriptions of Program Types

Combating Underage Drinking

This program provides funding to establish or enhance comprehensive community projects that support and enhance efforts to combat underage drinking. All projects have a coordinator who is responsible for developing and maintaining a broad-based task force of law enforcement personnel, community leaders, parents, and youth. Communities complete a needs assessment and strategic plan, develop strategies to increase law enforcement based on the needs assessment, and include development of youth leadership

and involvement that will result in youth participation in community task force work. Grantees receive training and technical assistance from the Connecticut Coalition to Stop Underage Drinking and from Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) Connecticut State Organization.

Every summer MADD conducts a Youth Leadership Power Camp to help young people learn the skills necessary to affect environmental changes in their communities to combat underage drinking. Teams of alcohol and drug-free student leaders are trained about alcohol and drug abuse and how to work within their communities to reduce these problems. Participants spend time with other student leaders sharing ideas, building friendships and absorbing valuable information.

Juvenile Review Board

This program supports local public agencies that want to establish or reactivate juvenile review boards. Supported costs include staff (program and/or clerical), police overtime, client programs, training, and supplies. Youth leadership opportunities are provided through participation on the juvenile review boards and through participation in the development and planning of community service alternatives in lieu of prosecution for status offenses.

Youth Advisory Committees

The purpose of this program is to establish Youth Advisory Committees (YAC), composed entirely of youth members, to teach young people the art of philanthropy, to develop youth leadership skills, and to foster volunteerism. Support is provided to organizations to establish or expand a youth advisory committee that makes recommendations for grants to the organization's funding authority. Financial support is provided to recruit and train YAC members, staff the YAC, and support fund development activities and recognition events.

Title V: Delinquency Prevention

This program provides grants to cities and towns for local delinquency prevention projects based on an approach that calls on communities to identify the risk and protective factors to which their children are exposed. A key component of this approach is the coordination and use of existing programs and resources. Programs receive funding for up to three years to implement a delinquency prevention plan based on an assessment of risk and protective factors associated with the development of delinquent behavior in the community's children. Funding is focused on youth development programs that provide young people with positive role models and opportunities to participate in recreational, cultural, and skill-development activities. This may be through after-school programs, teen drop-in centers, community service projects, or other recreational or educational programs. In order to participate in the current project, communities had to incorporate youth leadership training.

Despite the obvious differences in the focus and content of these various programs, all programs were required to offer youth several common opportunities. These included youth involvement in program planning and decision-making, training in youth leadership, on-going interaction with program staff and other adults, and active participation and involvement in the local community.

Outcomes Included in the Evaluation

It was hypothesized that youth who participated in leadership programs would likely show changes in four general categories of outcomes (Sabatelli, Anderson, & LaMotte, 2001). These included youth personal adjustment, social competencies, positive adult-youth connections, and positive youth-community connections. The specific outcomes included in the evaluation are listed below according to each of these outcome categories.

Personal Adjustment

It was hypothesized that youth leadership programs would have a positive influence on participants' self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as, "the belief in one's capacities to organize and execute the sources of action required to manage prospective situations" (Bandura, 1986). It is a context-specific assessment of competence to perform a specific task or domain (Bandura, 1997). This means that accurate assessments of self-efficacy must be based upon specific skills or skill sets. For this evaluation, three sets of skills were thought to be associated with youth leadership. These included social self-efficacy (the ability to relate to and communicate effectively with others), self-assertive efficacy (ability to speak up for one's rights), and self-regulatory efficacy (ability to resist negative peer pressures).

Social Competencies

A social competency thought to be affected by leadership programs was the capacity for empathy with others. Empathy is defined as the ability to be sensitive to the feelings and experiences of others. Leaders are generally able to listen well to others, show sensitivity and explain the reasons for their decisions (McCauly & Van Velsor, 2002).

Adult-Youth Connections

The nature of youth leadership programs is such that youth who become involved spend a good deal of time interacting with adults in a variety of experiences such as staff meetings, adult mentoring, program planning, and decision-making activities. It was hypothesized that, as a result, youth engaged in leadership programs would develop supportive relationships with adults (staff) and that they would perceive them as resources for dealing with social and emotional experiences.

Youth-Community Connections

The leadership programs that participated in this evaluation were community-based and regularly involved youth in a variety of community projects. This suggested that positive changes could be expected in this area. It was expected that youth engaged in these programs would report a greater sense of involvement and connection to their neighborhoods and communities. A sense of connection to one's community has been consistently shown in previous research to be a key indicator of positive youth development (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Hawkins, Arthur, & Olsen, 1998).

The two specific outcomes in this category included in the evaluation were neighborhood support and neighborhood activities. Neighborhood support involves receiving help and protection, and a sense that people work together in the neighborhood. Neighborhood activities refer to the perception that there are available activities (things to do, places to gather) in the community.

Sample: Characteristics of Youth Participants

All participants in this study were either enrolled in youth programs funded by the State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management (OPM) or recruited by the programs to complete surveys as part of a comparison group. The participants in the comparison groups had no involvement in the youth leadership programs. Many were recruited, for example, from high school classes, homeroom classes, or school extracurricular activities (e.g., band). A total of 586 youth from twenty-five youth leadership programs were included in the evaluation. Another 747 youth were recruited for the comparison group.

The total sample was comprised of 547 males (42.1%) and 752 (57.9%) females (34 youth did not indicate their gender). Their grades ranged from fourth grade through college, with tenth grade being the average. Ninety-one percent of the youth fell within grades seven though twelve. The age range represented was between seven years and 22 years, with the average being 16 years old. Ninety-two percent of the sample fell within the targeted age range of 12 to 18 years. Only youth falling within the targeted range were included in the data analyses that will be described later. Youth in the sample reported doing fairly well in school with 73% reporting a B average or better. Only 3.4% of the sample reported a D to F grade point average.

The total sample was comprised of mainly Caucasian youth with 866 of 1333 youth (65%) being Caucasian. Among the remaining participants, 12.5% were African American, 11.8% were Hispanic, 2.1% were Asian. Less than 1% were American Indian and 6.2% reported "other." In addition to these demographics, youth were also requested to report their family status, or which caregivers lived with them in the home. The majority of the sample (51%) reported living with both their mother and father. Another 21.5% reported living with their mother, and 11% reported living with their mother and stepfather. About 4% reported living with their father, and 1.5% reported living with their father and stepmother. The rest reported living with close relatives (4%), foster parents (1.3%), or non-relatives (1.3%). About 5% of the sample did not answer this question.

Comparisons between the leadership group and comparison group revealed no significant differences between youth participants in terms of race, family composition, age, or grade in school.

Measures

Social Self-Efficacy

Social self-efficacy was assessed using a brief scale developed by Muris (2001) based upon Bandura's work. Muris' original scale measured three types of youth self-efficacy: social, academic and emotional self-efficacy. Muris reported high alpha coefficients for these subscales (between .85 and .88). An exploratory factor analysis also showed the "majority of the items loaded convincingly on their intended factors" (Muris, 2001, p. 146).

Self-Assertive Efficacy & Self-Regulatory Efficacy

A variety of measures of self-efficacy have been utilized in the past. Some measure self-efficacy as a global construct and some focus on specific types of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Bandura et al., 1999, Bandura, 2001, Muris, 2001). Measures of specific types of self-efficacy typically show higher validity and reliabilities and are thus more useful in research and evaluation (Bandura, 1997). Bandura (1997) reported that self-efficacy includes both knowing what to do in a particular situation and having confidence that one can carry out those tasks. Two of the four scales originally developed by Bandura (1977) to assess specific types of youth self-efficacy were used in this evaluation to measure self-assertive efficacy and self-regulatory efficacy.

Neighborhood Support & Neighborhood Activities

Neighborhood support and neighborhood activities were examined using subscales from the Neighborhood Youth Inventory (Chipuer et al., 1999). The Neighborhood Youth Inventory was developed and validated on both rural and urban youth ranging from seventh through eleventh grades and thus seemed appropriate for use with our current sample. Chipuer et al. reported high reliabilities for the support subscale, ranging from .92 to .94. The authors reported acceptable reliabilities for the activities subscale, ranging from .75 to .81.

Empathy for Others

This outcome was measured using a subscale of the Teen Conflict Survey (Bosworth & Espelage, 1995). The scale has been shown to have an internal reliability coefficient of .83 (Dahlberg, Toal, & Behrens, 1998). Previous research has demonstrated a significant relationship between lack of empathy and high rates of violence and interpersonal conflict between individuals (see Barnett et al., 1997).

Presence of Caring

This outcome was assessed using the presence of caring subscale from the Individual Protective Factors Index (Phillips & Springer, 1992). The scale was developed for use in a large national survey of youth by EMT Associates (Dahlberg, et al., 1998). In an evaluation by Gabriel (1994) the scale demonstrated an internal reliability coefficient of .65.

Instrument Reliabilities

In the present evaluation, the alpha reliability coefficients indicated moderate to good internal consistency on most of the seven scales. They ranged between .70 (self-assertive efficacy) and .94 (neighborhood support). The reliability coefficients for each scale are reported below.

Pre-test Alpha coefficients (N=1257)

Measure	Number of Items	α	Sample Item
Social Self-Efficacy	8	.74	How well can you become friends with other children?
Self-Assertive Efficacy	4	.70	How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?
Self-Regulatory Efficacy	9	.86	How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?
Neighborhood Support	8	.94	People support each other in my neighborhood.
Neighborhood Activities	3 [1]	.76	There are things for kids my age to do in my neighborhood.
Empathy	5	.71	I get upset when my friends are sad.
Presence of Caring	9	.78	There are people I can count on in an emergency.

[1] One item ("people in my neighborhood can be really mean") was deleted from the scale because it was poorly correlated with the total scale (r=.08).

Internal reliability coefficients for the post-test scales are reported in Table 2. Overall, the alpha coefficients were in the moderate to good range. They ranged between .66 (Neighborhood Activities) and .95 (Neighborhood Support).

Table 2
Post-test Alpha coefficients (N=849)

Measure	Number of Items	α	Sample Item
Social Self-Efficacy	8	.74	How well can you become friends with other children?
Self-Assertive Efficacy	4	.79	How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?
Self-Regulatory Efficacy	9	.76	How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?
Neighborhood Support	8	.95	People support each other in my neighborhood.
Neighborhood Activities	3 [1]	.66	There are things for kids my age to do in my neighborhood.
Empathy	5	.72	I get upset when my friends are sad.
Presence of Caring	9	.79	There are people I can count on in an emergency.

[1] The same item ("people in my neighborhood can be really mean") was deleted from the scale because it was poorly correlated with the total scale (r=.08).

Evaluation Results

Definitions of Leadership: Interview Results

After examining data for Year 1, August 2002 through September 2003, we concluded that it was unclear how each program had defined leadership and, thus, which leadership qualities programs were hoping to instill in youth participants. Consequently, as part of the Year 2 evaluation, staff in all programs were personally contacted and asked to provide information on how their program defined leadership.

Several prominent themes emerged from these staff interviews. One of the most consistent themes, reported by 67% of respondents, was that teaching communication skills was an important dimension of leadership training. Productive communication skills were described as necessary requirements for leaders. Listening was the communication skill most often cited by programs. Other desired communications skills were offering support and encouragement to others, providing input and feedback to the program, and an openness to discussing current issues in the community.

These skills were thought to be facilitated by the modeling of leadership roles by staff members. That is, half of the participating programs believed that the staff involved with the youth should model desired leadership behaviors. For instance, respondents referred to the staff as "adult mentors" and "role models."

In addition, 67% of the contacts defined leadership in terms of one's actions and attitudes towards others. Leadership was considered the ability to influence and motivate one's peers. A youth advisory council member stated that leaders should be "accessible to other youth and interested adults." Another respondent characterized leadership in terms of making healthy choices for oneself and encouraging those choices in others. In addition, leadership was described as providing "direction and support" for one's peers.

Furthermore, 85% of these leadership programs reported that they had allowed youth opportunities to perform in real leadership roles. That is youth were offered opportunities to plan and execute various activities. For instance a respondent from a Combating Underage Drinking program reported, "Leadership is about displaying specific skills, promoting community service, reviewing grant proposals and making funding decisions." Youth Advisory Committee members generally thought that giving youth the opportunity to give valuable input to their local government would, in turn, provide youth with hands-on experience in leadership both by observing local officials and by having their voices heard in these influential settings. One Youth Advisory Committee staff member reported that youth "attend monthly meetings to discuss current issues that affect [town's] youth. Youth's presence at these meetings offer leadership skills such as good listening and providing input to [town's] staff and officials."

Participation in community activities was another related theme. Fifty percent of respondents specifically mentioned youth contributing to a specific cause or helping those who were less fortunate. Some of these causes were supporting groups such as SADD (Students Against Destroying Dreams), raising money to improve the lives of kids in Connecticut, and promoting other kinds of community service.

Less common definitions of leadership were also mentioned by a few contacts. For instance, it is interesting to note that while many of the definitions and themes previously mentioned seemed to allude to responsibility as part of leadership, only one respondent specifically used the word responsibility. Only one contact mentioned a personal commitment as part of leadership in reference to their program. Additionally, one Combating Underage Drinking representative described what was referred to as "Situational leadership." According to this respondent, necessary leadership skills vary across circumstances and thus self-knowledge and self-awareness is essential to accommodate diverse situations and maintain one's leadership role.

Overall, the responses of program staff were quite consistent with how leadership was defined in the literature reviewed on pages 4-5. Themes such as empowerment, active participation, partnership with staff and other adults who model leadership skills, and service in the community were evident.

Participants' Satisfaction with the Leadership Programs

Satisfaction with various aspects of the leadership programs was examined as one way of getting insight into how the youth experienced these particular leadership programs. Specifically, participants' retrospective reports of their experiences with and feelings about the programs were examined. Questions exploring these issues were included on the post-test survey that was administered to all participants at the end of the project year. Participants were asked to "think about what it had been like for them in the program the past year." Overall, participants reported a high degree of satisfaction with the Youth Leadership programs. The following table shows the percentage of youth who agreed with each statement.

	Percent who said Yes
Made friends in the program	91%
Felt accepted and supported	95%
Felt like I belonged	95%
Felt safe	96%
Participated in stimulating and engaging activities	91%
Staff really cared about me	93%
Felt part of a community	89%
There was a staff person who helped me solve my problems	79%

Youth Outcomes

I. Total Sample of Youth

This study was designed as an evaluation of programs that engage youth in leadership activities. As a way of evaluating these programs, indicators of developmental maturity and adjustment were explored within two samples – a sample of youth involved in leadership programs and a contrasting sample of youth who did not participate in these types of leadership programs. Specifically, the pre-test and post-test responses to the outcome surveys that were administered at the beginning and end of the project years were examined for these two contrasting groups. These analyses, involving youth between the ages of 12 and 18, were conducted using repeated measures analysis with pre-test and post-test scores as the within subjects factor and group membership (leadership, comparison) as the between subjects factor.

In addition, gender was included as a between subjects factor. Gender was included as a between subjects factor because t-test analyses revealed that males and females differed on several of the outcome measures included within the study. Specifically, females scored higher than males on the pre and post-test indicators of self-regulatory efficacy (t = 4.29; p < .001 and 3.75; p < .001, for the pre and post test contrasts, respectively),

14

empathy (t = 7.22; p < .001 and t = 4.97; p < .001), and the presence of caring (t = 3.06; p < .05 and t = 2.14; p < .05).

The repeated measures analysis with pre-test and post-test scores as the within subjects factor and group membership (leadership, comparison) and gender as the between subjects factors are summarized for each of the outcome indicators.

Social Self-Efficacy. The males engaged in leadership activities reported a statistically significant increase in their social self-efficacy over time when compared to females within the leadership group and all of the youth within the comparison group (F (1,742) = 3.91; p < .05). These findings suggest that the males within the leadership group felt over time as if they were better able to relate to and communicate effectively with others.

In addition, the tests of between subject effects indicated that the youth within the leadership group tended to score higher at both the pre and post-test intervals on reported levels of social self-efficacy when compared to the youth within the comparison group (F(1,742) = 14.1; p < .001). This suggests that the youth participating in the leadership activities perceived themselves as being more socially competent than the youth within the comparison group.

Social Self-Efficacy			
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	32.2	32.5	+ 0.3
Males	31.8	33.6	+1.8[*]
Females	32.4	32.4	0.0
Comparison Groups	31.1	31.3	+0.2
Males	31.1	31.2	+0.1
Females	31.2	31.4	+0.2

Self-Assertive Efficacy. Though the amount of change is small, post-test scores were significantly higher for both the leadership and control groups (F(1,740) = 10.1; p < .002). This finding suggests that over time youth believed that their ability to stand up for themselves increased.

Self-Assertive Efficacy			
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	22.7	23.2	+0.5
Males	22.9	23.5	+0.5
Females	22.6	23.0	+0.4
Comparison Groups	22.2	22.6	+0.4
Males	22.2	22.8	+0.6
Females	22.3	22.5	+0.2

* denotes the group that was significantly different than the other groups

15

Self-Regulatory Efficacy. The post-test scores of the leadership youth and the youth within the comparison groups were not significantly higher than their pre-test scores. That is, over time, neither the youth within the leadership groups or comparison groups reported increases in their self-regulatory efficacy.

It is interesting to note that the self-regulatory efficacy scores of the youth within the leadership group were statistically significantly higher, at both the pre-test and post-test intervals, than the youth within the control group ($F(1,729) = 23.09$; $p < .001$). Furthermore, it is interesting to note that there was a statistically significant group x gender interaction ($F(1,729) = 9.36$; $p < .002$). The pattern of mean scores, as summarized in the table below, suggest that the males, in particular, within the leadership group reported higher levels of self-regulatory efficacy when compared to the males within the comparison group.

Self-Regulatory Efficacy

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	56.7	56.8	+ 0.1
Males	57.1	55.7	- 1.4
Females	56.6	56.1	- 0.5
Comparison Groups	53.6	54.1	+0.5
Males	52.2	52.3	+0.1
Females	54.7	55.5	+0.8

Neighborhood Support. Youth engaged in leadership activities reported a significant increase in the level of support they experienced in their neighborhoods compared to youth in the comparison groups who reported essentially no change ($F (1,738)= 4.28$; $p < .03$). That is, youth in leadership programs reported positive changes in support, help, protection, and people working together in their neighborhoods. It is of interest to note that this increase in the perception of support occurred mostly for the males in the leadership group.

In addition, the tests of between subject effects indicated that the youth within the leadership group tended to score higher at both the pre and post-test intervals on reported levels of neighborhood support when compared to the youth within the comparison group ($F(1,742) = 11.3$; $p < .001$). This suggests that the youth participating in leadership programs consistently experienced higher levels of neighborhood support than the youth comprising the comparison group.

Neighborhood Support

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	24.1	25.4	+ 1.3*
Males	22.9	24.9	+2.0
Females	24.8	25.6	+0.8
Comparison Groups	22.6	22.9	+0.3
Males	23.3	23.3	+0.0
Females	22.1	22.5	+0.4

Neighborhood Activities. The post-test scores of the leadership youth and the youth within the comparison groups were not significantly higher than their pre-test scores. That is, over time neither the youth within the leadership or control groups reported increases in their perception of neighborhood activities.

Consistent with the general trend of the findings reported previously, however, it is interesting to note that the youth participating in leadership activities reported a higher level of neighborhood activities than the youth within the control group, at both the pre-test and post-test intervals ($F(1,749) = 4.54$; $p < .03$). That is, the leadership and control groups differed from the outset of the program in their perception of available neighborhood activities and these differences remained constant over time.

Neighborhood Activities

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	8.1	8.4	+ 0.3
Males	8.4	8.8	+ 0.4
Females	7.9	8.2	+0.3
Comparison Groups	7.7	7.8	+0.1
Males	8.1	7.9	-0.2
Females	7.4	7.8	+0.4

Empathy. The post-test scores of the leadership youth and the youth within the comparison groups were not significantly higher than their pre-test scores. That is, over time neither the youth within the leadership or control groups reported increases in their reported levels of empathy.

Consistent with the general trend of the findings reported previously, tests for differences between the youth in the leadership and comparison groups revealed that the youth participating in leadership activities reported higher levels of empathy than the youth within the control group, at both the pre-test and post-test intervals ($F(1,749) = 19.8$; $p <$

.001). That is, the leadership and control groups differed from the outset of the program in their perceived capacity to be empathic to others.

Furthermore, the pattern of mean scores indicated that the females within the sample scored consistently higher than the males in their reported levels of empathy $(F(1,749) = 50.9; p < .001)$.

Empathy

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	17.7	17.9	+ 0.2
Males	16.6	17.0	+0.4
Females	18.5	18.3	- 0.2
Comparison Groups	16.6	16.8	+0.2
Males	15.7	15.9	+0.2
Females	17.3	17.5	+0.2

Presence of Caring. The post-test scores of the leadership youth and the youth within the comparison groups were not statistically higher than their pre-test scores. That is, over time, neither the youth within the leadership or control groups reported increases in the presence of caring adults in their lives.

Consistent with the general trend of the findings reported previously, tests for differences between the youth in the leadership and comparison groups revealed that the youth participating in leadership activities reported higher presence of caring scores when compared to the youth within the control group, at both the pre-test and post-test intervals $(F(1,735) = 5.3; p < .02)$. That is, the leadership and control groups differed from the outset of the program in their perception of supportive connections to others.

Furthermore, the pattern of mean scores suggested that the females within the sample consistently reported higher presence of caring scores when compared to the males within the sample $(F(1,735) = 11.7; p < .001)$.

Presence of Caring

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	21.3	21.3	+ 0.0
Males	20.9	20.6	- 0.3
Females	21.6	21.7	+0.1
Comparison Groups	20.6	20.8	+0.2
Males	20.3	20.5	+0.2
Females	20.9	21.0	+0.1

Summary. The results indicated that youth who participated in leadership activities reported significant improvements in two areas compared to youth who comprised the comparison group. Youth engaged in leadership programs reported greater neighborhood support than other youth. In addition, males in leadership programs reported improvements in their social self-efficacy compared to other youth. The other consistent finding was that youth who were involved in leadership activities appeared to exhibit a higher level of personal and social adjustment overall compared to youth in the comparison groups. This is discussed further below.

II. High and Low Functioning Youth

The analyses to this point highlight a consistent difference between the youth participating in leadership programs and the youth making up the control group. Specifically, the youth participating in the leadership programs consistently scored higher than the youth within the comparison groups on the youth outcome measures. In point of fact, only on the measure of self-assertive efficacy were the leadership and control group scores comparable. On all of the other outcome indicators used within this study, the youth within the leadership programs scored higher, at both the pre and post-test time intervals, than the youth within the control groups.

This pattern of results suggests the possibility that the youth who participate in youth leadership programs are (1) self-selected, (2) highly motivated, and (3) more developmentally adjusted than their peers. That is, the youth who are involved in the leadership programs, for the most part, begin their involvement with the programs possessing relatively high levels of developmental skills and assets. As such, these individuals are not likely to change much over the course of the program year because they start out at relatively high levels of functioning.

We, thus, decided to explore the possibility that the youth who are most likely to show changes as a result of participating in such leadership programs may be those who are less skilled or competent prior to beginning the program. In order to accomplish this objective, a second level of analyses was conducted. These analyses involved splitting the total sample of youth who were involved in leadership programs and comparison groups each into two groups. The split groups were derived by computing the grand mean among all pre-test measures used in the outcome evaluation and dividing the total sample into thirds using this statistic. Youth whose grand mean scores fell within the top and bottom thirds of the sampling distribution were retained for further analysis. This method produced two separate groups of youth in leadership programs and two separate groups of youth in the comparison groups. The high functioning groups included individuals who reported the highest level of functioning on youth development measures prior to beginning the program year (N = 456). The low functioning groups included those youth who reported the lowest level of functioning on the youth development measures on the pre-test (N = 464).

This analysis examined whether participants in four categories reported changes between their pre-test survey scores and their post-test survey scores. The categories were high-

and low-functioning youth engaged in leadership activities and high- and low-functioning youth included in the comparison groups. The analysis was conducted using repeated measures analysis with pre-test and post-test scores as the within subjects factor and group membership (leadership, comparison) and functioning (high, low) as the two between subjects factors. Our expectations in doing these analyses were that (1) participants in leadership groups would report greater changes than participants in the comparison group and (2) low-functioning youth in the leadership groups would show the greatest level of change following participation in the program.

Social Self-Efficacy. When high and low functioning participants were considered in analyzing pre-test and post-test changes, a significant 3-way interaction between level of functioning (high, low), group (leadership, comparison), and time was found for reported levels of social self-efficacy (F (1,535)= 5.13; p<.02). Low functioning participants in leadership programs showed significantly more positive change than did higher functioning youth in the youth leadership programs. As shown in the table below, the positive rate of change in the lower functioning group of youth leadership participants was also significantly better than the rates of change in either of the two comparison subgroups (high and low functioning). In other words, youth who began the youth leadership project year at a lower level of functioning on general indicators of positive youth development reported feeling more comfortable in social settings.

This finding supported the initial evaluation question by finding a positive change for a subgroup of youth engaged in youth leadership activities over and above that shown for youth in the comparison group. The results also supported the secondary evaluation question by finding greater change among a subgroup of youth who began the project at a lower level of functioning.

	Social Self-Efficacy		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	28.5	31.1	+2.6*
High Functioning	34.0	34.1	+0.1
Comparison			
Low Functioning	29.5	29.5	+0.0
High Functioning	34.1	33.1	- 1.0

Self-Assertive Efficacy. Consistent with the findings for social self-efficacy, when high and low functioning participants were considered in analyzing pre-test and post-test changes, a significant 3-way interaction was found for on reported levels of self-assertive efficacy (F (1,528)= 8.7; p<.001). Low functioning participants in leadership programs showed significantly more positive change than did higher functioning youth in the youth leadership programs. As shown in the table below, the positive rate of change in the lower functioning group of youth leadership participants was also significantly better than the rates of change in either of the two comparison subgroups (high and low functioning). That is, the youth who began the youth leadership project year at a lower level of functioning on general indicators of positive youth development reported feeling

more able to stand up for themselves. Interestingly, slight decreases in self-assertive efficacy were noted for the high functioning group, particularly those within the comparison group.

Self-Assertive Efficacy

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	20.5	21.9	+1.4*
High Functioning	24.7	24.5	-0.2
Comparison			
Low Functioning	20.3	21.3	+1.0
High Functioning	24.2	23.4	- 0.8

Self-Regulatory Efficacy. For the results with regard to self-regulatory efficacy, one significant two-way interaction indicated that low functioning participants (regardless of membership in a leadership or comparison group) reported significantly greater change than high functioning participants (regardless of membership in a leadership or comparison group) $(F(1,524)= 28.4; p< .001)$. As shown in the table below, both low functioning groups reported increases in self-regulatory efficacy while both high functioning groups reported decreases. And though the result did not achieve statistical significance, it is interesting to note that the largest increase from pre-test to post-test occurred for the youth in the leadership programs.

Self-Regulatory Efficacy

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	50.5	53.0	+2.5
High Functioning	60.1	57.8	-2.3
Comparison			
Low Functioning	47.0	49.0	+2.0
High Functioning	58.8	57.6	- 1.2

Neighborhood Support. A significant result also was found for the neighborhood support measure. Two significant two-way interactions indicated: (1) low functioning participants (regardless of membership in a leadership or comparison group) reported significantly greater change than high functioning participants (regardless of membership in a leadership or comparison group) $(F(1,532)= 38.4; p< .001)$, and (2) participants in leadership programs overall showed significantly more positive change that did youth engaged in comparison group activities $(F(1,532)= 5.5; p< .05)$.

As shown in the table below, both low functioning groups reported increases in neighborhood support while both high functioning groups reported decreases. However, it is interesting to note that the members of the leadership/low functioning group report the highest rate of change over time. Furthermore, members of the leadership groups (both high and low functioning) reported a higher rate of change than did the members of

the comparison groups (both high and low) – even taking into account the fact that the high functioning leadership youth report slightly lower levels of neighborhood support over time.

This result supported the initial evaluation question by finding a positive change among youth in the leadership group compared to youth in the comparison group. The findings also supported the secondary evaluation question that youth who started the project at a lower level of functioning would report more improvement than youth who started the project at a higher level of functioning.

	Neighborhood Support		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	18.5	21.7	+3.2
High Functioning	28.5	27.9	-0.6
Comparison			
Low Functioning	18.2	20.2	+2.0
High Functioning	29.2	26.7	- 2.5

Neighborhood Activities. A significant 3-way interaction was found for reported levels of neighborhood activities (F (1,535)= 3.97; p<.05). As shown in the table below, the positive rate of change in the lower functioning group of youth leadership participants was significantly better than the rates of change in the high functioning youth in the leadership groups and the rates of change in either of the two comparison subgroups (high and low functioning).

	Neighborhood Activities		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	6.5	7.7	+1.2*
High Functioning	9.0	9.3	+0.3
Comparison			
Low Functioning	6.4	7.2	+0.8
High Functioning	9.7	9.0	- 0.7

Empathy. The results for empathy indicated the presence of one significant 2-way interaction. Specifically, low functioning participants (regardless of membership in a leadership or comparison group) reported significantly greater change than high functioning participants (regardless of membership in a leadership or comparison group) in reported levels of empathy (F(1,533)= 10.6; p< .001). As shown in the table below, both low functioning groups reported increases in empathy while both high functioning groups reported decreases.

	Empathy		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	15.9	16.3	+0.4
High Functioning	19.0	18.8	-0.2
Comparison			
Low Functioning	14.9	15.7	+0.8
High Functioning	18.3	17.8	-0.5

Presence of Caring. When high and low functioning participants were considered in analyzing pre-test and post-test changes, a significant 3-way interaction was found for the presence of caring ($F (1,528) = 8.2$; $p < .05$). Low functioning participants in leadership programs showed significantly more positive change than did higher functioning youth in the youth leadership programs. As shown in the table below, the positive rate of change in the lower functioning group of youth leadership participants was also significantly better than the rates of change in either of the two comparison subgroups (high and low functioning).

In other words, youth who began the youth leadership project year at a lower level of functioning on general indicators of positive youth development reported feeling that there were now more trustworthy people in their lives outside of home and school. They could depend upon these people for help, guidance, advice, and support. In this regard, it is important to note that positive relationships with supportive adults have consistently been shown in previous research to be associated with improved social and emotional development (Catalano, et al., 2002; Larson, 2000; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2003; McLaughlin, 2000).

	Presence of Caring		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership			
Low Functioning	19.2	21.4	+2.2*
High Functioning	22.4	22.3	-0.1
Comparison			
Low Functioning	19.4	19.7	+0.3
High Functioning	22.2	21.9	-0.3

Summary. The most significant gains among youth were among those who started the project year at a lower overall level of personal and social development as defined by their overall score relative to the population grand mean. Low functioning participants in leadership programs showed significantly more positive changes in social self-efficacy, self-assertive efficacy, neighborhood activities, and the presence of caring from adults in their lives than did higher functioning youth in leadership programs. The positive rates of change in the lower functioning group of youth leadership participants were also significantly better than the rates of change in either of the two comparison subgroups (high and low functioning). Youth in the low functioning subgroup also showed greater

improvements in their scores on self-regulatory efficacy, neighborhood support, and empathy towards others. However these changes were not specific to youth involved in leadership activities. Rather, they occurred for all youth in the low-functioning group regardless of whether they were involved in leadership or a comparison group.

III. Outcomes for Youth Involved in Different Program Types

 The third level of analysis involved looking separately at the different types of programs involved in the evaluation. For instance, all youth who participated in combating underage drinking programs were examined together in a separate analysis. The same was done with all youth who participated in Title V: Delinquency Prevention Programs and the Youth Advisory Committees. Youth involved in Juvenile Review Boards were not analyzed as a separate group due to the small number of participants who provided complete data. The number of youth participants included in the analysis for each program type is listed below.

	Leadership	Comparison
Combating Underage Drinking	237	297
Juvenile Review Boards	34	31
Title V: Delinquency Prevention	242	337
Youth Advisory Committees	73	82

In each of these analyses, participants who were involved in youth leadership projects were contrasted with youth who completed the comparison surveys in the same communities. Specifically, these analyses were conducted using repeated measures analysis with pre-test and post-test scores as the within subjects factor and group membership (leadership, comparison) as the between subjects factor. In addition, gender was included as a between subjects factor. **For each of these programs only statistically significant results for the outcomes employed in the study are reported.**

Combating Underage Drinking

Before reporting on the results of the pre/post-test analyses, it is important to note that the youth participating in the Combating Underage Drinking Programs scored significantly higher than the comparison group on all of the youth outcome measures with the exception of the Self- Assertive Efficacy scale. That is, only on the measure of self-assertive efficacy were the leadership and control group scores comparable. This pattern of results supports the notion that the youth involved in the Combating Underage Drinking Programs are a select group of youth who enter the programs with advanced abilities or are referred by others who believe them to have obvious talents and abilities.

With respect to the repeated measures analyses, significant findings occurred for only two of the outcome measures – namely, Neighborhood Activities and Empathy. These results are summarized below:

Neighborhood Activities. A significant 3-way interaction (for Time, Group, and Gender, $F(1,254) = 4.57$; $p < .05$) was found when the Combating Underage Drinking youth were contrasted with the youth within the comparison group. The pattern of mean scores summarized in the table below are interesting in that they suggest that the greatest change in the positive perception of neighborhoods occurs among the males within the underage drinking programs.

| | **Neighborhood Activities** | | |
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	8.1	8.6	+ 0.5
Males	7.6	8.7	+ 1.1*
Females	8.5	8.5	+0.0
Comparison Groups	6.9	7.0	+0.1
Males	7.3	6.7	-0.6
Females	6.6	7.2	+0.6

Empathy. A significant 3-way interaction (Time, Group, Gender; $F(1, 254) = 3.96$; $p < .05$) was found for the analysis conducted on the empathy scale. The pattern of mean scores depicted in the table below suggest that over time males within the leadership groups increased their self-reported empathy more than youth in any other subgroup.

| | **Empathy** | | |
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	17.7	18.6	+ 0.9
Males	16.6	18.1	+1.5*
Females	18.7	19.0	+ 0.3
Comparison Groups	17.3	17.6	+0.3
Males	16.4	16.8	+0.4
Females	18.2	18.5	+0.3

Summary. Youth engaged in leadership activities as part of combating underage drinking programs reported increases in their positive perceptions of activities in their their neighborhoods and in their ability to respond empathically to others. The data suggested that males are most positively impacted by the leadership activities occurring within underage drinking programs.

Title V: Delinquency Prevention Programs

With respect to the Delinquency Prevention Programs, the distinctions between those youth participating in the leadership activities and those within the control groups are not as pronounced as was the case with the youth in the Combating Underage Drinking Programs, though they are still noteworthy. Specifically, youth in the Delinquency

Prevention Programs scored higher than those in the control groups on the measures of social self-efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy, and empathy.

With respect to the repeated measures analyses, statistically significant findings occurred for only two of the outcome measures – namely, Self-Assertive Efficacy and Neighborhood Support. These results are summarized below:

Self-Assertive Efficacy. Though the amount of change is small, post-test scores were significantly higher for both the leadership and control groups ($F(1,345) = 9.5$; $p < .002$). This finding suggests that over time, all youth, whether or not they participated in a delinquency prevention program, believed that their ability to stand up for themselves increased.

	Self-Assertive Efficacy		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	22.6	23.2	+ 0.7
Males	22.7	23.4	+0.7
Females	22.5	23.1	+0.6
Comparison Groups	22.0	22.6	+0.6
Males	21.8	22.9	+1.1
Females	22.2	22.4	+0.2

Neighborhood Support. A significant 2-way interaction was found for time and gender on the neighborhood support scale ($F(1, 344) = 4.0$, $p < .05$). All males, whether they participated in a delinquency prevention program or a comparison group, reported significantly greater increases in the level of support they experienced in their neighborhoods at the end of the project year than did females. That is, males were more likely to report positive changes in support, help, protection, and people working together in their neighborhoods.

	Neighborhood Support		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	23.2	24.3	+ 1.1
Males	21.9	24.1	+2.2
Females	24.5	24.5	+0.0
Comparison Groups	22.9	22.8	+0.1
Males	22.8	23.9	+1.1
Females	23.1	22.0	- 1.1

Summary. The results for Title V: Delinquency Prevention Programs highlighted two positive changes for program participants following the project year. Changes were found in self-assertive efficacy (males and females) and perceptions of neighborhood support (males only). However, these same changes were reported by youth in the comparison groups as well, indicating that the changes were not necessarily related to participation in

the delinquency prevention programs. At the same time, youth engaged in leadership activities began with, and maintained, higher levels of skills in social self-efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy, and empathy for others, again suggesting the selective nature of youth who participate in these leadership programs.

Youth Advisory Committees

It is interesting to note, before reporting on the specifics of the results of the repeated measures analyses of variance, that no differences were found on any of the outcome measures used in the study between those youth participating in the leadership activities and those within the control groups. This finding is in stark contrast to the findings with respect to youth in the Combating Underage Drinking Programs and Delinquency Prevention Programs who generally began their program years with higher self-reported levels of personal and social competencies.

With respect to the repeated measures analyses, statistically significant findings occurred for three outcome measures – Self-Assertive Efficacy, Neighborhood Support, and Empathy. These results are summarized below:

Self-Assertive Efficacy. A significant 2-way interaction was found for time and gender on the self-assertive efficacy scale (F(1, 106) = 3.89, p < .05). In particular, over time, the differences between the males' and females' self-assertive efficacy scores became more pronounced, both within the Youth Advisory Committees and control group. Interestingly enough, males reported higher levels of self-assertive efficacy over time while females reported a slight decline.

	Self-Assertive Efficacy		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	22.9	22.9	+ 0.0
Males	23.1	23.6	+0.5
Females	22.7	22.2	- 0.5
Comparison Groups	22.6	22.8	+0.2
Males	22.6	23.7	+0.7
Females	22.6	22.1	-0.5

Neighborhood Support. A significant main effect was noted for time on the neighborhood support measure (F (1,104) = 5.48; p < .02). That is, both the youth within the control groups and the Youth Advisory Committees reported over time positive changes in support, help, protection, and people working together in their neighborhoods.

	Neighborhood Support		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	23.4	25.6	+ 2.2
Males	23.2	26.1	+2.9
Females	23.6	25.1	+1.5
Comparison Groups	23.0	24.0	+1.0
Males	25.5	25.1	-0.4
Females	20.5	22.9	+2.4

Empathy. A significant 2-way interaction for Group by Time ($F(1, 106) = 3.89$; $p < .05$) was found for the analysis conducted on the empathy scale. The pattern of mean scores depicted in the table below suggest that over time, youth in leadership programs consistently scored higher than the youth in the comparison group on reported levels of empathy.

	Empathy		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Amt of Change
Leadership Groups	17.3	18.3	+ 1.0
Males	16.6	18.2	+1.6
Females	18.0	18.4	+0.4
Comparison Groups	16.8	17.1	+0.3
Males	16.6	16.7	+0.1
Females	17.0	17.5	+0.5

Summary. Youth engaged in leadership activities as part of a Youth Advisory Committee did not show wide-spread positive changes in their outcome scores when compared to the youth in the comparison group. The one exception was in the capacity to be empathic with others where the leadership youth reported significantly more change in contrast to those in the comparison group. Youth on the Youth Advisory Committees and youth in the comparison groups all showed positive changes over time in their perceptions of neighborhood supports.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from this evaluation of youth leadership programs.

Youth generally found involvement in youth leadership programs to be very rewarding. When asked to retrospectively report on their year in the program, a large majority felt safe, involved, supported by the staff and stimulated by the activities.

In general, youth who engaged in youth leadership training were more likely than those who were not to feel an improved sense of support from their local communities. That is,

youth involved in leadership programs viewed their neighborhoods as offering more support, help, and protection, and they saw people working more closely together. This is an important finding because many researchers have pointed out that a connection to the community as opposed to a sense of detachment and alienation is an important protective factor and predictor of positive adjustment and pro-social behavior (Coie, 1996; Hawkins, Herrenkohl, Farrington, Brewer, Catalano, & Harachi, 1999; Catalano, et al., 2002).

Leadership training also appeared to offer an added benefit to males. Males who participated in leadership activities reported significant improvements in their social self-efficacy when compared to other subgroups of youth (females in leadership, all youth in comparison groups). Social self-efficacy refers to a belief in one's capacities to organize and execute the actions needed to manage interpersonal and social situations (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura (1997), individuals' assessments of their social self-efficacy are based upon the acquisition of specific skills or skill sets. It appears that leadership involvement may have enabled adolescent males to acquire these important skills.

Another important finding was that youth who participated in the leadership programs appeared to be a uniquely talented group of individuals. They scored higher initially on a variety of youth outcome measures when compared to youth who participated in the comparison group. We are not able to comment on how youth were actually recruited into these leadership programs, but it is likely that it is a combination of youth being referred by adults who see some leadership qualities in them and self-selection. In the latter case, youth who are intelligent, highly motivated, and interpersonally skilled are likely to choose to participate in leadership training programs and activities.

However, the data also suggest several other factors that programs may wish to consider when recruiting youth participants into leadership programs. Despite the generally high level of functioning of participants overall, there was a subgroup of youth engaged in leadership activities that was less socially and emotionally skilled. It was this subgroup that was most likely to report positive changes over the evaluation period. Those who started the year at a lower level of overall functioning on a general index of youth development were most likely to report significant improvements on such outcomes as social self-efficacy, self-assertive efficacy, neighborhood activities, and the presence of caring from adults in their lives. Most programs that target positive youth development are universal in nature. That is, they are open to all youth in a given community who express an interest. However, programs may want to focus their recruiting efforts not only on those who have obvious talents, but also on those who may appear less suited for leadership training because they may be the ones who can benefit the most from it.

Separate analyses of the different types of programs involved in the youth leadership evaluation showed some differences across the different program types. Involvement in leadership activities as part of a combating underage drinking program showed the most significant results. Youth in these leadership programs reported more positive changes in their involvement in neighborhood activities and in their ability to respond empathically

to others than did members of the comparison groups. Youth engaged in leadership activities as part of a Youth Advisory Committee showed one significant change when contrasted with the comparison groups. They reported a more significant increase in their capacity to empathize with others. Finally, youth involved in leadership programs in Title V: Delinquency Prevention programs did not show any superior improvements when contrasted with youth in the comparison groups. Although these leadership youth reported increases in the self-assertive efficacy (males and females) and perceptions of neighborhood support (males only), these same changes were reported by youth in the comparison groups. Thus, it is not possible to attribute these changes among the leadership youth to the delinquency prevention program.

One additional theme from these findings is worth noting. Combating Underage Drinking and Title V: Delinquency Prevention programs were the ones that consistently engaged youth who were at the high end of functioning on general indicators of youth development at the beginning of the project. Participants in these types of leadership programs reported significantly higher scores than those in their comparison groups on such measures as self-regulatory efficacy, neighborhood support, neighborhood activities (Combating Underage Drinking), social self-efficacy, and empathy for others (Title V). The same trend was not evident in Youth Advisory Committees programs. Thus, there appears to be discernible differences in the recruiting practices among the different types of leadership programs.

Finally, the evaluation results also point to several recommendations to be taken into account in future evaluations. One recommendation is to focus carefully on how programs define youth leadership and to collect additional process data as to what activities are offered in different programs that are considered to be youth leadership training. It was reassuring to find that a majority of programs in the present evaluation shared many of the same basic assumptions about what constitutes leadership skills training. However, it remains unclear to what extent programs offered a uniform set of training procedures and activities to promote youth leadership.

A second recommendation is to more effectively assess the kinds of activities youth in the comparison groups were involved in. That is, were youth who completed the comparison group surveys participating in no other, qualitatively different, or similar youth development programs and activities than youth in the leadership programs? This is an especially important concern because other researchers have suggested that it is the engagement in challenging and stimulating activities that lead to the development of important life skills (Catalano et al., 2002, Eccles, Stone, & Hunt, 2003; Larson, 2000; Walker et al., 2005). Without knowing more specifically the kinds of activities youth in the comparison groups were engaged in, we cannot separate the effects of leadership training from the effects of being engaged in challenging and stimulating activities. If members of the comparison groups were engaged in stimulating activities, this might explain why these youth also reported positive changes on some of the outcome measures.

A third recommendation would be to assess how youth are recruited into youth leadership programs. Does staff look for specific qualities in potential participants? Why do youth choose to participate in leadership programs? Do they see themselves as having some unique abilities in terms of leadership?

A final recommendation would be to assess program dosage. Evaluation researchers have often pointed to frequency and length of participation as a potentially important consideration in maximizing positive developmental changes for youth (Anderson & Sabatelli, 2003; Scheirer, 1994). The present evaluation included an item on the post-test survey that asked youth to say how long they had been involved in the program. Although length of time in the program, as measured by this item, was not a significant factor in explaining who profited from participation in youth leadership training, future evaluations might benefit from a more extensive assessment of this variable. This last point highlights the importance of systematically collecting accurate attendance data.

References

Anderson, S.A. & Sabatelli, R.M. (2003). *Process Evaluation: An Overview*. Unpublished paper. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut, School of Family Studies, Center for Applied Research.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A., Pastorelli, C., Barbaranelli, C., & Caprara, G. (1999). Self-efficacy pathways to childhood depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 258-269.

Bandura, A. (2001*). Guide For Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales.* Stanford University. (Unpublished).

Barnett, O., Miller-Perrin, C., & Perrin, R. (1997). *Family violence across the lifespan.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bosworth, K. & Espelage D. (1995). *Teen Conflict Survey*. Center for Adolescent Studies, Indiana University. (Unpublished).

Boyd, B. L. (2001). Bringing leadership experiences to inner-city youth. *Journal of Extension*, 39, 4. 1-5.

Catalano, R.F., Berglund, J.A., Ryan, H.S., Lonczak, & Hawkins, J.D. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention and Treatment*, 5, 15, 1-1006

Chipuer, H. M., et al. (1999). The neighborhood youth inventory: Development and validation. *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology, 9,* 355-368.

Coie, J.D. (1996). Prevention of violence and antisocial behavior. In R. Peters & R. McMahon (Eds.), *Preventing childhood disorders, substance abuse, and delinquency*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dahlberg, L.L., Toal, S.B., & Behrens, C.B. (1998). *Measuring violence-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors: A compendium of assessment tools*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Eccles, J., & Gootman, J.A. (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

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

Hawkins, J.D., Arthur, M.W., & Olsen, J.J. (1998). Community Interventions to reduce risks and enhance protection against antisocial behavior. In D.W. Stoff, J. Breiling, & J.D. Masers (Eds.), *Handbook of antisocial behaviors* (pp 365-374). Seattle, WA: NIMH / John Wiley & Sons.

Hawkins, J.D., Herrenkohl, T., Farrington, D.P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R.F., & Harachi, T.W. (1999). A review of predictors of youth violence. In R. Loeber & D. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*

Larson, R.W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist*, 55, 170-183.

Lipsey, M.W., & Derzon, J.H. (1999). Predictors of violent or serious delinquency in adolescence and early adulthood: A synthesis of longitudinal research. In R. Loeber & D. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCauley, C.D. & Van Velsor, E. (2003). *The Center for Creative Leadership Handbook of Leadership Development, 2nd Edition*. New Jersey: Jossey-Bass.

McLaughlin, M. (2000). *Community counts. How youth organizations matter for youth development*. Washington, DC: Public Education Network.

Muris, Peter. (2001). A brief questionnaire for measuring self-efficacy in youth. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 23(3)*, 145 – 149

Northhouse, P.G. (1997), *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Phillips, J. & Springer, F. (1992). *Extended national youth sports program 1991-1992 evaluation highlights, part 2: Individual Protective Factors Index (IPFI) and the risk assessment study.* EMT Associates: Sacramento, CA. (Unpublished).

Roth, J., Brooks-Gunn, J., Murray, L., & Foster, W. (1998). Promoting healthy adolescents: A synthesis of youth development program evaluations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8, 423-459

Sabatelli, R., Anderson, S., & LaMotte, V. (2001). Assessing outcomes in youth programs: A practical handbook. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut, School of Family Studies, Center for Applied Research. http://www.opm.state.ct.us/pdpd1/grants/jjac/handbook.pdf

Sandmann, L.R., & Vendenberg, L. (1995). A framework for 21st century leadership. *Journal of Extension*, 33, 6, 1-9.

Scheirer, M.A. (1994). Designing and using process evaluation. In J.S. Wholey, H.P. Hatry, & K.E. Newcomer (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (pp. 40-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Walker, J., Marczak, M. Blyth**,** D., & Borden, L. (2005). Designing youth development programs: Toward a theory of developmental intentionality (pp. 399-418). In J.L. Mahoney, R.W. Larson, & J.S. Eccles (Eds.), *Organized activities as contexts of development.* Majwah. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

YOUTH LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE - posttest 2004

Please carefully read and fill out the following questionnaire. The reason for this survey is to improve youth programs in the state. Your honest answers are important. Thanks.

The first thing we ask for you to complete is an identification number. This ID is important because it enables us to track whether or not your feelings about the center change over time. There are two boxes for your initials, the month, the day, and the year of your birth. For example, if your name is Jane Smith and you were born on July 5, 1989, your id would be JS070589 and you would fill in the boxes as illustrated:

	First and Last Initials	Birth Month	Birth Day	Birth Year
Example:	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐

Please fill in the boxes below with your ID. Note that there are two boxes for the month, day and year. Also, note that if your day or month is a single digit like 5 or 2, just put a zero as shown in the example. **If you are not sure how to fill in the boxes, ask the person giving out this survey to help you.**

	First and Last Initials	Birth Month	Birth Day	Birth Year
Your ID:	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐	☐ ☐

Today's date _____

In what town do you live?
_____

Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

Year of Birth: 19_____

How long have you been involved in this program?
Check the answer that is closest.

_____ 3 months	_____ 1 year
_____ 6 months	_____ 2 years
_____ 9 months	_____ More than 2 years

Grade in school:

_____ K	_____ 4	_____ 8	_____ 12
_____ 1	_____ 5	_____ 9	_____ College
_____ 2	_____ 6	_____ 10	_____ Not in school or college
_____ 3	_____ 7	_____ 11	

What are your average grades in school:

_____ A (90-100%) or (3.3 to 4.0 grade point average)
_____ B (80-89%) or (2.3 to 3.2 grade point average)
_____ C (70-79%) or (1.3 to 2.2 grade point average)
_____ D (60-69%) or (.3 to 1.2 grade point average)
_____ F (0-59%) or (0 to .2 grade point average)
_____ Not in school

Race / Ethnicity: Check the one that best applies:

_____ White (not Hispanic / Latin)
_____ Black (not Hispanic / Latin)
_____ Hispanic / Latin
_____ Asian
_____ American Indian
_____ Other

YOUR FAMILY:
Family Status: Check the line that best describes the adults living in your house right now.

_____ Mother and Father	_____ Foster Parents
_____ Mother only	_____ Mother and Stepfather
_____ Father only	_____ Father and Stepmother
_____ Other relatives	_____ Other: unrelated (Please describe) _____

For the following questions, circle the answer that best describes you.

1. How well can you express your opinions when other classmates disagree with you?

     1   2   3   4   5

Not at all   Very well

2. How well can you become friends with other children?

     1   2   3   4   5

Not at all   Very well

3. How well can you have a chat with an unfamiliar person?

     1   2   3   4   5

Not at all   Very well

4. How well can you work in harmony with your classmates?

     1   2   3   4   5

Not at all   Very well

5. How well can you tell other children that they are doing something that you don't like?

     1   2   3   4   5

Not at all   Very well

6. How well can you tell a funny event to a group of children?

     1   2   3   4   5

Not at all   Very well

7. How well do you succeed in staying friends with other children?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

8. How well do you succeed in preventing quarrels with other children?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

9. How well can you express your opinions when other classmates disagree with you?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

10. How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

11. How well can you deal with situations where others are annoying you or hurting your feelings?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

12. How well can you stand firm to someone who is asking you to do something unreasonable or inconvenient?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

13. How well can you resist peer pressure to do things in school that can get you into trouble?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

14. How well can you stop yourself from skipping school when you feel bored or upset?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

15. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke cigarettes?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

16. How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

17. How well can you resist peer pressure to smoke marijuana?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

18. How well can you resist peer pressure to use pills (uppers, downers)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

19. How well can you resist peer pressure to use crack?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

20. How well can you resist peer pressure to have sexual intercourse?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

21. How well can you control your temper?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not well at all		Not too well		Pretty well		Very Well

22. Everybody is willing to help each other in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

23. People are there for each other in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

24. People support each other in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

25. People in my neighborhood work together to get things done.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

26. We look out for each other in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

27. If I needed help, I could go to anyone in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

28. People in my neighborhood pitch in to help each other.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

29. I feel okay asking for help from my neighbors.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

30. There is a place for kids my age to hang out in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

31. There are things for kids my age to do in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

32. There is not much to do in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

33. People in my neighborhood can be really mean.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

34. I can listen to others.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

35. Kids I don't like can have good ideas.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

36. I get upset when my friends are sad.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

37. I trust people who are not my friends.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

38. I am sensitive to other people's feelings, even if they are not my
    friends.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

These questions are about **adults** you know— not your same-age
friends or peers.   Please circle "YES!" if the statement is very
true for you; "yes" if it is somewhat true; "no" if it is somewhat
false; and "NO!" if it is very false.

Outside of my Home and School ………………….

39. There are people I can depend on to help me if I really need it.

        YES!   yes   no   NO!

40. There is an adult I can turn to for guidance in times of stress.

        YES!   yes   no   NO!

41. If something went wrong, no one would come to my assistance.

        YES!   yes   no   NO!

42. There is an adult I could talk to about important decisions in my life.

        YES!   yes   no   NO!

43. There is a trustworthy adult I could turn to for advice if I were having problems.

        YES!   yes   no   NO!

44. There is someone I can depend on for help if I really need it.

       YES!   yes   no   NO!

45. There is an adult I can feel comfortable talking about my problems with.

       YES!   yes   no   NO!

46. There are people I can count on in an emergency.

       YES!   yes   no   NO!

47. There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.

       YES!   yes   no   NO!

The following questions ask you about your attitudes towards drinking alcohol. We would like you to place an "X" on each line in the spot that most closely reflects how you feel about drinking alcohol. For example, if you think drinking alcohol in the next month would be more "bad" than "good," you would place an "X" on the line that represents your opinion. Do this for each of the pairs of the words.

48.   My drinking alcohol in the next month would be…

Good   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Bad

Healthy   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unhealthy

Pleasant   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unpleasant

Wise   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Foolish

Beneficial   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Harmful

49. Drinking only one or two drinks at a party would be…

Good ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Bad

Beneficial ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Harmful

Pleasant ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unpleasant

50. Drinking six or more drinks at a party would be…

Good ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Bad

Beneficial ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Harmful

Pleasant ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unpleasant

These last questions ask you to think about what it has been like for you in the program this last year. People circle your answer to each question.

51. Did you make friends in the program?   Yes   No

52. Did you feel accepted and supported in the program?   Yes   No

53. Did you feel like you belonged?   Yes   No

54. Did you feel safe in the program?   Yes   No

55. Were you involved in stimulating and engaging activities?   Yes   No

56. Did you feel like the teachers/staff really cared about you? Yes   No

57. Did you feel like part of a community?   Yes   No

58. Was there a staff person who helped you solve   Yes   No
     your problems?

59. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the program?

Completely   Completely
Satisfied   Dissatisfied
   10   9   8   7   6   5   4   3   2   1

60. How have you changed from being involved in this program?

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for completing this survey.