

Organized Activities as Contexts of Development

Extracurricular Activities, After-School and Community Programs

Edited by

Joseph L. Mahoney
Yale University

Reed W. Larson
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Jacquelynne S. Eccles
University of Michigan



2005

LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS
Mahwah, New Jersey
London

8

Everybody's Gotta Give: Development of Initiative and Teamwork Within a Youth Program

Reed Larson
David Hansen
Kathrin Walker
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

After the last bell rings, a typical high school classroom is transformed into a meeting place as youth begin arriving. These members of the Clarkston High School FFA chapter seat themselves on top of desks and begin several excited conversations, generating ideas for planning a Day Camp for 4th graders in the middle of the summer.¹ The youth's goal for the camp is to interest children in agriculture, partly with the hope that they will want to become FFA members when they reach high school. As the cascade of conversations goes on, the adult advisor interrupts to ask who is leading the meeting, and the youth in unison point to Susan. In the minutes that follow, youth continue to throw out ideas in spontaneous and rapid succession. Many of these ideas are wildly unrealistic, which adds to the humor, and despite occasional entreaties from Susan and others to "focus," their ideas flow for 45 minutes with little apparent or clear direction.

¹The name of the high school and the names used for youth and adult leaders have been changed. The FFA, formerly called Future Farmers of America, is an after-school program for high school students in the United States, which is oriented toward preparing youth for careers in agriculture, food, fiber, and natural resource systems.

These youth are in the process of putting themselves into a tight spot. Shortly after this meeting, they recruited 20 children from the community to attend their camp for 2½ days in midsummer, only 2 months hence. Yet, although they are full of ideas, they face numerous hurdles in order to develop these ideas into workable shape. These youth are inexperienced in planning a large-scale event such as the day camp; they have little knowledge of how to coordinate the people and resources needed for such an event to occur; and several of these youth will encounter conflicts in their schedule or will lose interest as the hard work of preparation turns out to be less fun than spinning out ideas. How do these teenagers organize themselves, individually, and as a team, to make this camp happen? What are the crucial strategies for planning this type of event that they must learn along the way?

This chapter focuses on the development of what we have called *initiative*, the capacity to direct cumulative effort over time toward achievement of a long-term goal (Larson, 2000). We are interested in understanding the constellation of knowledge, dispositions, and skills that youth must learn to carry out a project, such as creating the day camp. This capacity to carry out a plan of action, both individually and as a team, is of increasing importance in the rapidly changing world of the 21st century (Brandstätter & Lerner, 1999; Larson, 2000). Within the occupational sphere, automation has reduced the market value of rote and manual labor, and more jobs require abilities to think and act with a plan, to carry out "initiatives" either individually or collaboratively. In other spheres of life as well, the erosion of traditional norms has made daily life less codified, thus, individuals need the ability to deliberately shape their lives (Larson, Wilson, Broan, Furstenberg, & Verma, 2002). For communities, too, it is essential that their members possess capabilities for "social entrepreneurship" in order to maintain and extend the communities' values and goals (Frumkin, 2002; Gauvain, 1999). So there is reason to contend that the capabilities these FFA members must learn to successfully organize the day camp are critical ones.

In this chapter we describe our current qualitative research on initiative, using the creation of the day camp by these FFA youth as a case example for in-depth analysis. Our first objective is to begin to understand the development of initiative within the context of organized youth programs. What did these teenagers need to learn to organize this day camp? Our second objective is to understand how the adult leaders of youth programs support this development. What role can or should they play in facilitating preparations for an event like this day camp? Effective, youth-serving practitioners give teens responsibility and ownership (McLaughlin, 2000), but they also provide support and guidance so that the youths' efforts do not flounder (Camino & Zeldin, 2002)—in this case, so the camp does not "flop." How do adults balance these competing imperatives?

BACKGROUND: DEVELOPMENTAL ANTECEDENTS OF INITIATIVE

The Capabilities of Children and Adolescents

A useful first step to understanding the development of initiative is to examine what is known about its antecedents in childhood. Research on children helps us think about the capabilities for planful action that they will bring into youth programs in adolescence. If we start with young children, Piaget (1954) demonstrated that their understanding of the world is limited in a number of ways that prevent them from exercising initiative. Among these constraints, they have little sense of future time as an arena for organizing their actions (Haith, 1997). They are, in a sense, trapped in the immediate world in front of them. But research shows that children gradually acquire abilities to plan actions and anticipate contingencies within a short-term future horizon. By age 5, children are capable of considering alternative courses of action and formulating a series of 5 to 6 steps toward reaching a short-term goal, such as building a tower from blocks. By late childhood, they are able to develop more elaborate sequences and plans that are flexible, take into account situational constraints, and include if-then contingencies (Gauvain, 1999; Gauvain & Perez, in press).

Even by adolescence, however, there remain limits to most young people's capabilities for carrying out longer term initiatives, limits that reflect lack of experience and cognitive tools. Youth at the outset of adolescence are typically not able to devise plans that involve long sequences of actions and include a large number of separate components and actors (Gauvain & Perez, in press). Even older adolescents often have limited abilities to coordinate the multiple abstract levels and systems that might be involved in reaching a long-term goal (Mascolo, Fisher, & Neimeyer, 1999); in fact many adults remain ineffective in implementing long-term plans (Gollwitzer, 1999). Another constraint is that teenagers are still developing abilities to understand emotions and use this knowledge to regulate their emotional states; thus, encounters with frustration, anxiety, and boredom can disrupt sustained attention to a long-term project (Larson, 1985).

These limits partly reflect the fact that adolescents are just starting to learn to use and manipulate abstract concepts. Teenagers' conception of future time is typically unelaborated (Nurmi, 1991), which may impair their ability to plan. They are only beginning to develop capabilities to think analytically about systems (Keating, 1980), emotional processes (Larson, Clore, & Wood, 1999), and the causal sequence among complex narrative events (Habermas & Bluck, 2000). Adolescents also are just gaining abilities for what cognitive psychologists call *metacognition*—the ability to "think about thinking." This means they have limited abilities to think strategically; to

think about the planning process itself as an object of thought. In short, adolescents' internal tools for organizing a set of future interactions with a complex environment—as required for planning an event like the day camp—are at a nascent stage.

When we look at team projects with peers, other cognitive limitations are likely to affect adolescents' exercise of initiative. Piaget (1929, 1954) found that young children are cognitively egocentric, they assume that other people experience the world exactly as they do. In a planning task, they see collaborators as instruments of their own intentions, rather than as individuals who may have intentions of their own (Gauvain, 2001). Research shows that the abilities required to understand other people's points of view are formidable, and their development is a long process stretching through adolescence, if not further. Early teens begin to acquire the capacity to understand other people as centers of thought and feeling, but they do not always use it (Selman, 1980). Adolescents are prone to assume that others are thinking about the same information that they are (Elkind, 1967). This adolescent egocentrism may handicap them in understanding and anticipating the differing point of view and intentions of collaborators (which is hard enough for experienced adults), thus making coordination of work on a team more difficult.

The Role of Adults

What is important to know, however, is that children and adolescents are capable of functioning at a higher level of planfulness and initiative when they are assisted by others. When working in pairs, peers provide some degree of mutual assistance (Rogoff, 1998), despite the problem of egocentrism just discussed. However, research with 9- to 11-year-olds indicates that peers rarely verbalize longer term strategies to each other, but rather work on one step at a time and focus on completion of the immediate task. They do not share ideas about a larger plan of action. As a result, youth in peer collaboration situations do less well on a posttest planning task than youth who have worked with adults—who are much more likely to verbalize long-term strategies (Radziszewska & Rogoff, 1988, 1991).

Gauvain (1999) argued that, at least in Western culture, interactions with parents are the major context in which younger children develop abilities to formulate and carry out plans. In daily life, parents and children often engage in joint planning of activities for the child and the family, and parents often play a guiding role in these collaborations. Parents help children identify goals, determine steps to reach these goals, and monitor progress. Parents provide scaffolding; they structure, instruct, and model elements of the initiative process that children are not yet able to do on their own. Following the theories of Vygotsky (1978), this process of working together appears to

help expand children's planning abilities; they gradually learn parts of the process that their parents are providing. Indeed, as they get older, children take on more of the tasks involved in joint planning with parents, such as organizing materials and contributing strategic information and ideas (Gauvain, 1999; Gauvain & Perez, in press).

How much children learn, of course, differs as a function of what parents do. Research by Gauvain and Huard (1999) suggested that too much or too little guidance from parents is associated with slower development of planning capabilities. Authoritarian parents were found to be more directive in planning discussions, whereas permissive parents more often left planning in children's hands. It was the authoritative parents who most often engaged their children in joint planning and most often used open-ended, non-directive, scaffolding techniques, like reminders and suggestions. Not surprisingly, when children in the research reached adolescence, those with authoritative parents made more contributions to joint family planning.

These findings about parents' role are important to our discussion of youth programs in a couple of ways. First, they suggest that, to support development of initiative, adult leaders need to find a middle ground between being too directive and too *laissez faire*. But this is easier said than done, and we need to ask what it really means in the everyday situations that adult leaders face. Second, although research indicates that parents provide support for development of planning skills in childhood, parents are less involved in adolescents' daily lives, and thus engage in less joint planning with them (Gauvain, 1999; Gauvain & Perez, in press). This creates a gap in opportunities for teenagers to continue developing their planning and initiative skills, a gap that might potentially be filled by good youth programs.

YOUTH PROGRAMS

Our interest in youth programs as contexts for the development of initiative emerged from our research in which adolescents carried pagers for one week and provided reports on their psychological states at random times when signaled by the pagers. We found across samples of hundreds of youth that, when teens were participating in extracurricular activities and other structured programs, they consistently reported both high motivation and engaged attention. This is a combination likely to provide optimal conditions for the development of self-directed action (Larson, 2000). We were also influenced by the finding of Heath (1998, 1999) that adolescents in highly effective youth programs start using new types of language. New members in these programs showed dramatic increases in their use of what-if questions, scenario building, conditionals, and other linguistic tools for planning and executing plans—what we call initiative. This led us to ask what internal changes in youths' thought processes underlie the increased use of these

linguistic tools. What insights and new ways of thinking are related to the development of initiative?

Our first step to evaluating this prediction was to ask youth to tell us about their developmental experiences in these contexts. We conducted 10 focus groups with high-school students in which we asked them to describe what they were learning in youth programs (Dworkin, Larson, & Hansen, 2003). What struck us first was that these teens almost always portrayed themselves as the agents of their learning experiences within these contexts. These appeared to be contexts in which youth were "producers of their own development" (Lerner & Busch-Rossnagel, 1981; Silbereisen, Eyerferth, & Rudinger, 1986). Among the types of development they described, these students readily identified a set of competencies they were learning that related to initiative. These included skills involving management of one's energies and resources: learning to set realistic goals, exert effort, manage time, and take responsibility. They also included skills related to working effectively in a team: learning communication skills, the giving and taking of feedback, and taking responsibility within a group.

It is important to ask, however, whether young people really have these learning experiences more often in youth programs than in other contexts? In a second study, we developed a survey that identified different types of learning experiences, including those related to initiative, and we asked a high-school sample to rate how often they had had each of these experiences in youth programs, in their classroom, and during time "hanging out with friends" (Hansen, Larson, & Dworkin, 2003). These teenagers reported having all of the learning experiences related to initiative and teamwork skills at significantly higher rates within youth programs than in these comparison activities. For example, 40% of teens involved in youth programs reported that they had "learned to consider obstacles when making plans" in that context; whereas only 21% reported this experience in a school class and only 29% reported it in their interactions with friends. These findings supported our thesis that youth programs may be a particularly fertile context for the development of initiative.

The next step for us is to observe, close up, how this development takes place. Our goal is to use intensive observation to begin developing theory and practical knowledge about how initiative is fostered within youth programs. To achieve this, we chose to look at high-quality programs where there was a high likelihood of observing the development of initiative in process.

AN INTENSIVE STUDY

We chose an FFA chapter as one of the sites for our research because the FFA organization stresses the development of initiative skills. The motto of the National FFA Organization is "*Learning to do, doing to learn, earning to*

live, living to serve" [italics added]. Over the course of a year, FFA clubs and members within those clubs have the opportunity to participate in a wide range of activities and competitions that involve working toward a goal. In the months before and during our research, the FFA chapter we studied was involved in an agricultural mechanics contest, ran a community toy show, took part in a parliamentary procedure contest, planned their annual banquet, and competed in a poultry judging contest, as well as planning the day camp and several other activities. In some ways an FFA chapter might be seen as analogous to an urban neighborhood club where youth choose from a smorgasbord of activities. The difference is that FFA programs are located in schools and many of these activities involve competitions in which the chapter and participants vie for first, second, and third place rankings, and so forth, at the district and state levels.

We chose the Clarkston FFA chapter because it had a reputation for being very successful in these competitions. We also chose it because the agriculture teachers who were its advisors, Mr. Baker and Mr. Jensen, had strong reputations for caring about their students and making a difference in their lives. The Clarkston chapter had 77 members and was located in a rural, conglomerated high school of approximately 500 students. These members did not stand out as a self-selected group of high achievers and school leaders, as is the case with many high-school extracurricular activities (Holland & Andre, 1987). Some participants reported that there was a social stigma associated with being a member of FFA and several members saw themselves as social "outcasts." But the structure of the program provides many roles and ways for youth to fit in and contribute. The chapter had close to a dozen officer positions that provided leadership opportunities, as well as committees for each activity that allowed students to step into an activity of their choice.

We began the study in early April, when planning for the day camp was soon to get underway, and continued through mid-July, when the day camp was held. During the first 2 months, while school was in session, members were involved in a range of FFA activities, and our data included students' experiences in these activities. The idea of doing a summer day camp for 4th graders was originated by members 3 years before. This year, the adult advisors were experimenting with giving the youth more control over the development of the camp than they had in the 2 prior years. It was agreed between the advisors that Mr. Baker would take primary responsibility for supervising the day camp preparations and Mr. Jensen would help out as needed.

Our objective was to understand the functioning of the Clarkston FFA program and the development of the day camp from three points of view. First, over the 4 months, one or more of our staff members observed the chapter's activities on 13 different occasions (11 times by D. Hansen). Second, with input from the advisors, we chose 11 youths, most of them officers;

and one of our staff members was matched with each and conducted bi-weekly interviews with her or him over the 3½-month period. The interviews at the beginning, at midpoint, and at the end were conducted face-to-face; the other interviews were conducted by phone. The students included 3 seniors, 1 junior, 3 sophomores, and 4 freshmen (6 females and 5 males). Several of these students withdrew from FFA participation at the end of school in May, so we conducted final interviews with these youth at that time, and continued only with the 6 youth who were involved in planning the day camp. We completed a total of 74 youth interviews. Our third source of data was interviews with the two adult FFA advisors. D. Hansen and K. Walker were each paired with one of the advisors and interviewed them following the same biweekly schedule as used with the youth. A total of 15 advisor interviews were conducted.

In presenting this case study, we want to stress that it represents only one example of how the development of initiative occurs and is fostered. We start by providing a narrative description of what happened after that first day camp planning meeting, based primarily on the observers' notes. The two subsequent sections deal with the students' accounts of their learning experience and the role of the adult leaders in supporting the students' development of initiative skills. As a confirmatory step, we asked the two advisors of the program to read a close-to-final draft of this chapter and they reported that the account was "right on."

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: HOW THE YOUTH PLANNED THE DAY CAMP

Initial Brainstorming Phase: Fantasy and Fun

The meeting we described at the outset of the chapter initiated a phase of high enthusiasm. The free-flowing and enjoyable nature of this brainstorming phase crystallized members' ownership of the day camp, which was critical later on when the going got tougher. Over a sequence of three meetings, the members continued to throw out a wide range of ideas about activities they could do with the 4th graders. Most suggestions were built on topics such as plants, pets, or farm animals, for which they had developed expertise through prior FFA activities. The group quickly decided that one day of the camp would be focused on chickens, motivated no doubt by their success in trying for first place in the FFA state poultry judging contest. Many of their ideas for activities, however, were unrealistic, or deliberately funny. For example, someone joked that after doing activities with live chickens in the morning, they could make fried chicken with them in the afternoon.

During this initial phase, the students did not seem to want or need input from the adult advisors. One girl joked, "We'll let you know if we need any

thing, we'll write you a note." The advisors played a convivial, background role and joined in the humor. After the group decided that the 3 days would be focused on chickens, plants, and dogs, Mr. Baker introjected a word play on the Wizard of Oz, "Chickens and plants and dogs, oh my!" In their interviews, the advisors reported restraining the desire to push the planning process forward, even though they could see how much work had to be done. They did encourage ideas they liked, for example, the proposal that members go to the grade school to actively publicize the day camp. The advisors also made occasional suggestions to support the students' planning. They encouraged the youth to narrow down their ideas, made sure that someone was documenting ideas on paper, helped youth assess the feasibility of ideas, and they began to offer the next steps for the development of ideas. At the third meeting, Mr. Baker suggested that the youth break into three planning committees having responsibility for each day of the camp, a suggestion they followed almost immediately.

Although this phase was productive in generating investment in the day camp and settling on the topics that would be the focus of each day, the amount of progress being made was slowing down. Several youth felt that, since they had decided on the topics, the planning was done and there was no need to meet further. Yet the task of developing the plan—designing specific activities for each day, making arrangements, and getting the necessary materials—was not yet addressed.

Middle Phase: Wheel Spinning

In the next phase, progress came to a near standstill, mired in tension and an inability to take things to the next step. The group continued to meet but it was the observer's impression that these meetings did not accomplish much that had not already been done. Part of the problem was that members failed to show up at meetings and failed to follow through on what they had agreed to do. About 10 to 12 youth were involved at this stage, but several meetings had only 4 to 6 members in attendance. School was ending and people got caught up in summer jobs and other activities, or just had difficulty arranging transportation to come in for meetings. At one meeting, for example, the girl who was writing the lesson plan for one committee did not show up, leaving the other two members frustrated. Strains and conflicts also emerged that immobilized work. One younger student had taken over the role of leader from Susan but he locked horns with an older member on the question of how long a camp session should be and, then, on whether the children should be split into smaller groups.

The preparation process also appeared to be hampered by members not being able to formulate what they needed to accomplish next. One student later reflected that they did not know what they were doing or what they had

to do. The group tended to go over the same things it had in the previous meetings. For example, at each meeting, they talked about setting the schedule for the day camp in 15-minute increments, but they did not create a process for filling in those increments. Our observer felt they were using the meetings as a crutch, that is, "if we are meeting we must be making progress." Whether due to inexperience, cognitive limitations, interpersonal gridlock, or just a lack of felt urgency, the students seemed unable or unwilling to engage in future-oriented thinking. The observer wrote in his notes, "No where near being ready—the youth are no further along than they were at meetings 2 and 3!"

Aware that the process was stalling, the adult advisors began to take a more active role. Mr. Baker decided it would be helpful to teach the students how to construct a lesson plan, and then he suggested that the group set deadlines for the committees to have these lesson plans ready. When these deadlines were not met, Mr. Baker set new deadlines and invested his authority by saying he wanted to look at each of these plans. Mr. Baker also acted to resolve problems with the group process. He asked each person to take responsibility for getting the other members of their committee to the meetings. In addition, he began to make phone calls to the youth in leadership roles, checking up on their work and suggesting points about which they should be thinking.

Meetings during this phase had much less humor and more frequent expressions of strain. At each interview, we asked students to rate how much progress was being made on a scale from 1 to 10, and these ratings dipped during this middle phase. One student later said that the process "fell apart"; another that "it was frustrating going to meeting after meeting and not getting anything done." But some progress was being made. For example, the group working on chickens searched university Web sites for activities they could do with the children. The observer noted that when one of the students asked a question unrelated to the camp, the group admonished him to stay focused. Most importantly, as we will see when we turn to the youths' accounts, they were developing awareness of what the challenges were and what needed to be done, an awareness that kicked in during the final weeks of preparation.

The Serious Planning Phase: Student Leaders Step Forward

Only four youth showed up for the final planning meeting, 2 weeks prior to the day camp. But these were the four who were most invested and had assumed leadership roles. They had a clear sense of what to do and were committed to holding what they called a "working meeting." They got right down to business and focused on details of the day camp, intermittently

8. INITIATIVE AND TEAMWORK IN A YOUTH PROGRAM 169

working separately and as a unit. They ran through and set up the activities for each 15-minute period of the day camp. They completed mundane tasks, like creating name tags for the children and creating labels to identify chicken and dog anatomy. Several youth stayed for 3 to 4 hours, and some continued to work and meet with members of their committees until the weekend before the camp.

During this period, the youth appeared to work together seamlessly, setting aside past tensions between individuals. A student reported in her phone interview, "We worked really hard as a team. Everyone did their part and, if someone didn't, then another person was there to pick up the pieces and help things continue on." During this stage, the students readily accepted responsibility for whatever needed to be done.

The adult advisors, at this phase, worked closely with youth providing supports. At the final meeting, Mr. Baker offered specific suggestions on what they needed to accomplish. Both advisors helped youth find material and circulated among the groups responding to requests for help. Our observer noted that the advisors still "didn't tell the youth what to do!" They asked members for their permission to offer assistance. For example, one student was looking on the Internet for cartoon pictures of dogs to use for name tags, and she found one but did not like the size and way it printed. Mr. Baker politely asked her, "Can I help?" When she said "Yes," he sat down and showed her how to change the picture so it was the way she wanted it.

The Day Camp: Moment of Truth

After these last 2 weeks of intensive effort, the dates of the camp finally arrived, and the youth ran it successfully with only a few minor problems. Between 7 and 10 FFA youth showed up each day to supervise the 20 children. Members of each committee took responsibility for their day, and our observers noted that several of the youth did a superb job of executing their lesson plans, demonstrating a high level of preparedness and sensitivity to the children. On one day, Mr. Baker took over leading the sessions because the children became unruly; and a planned field trip to the animal shelter did not work out as anticipated because no one had made a key phone call. But overall, the day camp was a great success. The children appeared to have a good time learning about chickens, dogs, and plants. Nearly all the FFA members expressed satisfaction that it had gone well and that they had had a positive influence on the children.

WHAT THE YOUTH LEARNED

So what happened that allowed the youth to come together and make the camp successful? In the final interview conducted right after the day camp,

and in bits and pieces throughout the period, the Clarkston FFA members in the study reported developing fundamental insights about how to accomplish a project like this. To understand this process of acquiring initiative skills, we turn now to analyzing the members' accounts of the day camp preparations. At every biweekly interview, we asked the students, among other things, what "challenges or obstacles" they faced, what means they were using to address these challenges, and what they were learning from their experiences. We then systematically analyzed their responses employing procedures of qualitative data analysis and grounded theory that are designed to identify underlying patterns and concepts within textual data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998).

Challenges and Obstacles

The experiences of challenges appeared to be key. The learning youth described toward the end of the period appeared to be related to the types of challenges they identified during the middle phases of the day camp and in other FFA activities. Our analysis of their reported challenges and obstacles revealed several repeated themes, fitting into two categories. The first category was *instrumental challenges*: impediments to their work. The second was *interpersonal challenges*: obstacles in coordinating one's work with peers.

Many of the instrumental challenges had to do with mobilizing one's time and effort. A frequent response to our question about challenges and obstacles was: "Just getting it done," or, "Making sure I do my part." The youth reported experiencing conflicts with other activities in their lives and having difficulty finding the time, as well as difficulties in knowing how to do something or what to do next. The youth also reported encountering emotional and motivational obstacles to getting work done. These concerned experiences of stress, negative feelings, and lack of motivation. One girl reported her challenge to be: "Sleeping in. I need to get around that. And I get on the Internet a lot, I need to stop doing that and just get out there and do it [the FFA work]. I mean, I'm motivated, but when I'm sitting there at home and after a full week of school, on Saturday I'm so relaxed, I just don't feel like going out there." This youth, like others, was struggling with basic self-organizational issues.

Interpersonal challenges, related to working with peers, accounted for two thirds of the challenges and obstacles for the work on the day camp. Not surprisingly, these were reported most frequently during the middle phase. Attempting to coordinate the planning with her committee's day, one exasperated youth said, "They're driving me nuts, ahhh," and at the next interview, "I have dates to get that stuff in and, if they're busy, then I'm gonna be like, oh crap." The students provided a litany of complaints about others not doing their part, not showing up, putting in little effort,

and just being difficult. The way youth phrased these interpersonal challenges ranged from those that simply blamed others—"It was Chris's meeting and he wasn't there; did he just forget?"—to those that recognized other people's irresponsibility as part of the problem to be solved. For example, one girl described the challenge:

Making sure that everybody does their part and we're not having to pick up after someone else. You know, this person didn't call so and so to find out if we could do this, or this person didn't make sure they gave us a list of things they needed bought and now they don't have everything they need. Or just making sure that everything gets done right and gets done on time.

In this example, one can see that the formulation of the challenge—which recognizes the flakiness of others—contains its solution. Indeed the challenges appeared to provide the germination for developmental change.

Insights Into Instrumentality

The members' reported learning experiences often appeared to stem from the challenges concerned with mobilizing time and effort. A frequent category of these reports entailed *learning that achieving something requires concerted effort and discipline*. The youth reported learning to start early, to work on the project every day, and that achieving a long-term goal "takes a lot of self-discipline." They reported learning to more deliberately coordinate the different competing parts of their lives. One girl said, "It's sort of a new idea for me, this idea of knowing what you are doing a week before. Usually I'm just day-by-day." It appeared to come as a major discovery to many of these youth, that "if you work hard toward something, it will pay off in the long run." This lesson at first seemed rudimentary to us, something one might associate with Erikson's (1950) preadolescent stage of "industry." But for many youth, this lesson contained a higher order, metacognitive concept—that one's time and effort can be organized strategically. The underlying developmental insight was that one's own time and effort are *quantities* that one can manipulate, allocate, and invest. Excited by this insight, one member said he was now going to "turn attention toward other things that I like, and work hard toward them." It appeared that future time had taken form for these youth as an arena in which the deployment of effort could be purposefully organized toward reaching a goal.

A related set of learning experiences appeared to arise from the challenges presented by emotional and motivational obstacles. The students reported learning to be less nervous, "not get stressed out," and control negative feelings. These fit in the category, *learning to self-regulate internal states*. One girl reported learning, "You just live with yourself. Even if you

don't wanna do it, you don't have a choice most of the time." After one only partially successful FFA competition, the same girl said, "We couldn't let our anger, disappointment, and stress take over and completely smash the project that had to be done." These lessons, too, reflect metacognitive insight: that strong emotions interfere with the investment of attention and with effective work. Although intangible and abstract, emotional and motivational states are entities that can, at least partly, be controlled. In order to make progress on a task, one has to stand above what you feel in the moment and think about the larger goal to be achieved. The challenges of carrying out a project, such as the day camp, involves understanding and learning to manage one's time, one's effort, and one's inner life.

One thing we expected but did not hear were insights on how to organize the steps of the planning process. Although the youth articulated abstract psychological concepts about self-management, they said little about logistic strategies for creating and executing an effective plan, for example, what steps should be taken early and late in carrying out a project like this and how the steps relate to each other. We do not know whether this is because youth did not learn these things, or they were not salient for them. They did, however, articulate developing this type of strategic thinking about collaborating with peers.

Insights Into Working as a Team

Over half of the students' reported learning experiences were related to the interpersonal challenges of working with other people. Our coding process yielded a set of categories that involved being more understanding of others, which we present followed by examples of each in individual quotes:

- *Accepting others' viewpoints.* "You [learn to] consider people's opinions and thoughts; you're patient with them, and you accept their beliefs."
- *Giving people space.* "If they're doing their job, but not doing it the way you want, you feel like you need to step back and sort of let them do it on their own." "You learn that if someone says something that you don't like, you kind of ignore them. I used to snap right back at them, and I've learned to kind of wait and then sit down and say, 'this is how I feel.'"
- *Recognizing individual differences.* "You have to know like some people they can handle a lot of criticism, but then [with] others you have to be more careful of their feelings. Like some of the guys you can just tell them, 'You better get this done otherwise you're gonna be kicked out,' but [with] some of the girls [you] are like, 'Could you please start working a little harder?'"
- *Working together.* "That one person can't do everything on their one, it's got to be a group effort to put something like this on." "Even

though we're fighting and arguing, we got back together, put everything behind us and came out with a great product."

These reports suggest advancement from an egocentric perspective, which positions their own views and intentions at the center, to a more *sociocentric perspective*, which is understanding of and gives weight to the subjective realities and agency of other team members. This shift toward a sociocentric orientation is effectively summarized by a freshman girl who played a key role in the day camp: "When I first started, I was pretty intolerant of just about anybody, but you know, I am sure that they're pretty intolerant of me sometimes. So everybody's gotta give and everybody's just gotta hold back just a little."

But giving and holding back did not mean total self-abnegation. The FFA members also reported learning to be more confident and self-assertive in a group context. On the one hand, a girl reported learning that "If someone is a slacker, you still have to make them feel like they are doing something." But she also learned that "Sometimes you gotta get your foot up their rear and drag em in." A common theme among the students who stepped forward was to "not let peers' irresponsibility derail your work." One of these student leaders reported learning, "You can't let other people affect you, and make you negative; you just gotta be you; sometimes you've just gotta hold your breath and do it." Another said, "I've never thought of this until now, but you work as a team individually. It's kinda neat. You do a lot of stuff individually that you're doing, not for yourself, but for everyone else." So students described themselves as learning to listen and work with others, but not at the cost of setting aside their own views, or letting the work be dragged down by others' irresponsibility.

The Development of Initiative

What the youth were telling us, then, was that they were developing new ways of thinking and acting that transcended the experience of the present moment and their own personal perspective. Out of their struggle with the challenges of the task, they appeared to be acquiring a more elaborated view of time that included the future—the days ahead—as a field for the strategic allocation of effort. They were developing a way of operating that incorporated other people as independent centers of intentionality. It appeared to us that they were gaining use of new abstract concepts—effort as quantity, emotion, other people's intentions—that allowed them to coordinate multiple levels and systems of activity. Acquisition of these initiative skills may contribute to the findings of others that participation in youth programs predicts later educational achievement (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Marsh, 1992) and adult occupational attainment (Glancy, Willits,

& Farrell, 1986). As a result of participation in FFA and the day camp planning, these youth appeared to be gradually acquiring skills of thinking and acting that made them more able to organize effort toward the achievement of long-term goals.

Before examining the adult leaders' role in supporting this learning, it is important to register appropriate cautions. The methods we used are those of theory building; further research is required to definitively test the processes of change suggested here. We have only studied one exceptional program, and our data come from a subset of youth who volunteered to organize the day camp. Even within this group, we observed variations between those youth in leadership roles—who most often articulated these advanced initiative insights—and those playing supportive roles, who were learning at levels that may prepare them to jump up to the advanced level the next year.

We also want to point out that there are additional dimensions to these developmental changes that we have not been able to cover in this limited space (Friedman & Scholnick, 1997). One is the role of brain development, a topic about which little is yet currently known.² Another is the role of confidence, perceived control, self-efficacy, and similar motivational constructs. Current research on planful action sees these motivational constructs in ways that are interrelated with what we have discussed: less as dispositional traits, and more as changeable beliefs about the efficacy of goal-directed action. Research shows that people who possess these beliefs—this confidence—act in more efficacious ways. In turn, experiencing success is likely to strengthen these beliefs, and lack of success may undermine this confidence (Skinner, 1997). In this vein, a number of the Clarkston youth preparing the day camp described gaining confidence as an important part of their learning experience. One additional observation was that this confidence was not just an individual quality, it was negotiated and shared within the group. Thus, the scaffolding that group members provided for each other's learning was not just in learning cognitive skills but also in building each others' confidence in their ability to succeed in this project—as well as in other projects in the future.

WHAT THE ADULT LEADERS DID

The students experienced this learning as coming from themselves. But Mr. Baker and Mr. Jensen played important, partly invisible, roles in facilitating

²Recent research shows that the frontal cortex of the brain, which plays an important role in self-regulation and planning, is still developing in adolescence (Gauvain, 2001). This may explain some of the limits in young people's initiative skills, but evidence consistently shows that brain growth and experience reciprocally influence each other (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). So the fact that this region of the brain is changing suggests that it may be particularly important to give youth opportunities to develop the capabilities located in this region.

it. The Clarkston advisors faced two objectives, which were not always compatible. They wanted to help youth to learn and they also wanted to be certain that the day camp was a success. The students' learning of initiative skills, as we have just seen, stemmed in great part from holding responsibility, from having ownership for the challenges of the preparation process. Yet, as began to happen midway through the planning, when youth hold sole responsibility, their work can stall or become disorganized, which can undermine their motivation and the success of the project. The horns of the paradox for adult leaders, then, are that if they take over control, youth will not learn, but if they give youth total control, things may get off track (see also Camino, 2000). By analyzing the data we obtained from the advisors, the youth, and our observations, it became apparent that Mr. Baker and Mr. Jensen had developed expertise in a number of techniques that helped them avoid both horns of this paradox and achieve both objectives. We describe four that were particularly effective in allowing the members to maintain ownership while keeping the preparation process on track.

One of these techniques was *following youths' lead*. In the interviews with the advisors, one of their repeated mantras was: "It's their camp." This technique was most apparent in the brainstorming phase, when they almost entirely stood aside and supported the students' development of ideas for the day camp. But the advisors continued to use this approach through to the final working meeting, when Mr. Baker was still asking members' permission before giving help. The students were very aware that responsibility for setting the direction for the camp and for other FFA activities was being given to them. As one youth said, "Rarely, rarely, rarely, do the advisors just say 'Here's how it's gonna be,' which is nice." Another said, "That's the neat thing about it, you're never really truly forced to do something. It's, 'do you wanna do this? Or, hey Mr. Baker, Mr. Jensen, I wanna do this.' And then they help you, they help you do it."

This technique builds students' ownership, but requires considerable restraint from the advisors. In the words of Mr. Baker, "By allowing them to come up with ideas, they *become* their ideas." However, giving youth this much authority—to potentially mess things up—is not easy. In the middle phase, our observer reported that he felt quite anxious that things were falling apart, an anxiety that Mr. Baker did not appear to share. We observed in other FFA activities that Mr. Baker was not adverse to letting youth fail, even when it meant that their program received a lower ranking in a competition. He viewed failure as an opportunity for youth to learn, and said that the adult advisors have to "check our egos at the door." Although the advisors progressively shifted to more assertive techniques in the middle phase—because letting the students fail was not an option for the day camp—they remained committed to following and supporting the directions set by the youth.

A second technique they used was *asking guiding questions*. In the early part of the planning process these were often questions that helped youth clarify suggestions or filter out ideas that were not likely to work, like "What would be the way to do it?" and "How feasible is a field trip?" Their questions directed the youth to evaluate whether a proposed activity would be appropriate, fun, interesting, approved by parents, and so on. In the middle and final phases, these questions became more focused on the preparation process, on strategies: "How can we find out everyone's schedule?" "How many practices will you need?" and "Who's going to be responsible for that?" The advisors posed these questions but did not offer their answers, although they may often have known good answers based on their past experience.

The advisors' described using this technique very intentionally. Mr. Baker said he used questioning to "Make them see where we need to be heading, and to let them come up with those directions." The virtue he saw in this technique was, "Even though we're bringing the questions up, it's still their idea and their project." In some cases, he pointed out, the youth come up with completely original ideas, for example, the suggestion of recruiting children for the camp through visits to their classrooms. Mr. Baker also described use of questions for a "debugging" process, where he and Mr. Jensen ask trouble-shooting questions and help the youth anticipate things that might go wrong with their plans. In some cases, the nature of the advisors' questions suggests an acceptable range of answers, nonetheless the youth were being given the responsibility for providing the answer—and also for following up on the answer. Questioning is a nonthreatening technique that, when used well, can provoke youth to think more deeply and strategically while keeping ownership with the youth.

What is most interesting is that we could see the youth internalize this questioning process. Toward the end of the day camp preparations, the observer recorded several youths beginning to pose these kinds of questions. In the final interview, one of the girls reported understanding exactly what the advisors were doing: "They are like, 'Where are you getting the tools, where you getting money, where you getting ... you know?' They do what they need to do to keep our heads on straight."

When it became clear that the youth were having difficulty structuring their work, the advisors deployed a third technique, *providing intermediate structures*. This included partial or mediating structures that helped organize the group, helped the students break their work into manageable steps, and provided realistic goals and deadlines. Mr. Baker's suggestion that they create committees for each day of the camp helped overcome the gridlock of everyone (or no one) being responsible for everything. One of the youth commented that this helped them "split up the responsibilities and come together as a team." When these committees got stuck, the advisors recom-

mended that each should create a lesson plan, mapped out in 15-minute blocks. This framework was open enough that it still allowed the youth to fill in their own activity and feel a sense of ownership, but it provided a structure to help focus the members' planning. When needed, the advisors also provided conceptual structures to help the youth shape what should go in each block. As one student described: "There's like a verbal outline they told us, 'You're gonna wanna discuss this, this, and this, and you're gonna wanna have points, you know so they [the children] can go home and tell their parents, 'This is what I learned and this is what we did,' not 'This is what they told us.'"

The students appeared to welcome these intermediate structures as timely scaffolding. One boy said the advisors were making sure "that we are not trying to do something that is out of our power." The literature on youth organizations stresses the importance of providing challenge to youth (Gambone & Arbreton, 1997), but challenge that is beyond someone's skills creates anxiety (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) and youth can feel betrayed if adults let them crash and burn in a situation that is beyond their abilities (Camino, 2000). These intermediate structures helped fit challenges to the limits in adolescents' initiative skills that we discussed at the beginning of the chapter. They helped youth divide up future time and the planning process into manageable chunks.

The fourth technique employed by the advisors was *monitoring to keep the youth on track*. In the early stages, this mainly took the form of observing and asking questions. As one student reported, "I think they're just watching over us right now and making sure we're getting it done, but they're letting us decide what we wanna do and make our own decisions." Another member said, "They kinda let us just take over, but they're there just in case." Monitoring sometimes took the form of behind-the-scenes support, done so as to be transparent to the students, such as verifying with a phone call that arrangements for the purchase of potted flowers had been made.

When the group was not progressing satisfactorily, the advisors intervened in more direct ways, as happened toward the end of the middle phase when they became more assertive in checking up on members' work. A student said, "We kind of ran around like chickens with our heads cut off for a while, but they got us back in line, got things organized." Although Mr. Baker has more of a *laissez-faire* approach to leadership, Mr. Jensen is a stronger advocate for intervention: "If things aren't coming together the way I think they should, eventually I'm going to step in and do whatever I have to do. You have to step in before it's too late to get something accomplished. Especially if we're dealing with public kinds of issues."

Over 8 years of working together, the two advisors have developed effective rapport, and both agreed that greater intervention was needed to get the day camp preparation on track.

This shift to greater adult control can be hazardous. When adults take over a project that was being run by youth, the youth can feel embarrassed, angry, and disempowered (Camino, 2000; Soep, 1997). When the FFA advisors became more assertive, it did threaten the sense of ownership for a couple of students. One reported:

If they know something wasn't done, they'll call us in the morning to ask us "did you do this yet," "have you gotten this done yet?" We'll say "No" or we just won't answer the phone and they know that it hasn't been done. They'll do it themselves sometimes, then they get upset but it's what you get when you deal with high-schoolers [laughs].

What is interesting here is that this student was aware of the paradox the advisors were facing. She knew their intervention was needed but also expressed some bitterness at being pressured, at having authority taken away from her. Most students, however, accepted the advisors' assistance, indeed, they recognized that the advisors were helping them regain control. In the final interview, all, including this student, felt that it had been *their* [the students'] camp. In effect what the advisors had done was to shore up the weak points in the preparation process, so that the youth could maintain a sense of ownership *and* create a successful day camp. Their intervention maintained a channel for the students' exercise of agency, and it kept the youth in the envelope of working toward a successful camp.

Take Home Messages on Adult Leadership

The key to the advisors' use of these techniques, we believe, is that they were adjusted to the capabilities of the youth. As we have discussed, most adolescents' have a constrained sense of future time that limits their ability to plan, or feel urgency that things need to get done early. The intermediate structures the advisors created—such as setting deadlines for specific tasks to be done—were introduced when needed to help break future time into more tangible pieces, fitted to the abilities of these youth. Adolescents are also just beginning to be able to think about other people as centers of thought and feeling. Mr. Baker's suggestion that the work be divided into committees permitted the students to narrow their focus to thinking about and coordinating their actions with the thoughts and intentions of the smaller number of people in their group.

Each technique was deployed and adjusted according to what students could handle. For example, in a study of preadolescents in Little League teams, Heath and Langman (1994) described coaches' use of questioning to get the children simply to remember and rehearse the basic rules of the game. These FFA advisors posed questions at a more advanced level, which

challenged youth to think about complex problems and come up with original solutions. As we have mentioned, we were struck by how little these youth talked about long-term strategies, about the *process* of preparation for the day camp. The questions the advisors used often pointed the youth toward strategic issues, and the intermediate structures they introduced provided strategic scaffolding. The leaders helped bridge skills that were in a developmental stage for these youth.

A lesson of our case study is that adult leaders who want to promote the development of initiative and teamwork need to keep the limited capabilities of youth in mind and be prepared to make adjustments to fit these capabilities. By allowing members to go the edge of the challenges they could handle, these two expert adult leaders provided optimal conditions for the youth to develop initiative skills. But adult leaders also need to be ready to provide intermediate structures and "shoring up," so that participants experience themselves in a channel of opportunities and challenges within their capability. They need to steer a course between supporting youth ownership and restrained intervention.

Of course, there are other techniques for maintaining this channel besides the four described here. Other adult leaders may balance control and youth ownership through different methods. Indeed, these two FFA advisors used additional techniques to support students' participation in the competitions that make up much of the chapter's activity. We observed that, as new opportunities arose, they had a special knack for fitting individual youth to specific challenges and roles. They spoke of looking for the "hook" that would get each individual involved, whether it be the student's skills in welding, a strong competitive drive, or interest in educating children. Another effective tool they used was cultivating a group culture that was passed from older to younger youth. This included a group spirit, ways of thinking, and aphorisms about how FFA members handled different situations. These techniques, we emphasize, may vary depending on the personality and style of the leader, as well as those of individual youth. As we have suggested, Mr. Baker and Mr. Jensen had somewhat different approaches, and one or the other was sometimes more successful for a given youth.

The techniques adult leaders use will also vary across different types of programs and program contexts. The position of these advisors as teachers at the school gave them leverage that adult leaders in community-based organizations do not have—they saw many of the FFA members every day in their agriculture classes, and it was undoubtedly easier to get students to stay after school for an activity than it is to get them to come to a community center. The advantage of being in a school was evident in the difficulties with "no shows" that emerged for the day camp planning once school was out. In addition, we have focused here on a collaborative project, but initiative development also can be supported in programs where students

toward individual goals, such as may happen in an arts or gymnastics program. We are now studying additional programs to understand the development of initiative, as well as other domains of growth across a range of programmatic and ecological contexts.

The essential ingredient of effective youth work, it is argued, is *intentionality* (Walker, Marczak, Blyth, & Bordon, chap. 18, this volume). Adult leaders need to be clear about their goals and develop a repertoire of methods for achieving these goals. When the goal is to promote development of initiative in youth, adults place themselves in what may sometimes seem like a paradoxical position of handing the intentionality over to the youth. But these beginning findings from our research shows that effective adult leaders develop methods for rising above this seeming paradox. They skillfully implement techniques that maintain a sense of ownership with the youth but also keep the youth in a channel of challenges, work, and growth that the youth can manage. Much evidence shows that, given the right support, young people can carry out quite remarkable projects (Heath & Smyth, 2000; Yates & Youniss, 1999). In so doing, they can develop important initiative skills for deliberately shaping their environment, a capability that is increasingly important to adults in the 21st century.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We offer profuse thanks to Mr. Baker, Mr. Jensen, and the youth who shared their experiences with us, and to the William T. Grant Foundation for its support of this research.

REFERENCES

- Brandstädter, J., & Lerner, R. M. (Eds.) (1999). *Action and self-development: Theory and research through the life span*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Camino, L. A. (2000). Youth-adult partnerships: Entering new territory in community work and research. *Applied Developmental Science, 4*, 11–20.
- Camino, L., & Zeldin, S. (2002). From periphery to center: Pathways for youth civic engagement in the day-to-day life of communities. *Applied Developmental Science, 6*, 213–220.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety: The experience of play in work and games*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dworkin, J. B., Larson, R., & Hansen, D. (2003). Adolescents' accounts of growth experiences in youth activities. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32*, 17–26.
- Eccles, J.-S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14*, 10–43.
- Elkind, D. (1967). Egocentrism in adolescence. *Child Development, 38*, 1025–1034.
- Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
- Friedman, S. L., & Scholnick, E. K. (1997). An evolving "blueprint" for planning: Psychological requirements, task characteristics, and social-cultural influences. In S. L.

- Friedman & E. K. Scholnick (Eds.), *The developmental psychology of planning: Why, how, and when to we plan?* (pp. 3–22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Frumkin, P. (2002). *On being nonprofit*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gambone, M. A., & Arbreton, A. J. A. (1997). *Safe havens: The contributions of youth organizations to healthy adolescent development*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- Gauvain, M. (1999). Everyday opportunities for the development of planning skills: Sociocultural and family influences. In A. Göncü (Ed.), *Children's engagement in the world: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 173–201). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gauvain, M. (2001). *The social context of development*. New York: Guilford.
- Gauvain, M., & Huard, R. D. (1999). Family interaction, parenting style, and the development of planning: A longitudinal analysis using archival data. *Journal of Family Psychology, 13*, 75–92.
- Gauvain, M., & Perez, S. (in press). Not all hurried children are the same: Children's participation in planning their after-school activities. In J. E. Jacobs & P. Klaczynski (Eds.), *The development of judgment and decision-making in children and adolescents*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Glancy, M., Willis, F., & Farrell, P. (1986). Adolescent activities and adult success and happiness: Twenty-four years later. *Sociology and Social Research, 70*, 242–250.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation intentions: Strong effects of simple plans. *American Psychologist, 54*(7), 493–503.
- Habermas, T., & Bluck, S. (2000). Getting a life: The emergence of the life story in adolescence. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 748–769.
- Haitz, M. M. (1997). The development of future thinking as essential for the emergence of skill in planning. In S. L. Friedman & E. K. Scholnick (Eds.), *The developmental psychology of planning: Why, how, and when to we plan?* (pp. 25–42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hansen, D., Larson, R., & Dworkin, J. (2003). What adolescents learn in organized youth activities: A survey of self-reported developmental experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*, 25–55.
- Heath, S. B., & Langman, J. (1994). Shared thinking and the register of coaching. In D. Biber & E. Finegan (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register* (pp. 82–105). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1998). Working through language. In S. M. Hoyle & C. T. Adger (Eds.), *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 217–240). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1999). Dimensions of language development: Lessons from older children. In A. S. Masten (Ed.), *Cultural processes in child development: The Minnesota symposium on child psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 59–75). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heath, S. B., & Smyth, L. (2000). *Art show: Youth and community development*. Washington, DC: Partners for Livable Communities.
- Holland, A., & Andre, T. (1987). Participation in extra-curricular activities in secondary school: What is known, what needs to be known? *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 437–466.
- Keating, D. P. (1980). Thinking processes in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescence* (pp. 211–246). New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Larson, R. (1985). Emotional scenarios in the writing process—an examination of young writers' affective experiences. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When the writer can't write: Studies of disruption in the composing process* (pp. 19–42). New York: Guilford.

- Larson, R. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist*, 55, 170-183.
- Larson, R. (2002). Globalization, societal change, and new technologies: What they mean for the future of adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12(1), 1-30.
- Larson, R., Clore, G., & Wood, G. (1999). The emotions of romantic relationships: Do they wreak havoc on adolescents? In W. Furman, B. B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *Romantic relationships in adolescence* (pp. 19-49). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Larson, R., Wilson, S., Brown, B. B., Furstenberg, F. E., & Verma, S. (2002). Changes in adolescents' interpersonal experiences: Are they being prepared for adult relationships in the 21st century? *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12(1), 31-68.
- Lerner, R., & Busch-Rossnagel, N. (1981). *Individuals as producers of their development*. New York: Academic.
- Marsh, H. W. (1992). Extracurricular activities: Beneficial extension of the traditional curriculum or subversion of academic goals? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(4), 553-562.
- Mascolo, M., Fisher, K., & Neimeyer, R. (1999). The dynamic codevelopment of intentionality, self, and social relations. In J. Brandstätter & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Action and self-development: Theory and research through the life span* (pp. 133-166). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLaughlin, M. (2000). *Community counts: How youth organizations matter for youth development*. Washington, DC: Public Education Network.
- Nurmi, J. (1991). How do adolescents see their future? A review of the development of future orientation and planning. *Developmental Review*, 11, 1-59.
- Piaget, J. (1929). *The child's conception of the world*. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, & Co.
- Piaget, J. (1954). *Construction of reality in the child*. New York: Basic.
- Radziszewska, B., & Rogoff, B. (1988). Influence of adult and peer collaborators on children's planning skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 24, 840-848.
- Radziszewska, B., & Rogoff, B. (1991). Children's guided participation in planning imaginary errands with skilled adult or peer partners. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 381-389.
- Rogoff, B. (1998). Cognition as a collaborative process. In W. Damon, D. Kuhn, & R. Siegler (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 679-744). New York: Wiley.
- Selman, R. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding*. New York: Academic.
- Shonkoff, J. R., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Rethinking nature and nurture: From neurons to neighborhoods*. National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Silbereisen, R. K., Eyferth, K., & Rudinger, G. (Eds.). (1996). *Development as action in context: Problem behavior and normal youth development*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Skinner, E. A. (1997). Planning and perceived control. In S. L. Friedman & E. K. Scholnick (Eds.), *The developmental psychology of planning: Why, how, and when to we plan?* (pp. 263-284). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Soep, E. (1997). Walking on water and knocking on doors. *New Designs for Youth Development*, 13(4), 32-35.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind and society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Roots of civic identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.