

The Youth Experience Survey 1.0: Instrument Development and Testing

David M. Hansen¹

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Reed Larson²

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

November 5, 2002

¹Department of Human and Community Development, 211 Child Development Laboratory, MC-038, 1105 West Nevada Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801. dmhans1@uiuc.edu

²Department of Human and Community Development, 211 Child Development Laboratory, MC-038, 1105 West Nevada Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801. larsonR@uiuc.edu

Table of Contents

Overview	3
Objectives and Parameters of the Instrument	3
Positive and Negative Experiences	3
Focus on the Immediate Past	3
Overlap between Dimensions of Experience	4
Personal vs. Interpersonal Positive Experiences	4
Use of the Scales as Independent, Dependent, of Mediating Variables	4
Target Populations	4
Types of activities	4
Age range of youth	5
Ethnicity	5
Item Development	5
Scale Development and Evaluation	6
The Center City Study	6
Sample Description	6
Scale refinement	7
Scale properties	8
Validity Study	8
Sample and Procedures	8
Conclusion	9
Instrument Strengths	9
Instrument Limitations	9
References	11
Tables	12
Appendix A	22

The Youth Experience Survey 1.0: Instrument Development and Testing

Overview

The Youth Experience Survey (YES) was developed to survey high-school aged adolescents about their developmental experiences in an extracurricular activity or community-based program. The YES includes 18 scales that assess self-reported experiences in the activity or program within six conceptual domains of development: Identity Work, Initiative, Basic Skills, Teamwork and Social Skills, Interpersonal Relationships, and Adult Networks. Five scales dealing with negative experiences that may interfere with development are also assessed. The instrument was designed for use with multiethnic youth and for use across a wide range of youth programs and activities.

This paper is divided into three sections. The first presents the guiding objectives used in designing the instrument and the parameters used in selecting items. The second section describes the stages of item development that led to a preliminary version of the YES. The third section presents results of two studies – the Center City Study and the Validity Study – used to finalize the scales of the instrument and obtain psychometric information on their properties.

Objectives and Parameters of the Instrument

Positive and Negative Experiences

Because the YES is intended to assess experiences related to development, its scales and items deal primarily with positive experiences. However, a limited number of scales and items dealing with negative experiences that might interfere with development are included. These positive and negative dimensions are not conceptualized as opposites. Prior research shows that removing negatives, while improving young people's well-being, does not necessarily promote positive development (Benson, 2000; Pittman, 1991; Roth, Brooks-Gunn, Murray, & Foster, 1998). For this theoretical reason we have not followed the practice of combining positively and negatively worded items within each scale, and have instead kept the positive and negative YES scales separate. This decision is supported by analysis of the data. In the small number of cases in which the YES positive and negative scales appear to be conceptually opposite from each other (i.e., *prosocial norms* and *negative group dynamics*), statistical analyses indicate that they are uncorrelated (Table 3).

Focus on the Immediate Past

Items in the YES are worded for an adolescent who is currently involved or has been involved in an organized youth activity or program within the last three months. Research shows that when respondents recall events and experiences that are further removed from the present the accuracy of recall is diminished (Stone et al., 2000). To address this time frame, the great

majority of items are worded in the past or past imperfect tense. A small number of items referring to recurring experiences or stable perceptions about the activity used present tense.

Overlap Between Dimensions of Experience

Our priority in forming scales was to survey experiences across the full range of conceptually important areas of positive development, rather than to produce scales that are statistically independent. Although we have given close attention to the results of factor analyses, we have not used it as the sole arbitrator of scale composition. Therefore, despite substantial correlations between different conceptual developmental domains (e.g., Initiative and Identity Work), we kept them separate because they represent theoretically separate processes. In several cases we also placed empirically uncorrelated dimensions together within one domain. For example, there is not a compelling reason why *emotional regulation* and *cognitive skills* should be strongly intercorrelated, and yet they still conceptually fit under the domain of Basic Skills. Our primary goal was choosing items and scales that correspond to the research literature and that adult leaders and adolescents think are important.

Personal and Interpersonal Positive Experiences

For purposes of organization, the six domains of positive experience within the YES have been grouped into two overarching categories: those that are personal or internal, and those that are interpersonal or external. This distinction was suggested by Larson (1994, 2000) and Youniss, Yates, and Su (1997). Similar distinctions have been made in the field of youth program development (Benson, 2000). It should be recognized, however, that personal and interpersonal experiences are often inter-related. Identity work, for example, may occur through community involvement. Therefore the division between these two overarching categories should not be over-emphasized.

Use of the Scales as Independent, Dependent, or Mediating Variables

The YES was developed as a survey of experiences, and was not intended for longitudinal research aimed at testing causal models of change. Researchers wanting to use the scales in this way are likely to face questions regarding whether the scales represent measures of independent or dependent variables. We see the YES scales as evaluating processes leading to growth; hence they might be seen as independent or mediating variables in a model of change. And yet, with the use of the stem “Learned to” in many items, the scales may also reflect the adolescents’ assessment of outcomes. Thus, one might expect correlation with self-report outcome measures administered at the same time due to common method variance. Caution is urged if using these measures in a causal model.

Target Populations

Types of activities. The YES was designed as a general instrument to discriminate experiences across all types of organized youth activities and programs. Given this broad goal, items were not included that ask about the specialized skills that might be gained within an

activity (such as those learned in the arts or sports). Researchers who desire to assess more specialized skills or experiences within a given activity are advised to seek an appropriate instrument.

Age range of youth. The YES was primarily developed with high school age youth, although a small number of youth as young as 7th grade were included in the development stages. The YES has been used successfully with over 500 youth in grades 9 thru 12. We consider the YES appropriate for high school aged youth. The appropriateness of the YES for junior high age youth has not been assessed, and we suspect that the abstract concepts used in some items may be beyond the comprehension of some younger adolescents.

Ethnicity. As described below, the YES was developed with multiethnic youth in mind, and a substantial proportion of multiethnic groups (particularly African Americans) were included in the development stages. However, further assessment with larger numbers of youth from a wider range of ethnic and racial groups would be desirable.

Item Development

As a first step in instrument development, focus groups were conducted to capture the language and concepts adolescents use to describe their developmental experiences in organized youth activities and programs. Ten focus groups, each with 4-9 adolescents, were conducted. The total sample included 55 youth (23 boys and 32 girls), ages 14-18, who were ethnically diverse (56% European American, 40% African-American and bi-racial). The leader of each focus group followed a semi-structured "rolling interview guide" (Morgan, 1997) aimed at getting students to describe their specific learning and growth experiences in youth activities in their own words. Transcripts of the focus group discussions were coded for recurrent themes and salient categories of developmental experiences and change (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). This process, along with a review of the literature, led us to identify the six domains of developmental experiences used for the YES. For a report on the focus group results see Dworkin, Larson, & Hansen, 2003.

Next, pools of items were generated to assess experiences in these six domains of developmental experiences. A smaller number of items assessing negative experiences were also generated. To do this we drew on the 120 pages of descriptions of such experiences from the focus groups. We also reviewed the theoretical and empirical literatures on positive development and features of contexts that foster positive development. This review included research on community-based youth organizations, extracurricular activities, parenting, coping, mastery learning, service learning, self-efficacy, community assets, adolescent employment, leadership, resilience, prosocial behavior, and sexual harassment. In a number of cases we adapted items from other instruments.

These pools of items were then vetted on three new focus groups of adolescents, containing youth as young as 7th grade. Working individually, these youth first rated their own experience on each of these preliminary items for a selected organized activity and rated each item on how "good" they thought it was. Then, as a group, they provided oral feedback on the merits and wording of each item. The students provided their "expert" opinions that some items

were too “cheesy” or not likely to be comprehensible by some teens, and they suggested changes in wording. This information was used to eliminate items with poor response characteristics and reword items to better capture their intended meaning.

As an additional step in refining the items we asked a set of 10 adult consultants to critically evaluate each item. This group included three nationally recognized researchers, six program leaders, and one parent who was a high school PTA president. They were asked to: “Rate each item on how important you think it could be in reflecting youth development. We want your judgment on whether the item reflects a worthy experience for a youth activity to foster (or avoid, in the case of negative items).” These adults were also asked to provide any additional comments they wanted about the items or instruments, which many did including suggesting additional items. This information was used to further refine and weed out items. This step led to the first complete version of the Youth Experiences Survey.

Scale Development and Evaluation

The Center City Study

This version of the YES was used to finalize scales within each of the domains of experiences and to obtain preliminary data from the instrument, drawing on data collected from a sizable sample of youth.

Sample description. The sample for the Center City Study included 450 students from high school in a small city in central Illinois. This city of 45,000 is typical of many working-class cities in the Midwest. Data from the 2000 U.S. Census showed that education levels for its population were somewhat below the state norms (75% of adults had graduated from high school, as compared to 80% for Illinois), the number of families living below the poverty line was somewhat higher (13% vs. 8%), and median household income was low (\$30,400 vs. \$46,600). Like other working class schools (Holland & Andre, 1987), sports were afforded high prestige and the school had high quality sports facilities, but it also offered a rich range of extra-curricular activities, including arts programs and student clubs. A variety of programs for youth were also available in the community (see Hansen, Larson, & Dworkin, 2002, for full description of the study).

All students in the 9th, 11th, and 12th grades who were in class on the day of the study were asked to participate. The 10th graders were unavailable due to a special course they were enrolled in. Of the 646 students invited, 506 (78%) agreed to participate. Sample attrition was partly due to administration of the instrument in a non-academic class during the week of final exams. Some students expressed the need to use this class period to prepare for upcoming exams, or just wanted to relax. Of the 506 participants, 450 (70%) completed the YES and provided data that met our quality criteria for inclusion in the final sample. These quality criteria were used to weed out students who did not take the survey seriously. A student’s data was included if two criteria were met: 1) he or she responded to at least 40% of the items (a few students quit responding part way through the instrument), and 2) he or she did not respond dogmatically to the instrument (defined as using all 1’s or all 4’s to more than 80% of the items).

The final sample included somewhat more females (55.8%) than males and consisted of 156 freshman, 157 juniors, and 137 seniors. Twenty-six percent of the students were African-American, 60% European-American, 4% Hispanic, 2% Asian, 2% American Indian, and 3% indicated other ethnicities or left this item blank. According to students' reports, the average education level of parents consisted of some college training, but not a college degree: 69% of mothers and 64% of fathers were reported to have at least some college education.

A randomization procedure was employed to assign each student to fill out the YES for one activity in which they were currently or recently involved (Hansen et al., in press). In cases when students were involved in more than one organized activity or program, this procedure typically assigned them to an activity that was less frequent (such as community and vocational activities) – so that we would obtain sufficient data across diverse types of activities. To permit comparisons to experiences with school and friends, some students were assigned to report on their experiences in these “comparison contexts,” but data from these are not included in this paper. The data reported here are based on the 356 students who filled out the YES for an organized program or activity.

Scale refinement. After the data from the study were obtained, several sources of information were employed to determine the YES scales and select items for each scale. Inter-item correlations, principal component analyses, and knowledge of the conceptual domains were used to refine scales within each of the six domains of development and within the domain of negative experiences.

Principal component analysis was employed as an important source of input. In preliminary analyses we first eliminated items that did not clearly belong in one of the domains. Then principal components analyses were conducted *within* each of the six domains of development and the domain of negative experience. The goal of principal component analyses is to explain the greatest percentage of variance with as few dimensions as possible. We did not specify the number of factors for each model and examined only those factors with Eigen values greater than 1.0. Our guideline was to include only items with loadings on a factor of greater than .40 (consistent with Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). The general analytic approach used here for examining factors and their loadings was suggested by Johnson and Wicher (1998): perform a principal component factor analysis with and without varimax rotation, perform a maximum likelihood factor analysis with and without rotation, compare the solutions. These analyses served as a guide to better understand the relationships among the items.

To finalize the scales, we drew on these statistical findings (including inter-item correlations and principal components analyses), the research literature, and the reports on the importance of items from adult and teen consultants during the item generation phase. As a team we discussed the merits of each possible scale and each item within that scale in relation to conceptual significance and the statistical integrity of scales, then came to agreement. Items that were statistically and conceptually indistinct were dropped. Our goal was to keep each scale brief, approximately 3-4 items. We chose scales that reflected conceptually important

dimensions, and we selected items for each scale that represented the range of content within that dimension and had adequate statistical properties.

This process led to the finalization of 18 scales representing significant dimensions within the six domains of positive development and five scales representing important dimensions of negative experience. The YES 1.0 (Appendix A), which resulted from this process, consists of 89 items that formed the 23 scales.

Scale properties. The means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas for the YES scales are presented in Table 1. In addition to reporting data for the 23 scales, we report data for the super-ordinate "domain scales," which are based on all the items within a specified developmental domain (e.g., Identity, Initiative, Negative Experiences). As shown, most scales had high reliability, with only 2 scales (self-knowledge, $\alpha = .58$, and exploration, $\alpha = .63$) below an alpha of .70.

The correlations among all YES scales are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Among the scales for positive experiences, the correlations ranged in magnitude from a low of .10 to a high of .91. These positive correlations indicate that many of the scales are not independent. The high number of significant correlations among the scales may reflect the possibility that good programs lead youth to have a wide range of positive experiences. This non-independence may also be partly due to method variance, for example, the tendency of some youth to be positive about everything. Means and Standard Deviations for the individual YES items and the item total correlation with its scale are presented in Table 4. These item total correlations ranged from a low of .39 to a high of .83, with lower correlations largely attributable to the small number of items in the scales.

Validity Study

An additional study was conducted to evaluate the convergent validity of the YES scales with reports from an observer. In this research, adolescents recruited from 10 organized youth activities completed the YES and, separately, an adult leader of the activity also filled it out *for each adolescent* based on what he or she had observed about that adolescent's experiences in that activity. A significant correlation between participants' reports is interpreted as evidence that a scale taps an observable developmental domain.

Sample and procedures. The 10 organized activities ranged from sports to arts to faith-based to community organizations. The adolescents in this study were 65 high school youth (37 girls and 28 boys), living in the central Midwest. The mean age of the youth was 16 years old (range = 13 to 18). There were five female adult leaders and five male adult leaders. The mean age range of adult leaders was 40-45 years of age, with a range of 30-over 50. The average time the leader had led youth in the activity was 7.7 years (Range = 1 to 25 years).

The YES used in this study was identical to that used for the Center City analysis, except that items were added to create a scale of communication skills and a scale of integration with family. The negative scales were not included in this study.

Validity findings. Most of the 10 youth activities were short-term summer programs, which meant there had not been a great deal of time for youth to have developmental experiences, nor for leaders to observe them. Despite this limited time, the adolescents' and leaders' reports were substantially and significantly correlated for nine of the 18 scales and for four out of the six super-ordinate domain scales (see Table 5). The leaders' evaluation of the youth's experiences of *self-knowledge*, *cognitive skills*, *physical skills*, *prosocial norms*, *leadership and responsibility*, and *linkages to work and college* were substantially correlated.

Correlations were low and non-significant for the scales in two developmental domains, Initiative and Basic Skills. In the latter case this was due to one scale, *emotional regulation*. We think these low correlations are in domains in which learning and change is more internal and out of sight of the adult leader. For example within the domain of Initiative, adult leaders of programs may not have had opportunities to observe youths' experiences related to goal setting and time management.

In sum, the correspondence between the leaders' responses and adolescents' responses in this study provide evidence for the validity of the YES scales. We encourage further testing of validity of the YES with a larger sample.

Conclusion

Instrument Strengths

The YES is different from other instruments in that it directly focuses on experiences likely to occur in youth activities rather than on generalized constructs (e.g., abstract features of the program). This instrument offers a quick and easy way to assess the rate and variety of a wide range of self-reported developmental experiences in organized youth activities and programs. The instrument was constructed using youth's first hand reports from focus groups on their experiences, as well as knowledge from the literature and input from adult experts. As such, we think the items of the YES portray the types and varieties of experiences occurring in organized youth activities and programs.

The YES has the additional strength of being tested with two separate groups of youth. These tests demonstrated that the scales have acceptable psychometric properties and offer evidence of scale validity. We recommend that researchers use all of the scales within a domain, since individual scales have few items. However, the decision to use a domain or a specific scale within a domain will hinge on the needs of the particular study.

Instrument Limitations

We make no claim that the YES covers all of the developmental experiences in organized youth activities and programs, nor that the six domains and 18 dimensions of positive experiences covered represent a conclusive categorization of what is most important. The state of

the research literature on youth programs is not far enough along for there to be any surety about what the full range of developmental experiences comprises.

It should be kept in mind that the YES was designed specifically to capture the developmental experiences in organized youth activities and programs. As such, it may tend to cast a positive light on these activities and programs if used to compare them to other activities in youths' lives (as we have done). It must also be kept in mind that some organized activities provide developmental experiences not covered by the YES. Specialized types of learning experiences within specific activities (e.g., sports and arts) are also not well covered by the YES.

The YES has not been sufficiently tested for use with grades earlier than 9th grade. Testing with younger ages should be undertaken prior to using the YES on this population.

Effects of response sets and young people's self-selection into an activity on the data should be kept in mind. In current research, we have sought to address these issues by asking youth to fill out the YES on two activities. This allows use of statistical techniques that minimize the influence of these effects through use of "within-person" comparisons. In addition, while self-report offers a rapid means to assess youths' experiences in activities, it is subject to the limitations of this methodology. Youth's perception of experiences within a program would benefit from independent verification of these experiences.

References

- Benson, P., & Saito, R. (2000). The scientific foundations of youth development. In N. Jaffe & J. Marquis (Eds.), Youth development: Issues, challenges and directions (pp. 126-147). Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.
- 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. & Barber, B. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching-band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? Journal of Adolescent Research, *14* (1), 10-43.
- Hansen, D. M., & Larson, R. (2002). The Youth Experience Survey. Unpublished manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Hansen, D. M., Larson, R., & Dworkin, J. (in press). What adolescents learn in organized youth activities: A survey of self-reported developmental experiences. Journal of Youth and Adolescence.
- Holland, A. & Andre, T. (1987). Participation in extracurricular activities in secondary school: What is known, what needs to be known? Review of Educational Research, *57* (4), 437-466.
- Johnson, R. A. & Wichern, D. W. (1998). Applied multivariate statistical analysis (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Larson, R. (1994). Youth organizations, hobbies, and sports as developmental contexts. In R. K. Silberiesen & E. Todt (Eds.), Adolescence in context (pp. 46-65). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Larson, R. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. American Psychologist, *55*, 170-183.
- Morgan, D. (1997). Focus groups as qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pittman, K. (1991). Promoting youth development: Strengthening the role of youth serving and community organizations. Washington, DC: Center for Youth Development and Policy Research, Academy for Educational Development.
- Roth, J., Brooks-Gunn, J., Murray, L. & Foster, W. (1998). Promoting healthy adolescents: Synthesis of youth development program evaluations. Journal of Research on Adolescence, *8*(4), 423-459.
- Stone, J. S. Turkkan, C. A. Bachrach, J. B. Jobe, H. S. Kurtzman, & V. S. Cain (2000). The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice, pp. 3-9 Lawrence Earlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. NY: Harper and Row.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). Introduction to qualitative research methods: A guidebook and resource (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Youniss, J., Yates, M., & Su, Y. (1997). Social integration: Community service and marijuana use in high school seniors. Journal of Adolescent Research, *12* (2), 245-262.

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's alphas for the YES 1.0 (n = 356)

Category of Developmental Experience Scales (Cronbach's alpha)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
<u>Personal Development</u>			
Identity Work	2.84	.65	.81
Exploration	2.90	.82	.63
Self-Knowledge	3.34	.72	.58
Identity Reflection	2.59	.84	.80
Initiative	2.95	.71	.91
Goal Setting	2.96	.86	.84
Effort	3.06	.86	.85
Problem Solving	2.78	.90	.80
Time Management	2.84	.80	.75
Basic Skills	2.55	.79	.87
Emotional Regulation	2.71	.90	.88
Cognitive Skills	2.36	.86	.74
Physical Skills*	2.56	1.28	--
<u>Interpersonal Development</u>			
Teamwork and Social Skills	2.95	.71	.93
Group Process Skills	3.00	.80	.84
Feedback	3.01	.96	.88
Leadership and Responsibility	2.91	.84	.84
Communication Skills+	2.92	.87	.80
Interpersonal Relationships	3.00	.71	.83
Diverse Peer Relationships	3.18	.79	.75
Prosocial Norms	2.79	.86	.81
Adult Networks	2.62	.86	.83
Integration with Family+	2.47	1.13	.84
Linkages to Community	2.67	1.04	.87
Linkages to Work and College	2.61	1.00	.81
<u>Negative Experiences</u>			
Stress	1.87	.71	.94
Stress	2.14	.94	.84
Negative Peer Interaction	1.81	.88	.83
Social Exclusion	1.85	.91	.78
Negative Group Dynamics	1.97	.82	.73
Inappropriate Adult Behavior	1.81	.83	.91

All data are based on the larger Center City study sample, except for the two items marked with a +.

* single item

Table 2

Intercorrelations among the YES 1.0 Scales (n = 356)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
1 Identity Work	--																								
2 Exploration	.78	--																							
3 Self-knowledge	.55	.30	--																						
4 Identity Reflection	.91	.53	.35	--																					
5 Initiative	.76	.55	.48	.70	--																				
6 Goal Setting	.70	.52	.43	.65	.87	--																			
7 Effort	.60	.42	.45	.54	.83	.65	--																		
8 Problem Solving	.58	.44	.33	.54	.76	.56	.44	--																	
9 Time Management	.60	.44	.35	.57	.85	.62	.59	.59	--																
10 Basic Skills	.59	.42	.41	.55	.70	.58	.60	.49	.60	--															
11 Emotional Regulation	.64	.49	.38	.59	.75	.61	.62	.58	.67	.79	--														
12 Cognitive Skills	.43	.27	.25	.43	.48	.40	.32	.46	.41	.69	.45	--													
13 Physical Skills	.35	.24	.32	.30	.42	.37	.45	.19	.34	.72	.43	.27	--												
14 Teamwork and Social Skills	.68	.52	.41	.61	.75	.63	.57	.63	.66	.60	.71	.42	.30	--											
15 Group Process	.54	.42	.32	.49	.64	.52	.50	.51	.59	.47	.60	.28	.23	.88	--										
16 Feedback	.42	.36	.27	.35	.45	.35	.30	.42	.42	.37	.45	.26	.18	.72	.55	--									
17 Leadership	.62	.46	.36	.59	.68	.58	.51	.57	.58	.55	.62	.42	.29	.89	.62	.52	--								
18 Interpersonal Relationships	.57	.39	.32	.54	.60	.51	.43	.50	.54	.47	.53	.40	.22	.69	.54	.48	.66	--							
19 Diverse Peer Relations	.42	.31	.32	.35	.44	.39	.33	.34	.39	.32	.35	.27	.10	.54	.42	.39	.53	.85	--						
20 Prosocial Norms	.59	.37	.27	.61	.64	.54	.45	.55	.57	.53	.57	.45	.29	.65	.53	.43	.63	.87	.45	--					
21 Adult Networks	.66	.42	.33	.66	.69	.58	.55	.53	.59	.59	.61	.46	.34	.66	.57	.44	.59	.73	.46	.77	--				
22 Integration with Family	.46	.31	.19	.47	.41	.35	.30	.33	.36	.41	.42	.29	.27	.40	.29	.23	.41	.51	.36	.51	.64	--			
23 Linkages to Community	.57	.37	.23	.58	.56	.46	.45	.43	.49	.53	.56	.35	.34	.55	.45	.36	.51	.61	.34	.70	.84	.52	--		
24 Linkages to Work and College	.52	.30	.29	.53	.54	.45	.42	.43	.46	.49	.47	.48	.25	.50	.43	.32	.44	.57	.39	.59	.80	.43	.50	--	

Note. All correlation coefficients are significant at .01 level. *indicates non-significant correlation

Table 3
Intercorrelations of Negative Scales and Positive YES 1.0 scales (n = 356)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Negative	--					
2. Stress	.70*	--				
3. Negative Peer interactions	.83*	.44*	--			
4. Social Exclusion	.76*	.41*	.62*	--		
5. Negative Group Dynamics	.83*	.53*	.67*	.61*	--	
6. Inappropriate Adult Behavior	.91*	.49*	.68*	.60*	.65*	--
7. Identity Work	.06	.15*	.09	-.00	.08	.00
8. Exploration	-.01	.11*	.06	-.06	.05	-.06
9. Self-knowledge	.07	.13*	.02	-.02	.03	.01
10. Identity Reflection	.06	.12*	.11*	.03	.08	.03
11. Initiative	.04	.18*	.02	-.12	.11*	-.01
12. Goal Setting	.03	.16*	.03	-.06	.09	-.02
13. Effort	.02	.12*	-.01	-.04	.09	-.01
14. Problem Solving	.08	.18*	.06	.05	.09	.05
15. Time Management	-.02	-.13*	-.00	-.01	-.07	.04
16. Basic Skills	.22*	.23*	.18*	.06	.20*	.19*
17. Emotional Regulation	.11*	.15*	.07	-.01	.11*	.10
18. Cognitive Skills	.12*	.16*	.11*	.03	.09	.21*
19. Physical Skills	.26*	.22*	.20*	.09	.21*	.22*
20. Teamwork and Social Skills	-.06	.07	-.10	-.13*	.04	-.09
21. Group Process	-.13*	.01	-.07	-.13*	-.03	-.15*
22. Feedback	-.11	.02	-.04	-.16*	-.03	-.12*
23. Leadership	.03	.11*	.06	-.08	.11	-.00
24. Interpersonal Relationships	.05	.10*	.05	-.08	.07	.07
25. Diverse Peer Relations	-.00	.06	-.01	-.12*	.02	.00

26 Prosocial Norms	.10	.09	.08	-.02	.11*	.12*
27. Adult Networks	.12*	.14*	.12*	-.02	.09	.12*
28. Integration with Family	.18*	.12*	.14*	.11*	.15*	.17*
23 Linkages to Community	.06	.08	.08	-.06	.02	.06
24 Linkages to Work and College	.11	.14*	.11*	-.01	.11*	.10

*p. < .05

Table 4

YES 1.0 Item Mean, Standard Deviation, and Item Correlation with Scale (n = 356)

	<u>M</u> (<u>SD</u>)	Item Total Correlation with scale*
IDENTITY WORK		
Self Knowledge		
1. Learned about what I am good at	3.33 (.85)	.41
2. Learned about my likes and dislikes	3.36 (.86)	.41
Exploration		
3. Tried doing new things	3.25 (.94)	.39
4. Tried a new way of acting around people	2.71 (1.16)	.45
5. I do things here I don't get to do anywhere else	2.73 (1.18)	.43
Identity Reflection		
6. Started thinking more about my future because of this activity	2.85 (1.13)	.55
7. This activity got me thinking about who I am	2.80 (1.10)	.67
8. This activity made me feel that I can make a difference in the world	2.44 (1.17)	.64
9. This activity has been a positive turning point in my life	2.80 (1.10)	.65
10. This activity helped me think about my ethnic or racial heritage	2.05 (1.16)	.44
INITIATIVE		
Goals		
11. I set goals for myself in this activity	3.07 (1.04)	.71
12. Learned to find ways to achieve my goals	2.95 (1.06)	.74
13. Learned to consider possible obstacles when making plans	2.90 (1.02)	.72
14. Learned to think about how other people fit into my plans	2.92 (1.06)	.55
Effort		
15. I put all my energy into this activity	2.90 (1.06)	.66
16. Learned to push myself	3.02 (1.05)	.76
17. Learned that hard work pays off	3.5 (1.04)	.70
18. Learned to focus my attention	3.07 (.97)	.69

Problem Solving			
19.	Observed how others solved problems and learned from them	2.93 (1.03)	.56
20.	Learned about developing plans for solving a problem	2.74 (1.06)	.72
21.	Used my imagination to solve a problem	2.65 (1.12)	.59

Time Management			
22.	Learned about organizing time and not procrastinating (not putting things off)	2.89 (1.03)	.61
23.	Learned about setting priorities	2.93 (1.10)	.64
24.	Learned to get my homework done in order to have time for this activity	2.83 (1.09)	.51
25.	Practiced self discipline	2.79 (1.01)	.46

BASIC SKILLS

Emotional Regulation			
26.	Learned about controlling my temper	2.60 (1.20)	.67
27.	Became better at dealing with fear and anxiety	2.68 (1.15)	.67
28.	Became better at handling stress	2.69 (1.13)	.75
29.	Learned to relax	2.78 (1.11)	.73
30.	Learned that my emotions affect how I perform	2.81 (1.15)	.66
31.	Learned when to express emotions	2.71 (1.11)	.71

Cognitive Skills

In this activity I have improved:			
32.	Academic skills (reading, writing, math, etc.)	2.42 (1.24)	.60
33.	Skills for finding information	2.53 (1.16)	.61
34.	Computer/internet skills	1.95 (1.15)	.57
35.	Artistic/creative skills	2.47 (1.18)	.38

PHYSICAL SKILLS

36.	Athletic or physical skills	2.56 (1.28)	--
-----	-----------------------------	----------------	----

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

TEAM WORK AND SOCIAL SKILLS

Group Process Skills			
37.	Learned that working together requires some compromising	3.00 (1.01)	.69
38.	Became better at sharing responsibility	2.96 (1.01)	.73
39.	Learned to be patient with other group members	3.05 (1.01)	.72
40.	Learned that my emotions and attitude can affect others in the group	3.09 (1.01)	.62
41.	Learned that it is not necessary to like people in order to work with them	2.93 (1.06)	.54

Feedback			
42.	I became better at giving feedback	2.99 (1.06)	.79
43.	I became better at taking feedback	3.03 (1.01)	.79

Leadership and Responsibility			
44.	Learned about the challenges of being a leader	2.99 (1.04)	.76
45.	Other youth in this activity counted on me	2.97 (1.05)	.79
46.	I have done things to be supportive of others	3.07 (1.04)	.70
47.	Had an opportunity to be in charge of a group of peers	2.88 (1.10)	.71
48.	Learned to stand up for myself	2.64 (1.16)	.32

Diverse Peer Relationships			
49.	Made friends with someone of the opposite gender	3.28 (1.04)	.44
50.	Learned I had a lot in common with youth from different backgrounds	3.10 (1.04)	.54
51.	Made friends with someone from a different ethnic group	3.16 (1.03)	.57
52.	Made friends with someone from a different social class (someone richer or poorer)	3.18 (1.04)	.64

Prosocial Norms			
53.	Learned about helping others	3.26 (1.00)	.56
54.	I was able to change my school or community for the better	2.43 (1.15)	.62
55.	Learned I could make a difference in my community	2.62 (1.14)	.77

56.	This activity got me thinking about obstacles people face due to ethnic discrimination, poverty, physical disabilities, or other things	2.65 (1.20)	.60
57.	Learned to appreciate other people's backgrounds	2.94 (1.05)	.62

ADULT NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

Integration with Family**			
58.	This activity improved my relationship with my parents/guardians	2.57 (.89)	.77
59.	I had good conversations with my parents/guardians because of this activity	2.71 (.92)	.77

Linkages to Community			
60.	Got to know people in the community	2.82 (1.15)	.68
61.	Came to feel more supported by the community	2.59 (1.16)	.83
62.	Came to feel more a part of my community	2.62 (1.19)	.79

Linkages to Work and College			
63.	This activity opened up job or career opportunities for me	2.47 (1.18)	.62
64.	This activity helped prepare me for college	2.52 (1.19)	.74
65.	This activity increased my desire to stay in school	2.83 (1.18)	.61

NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES

Stress			
66.	Demands were so great that I didn't get homework done (skip this item if your Target Activity is a class)	2.17 (1.15)	.61
67.	This activity interfered with doing things with family	2.16 (1.11)	.69
68.	This activity has stressed me out	2.15 (1.16)	.71
69.	Have felt over-worked in this activity	2.10 (1.18)	.67

Negative Peer Interaction			
70.	I did something in this activity that was morally wrong	1.86 (1.11)	.69
71.	Felt pressured by peers to do something I didn't want to do	1.74 (1.03)	.72
72.	Youth in this activity made fun of me for something I did in this activity	1.93 (1.13)	.58
73.	Youth in this activity got me into drinking alcohol or using drugs	1.70 (1.10)	.63

Social Exclusion			
74.	Felt like I didn't belong in this activity	1.75 (1.08)	.64
75.	I felt left out	1.72 (1.04)	.72
76.	There were cliques in this activity	2.07 (1.14)	.49

Negative Group Dynamics			
77.	I get stuck doing more than my fair share	2.25 (1.16)	.52
78.	Participants say negative things about this activity	2.04 (1.05)	.59
79.	Other youth in this activity made inappropriate sexual comments, jokes, or gestures	2.00 (1.15)	.55
80.	Was discriminated against because of my gender, race, ethnicity, disability, or sexual orientation	1.57 (.97)	.44
Note: The following set of items (81-89) were only asked if there was an adult or young adult, coach, director, teacher, or leader.			

Inappropriate Adult Behavior			
81.	My ideas were put down by adults in this activity	1.83 (1.12)	.75
82.	Adult leaders in this activity are controlling and manipulative	1.91 (1.11)	.73
83.	Adult leaders blamed us for things beyond our control	1.84 (1.07)	.77
84.	Adult leaders in this activity made unreasonable demands on my time	1.87 (1.12)	.75
85.	Adult leaders "hit" on me (made sexual advances)	1.59 (1.00)	.73
86.	Adult leaders made inappropriate sexual comments or jokes	1.63 (1.00)	.72
87.	Adult leaders played favorites	2.14 (1.11)	.49
88.	Adult leaders encouraged me to do something I believed morally wrong	1.60 (1.00)	.73
89.	Adults in this activity talked down to teens	1.89 (1.12)	.72

* Item total correlations are the correlation with the total scale scores with that item removed.

** indicates item analysis based on Validity Study data

Scale range = 1-4, where 1 is 'not at all' and 4 is 'yes, definitely'

Table 5
Youth-Leader Correspondence Correlations on the YES 1.0 (N=65)

Learning Experiences	Youth/Leader Correlation¹
<u>Identity Work</u>	.24*
Exploration	.22*
Self-Knowledge	.33**
Identity Reflection	.18
<u>Initiative</u>	-.05
Goal Setting	-.08
Effort	.08
Problem Solving	.07
Time Management	.06
<u>Basic Skills</u>	.10
Emotional Regulation	-.17
Cognitive Skills	.47**
Physical Skills (single item)	.41**
<u>Interpersonal Relationships</u>	.37**
Diverse Peer relationships	.15
Prosocial Norms	.47**
<u>Teamwork and Social Skills</u>	.31**
Group process	.07
Feedback	.12
Leadership and responsibility	.37**
Communication Skills	.25*
<u>Adult Networks</u>	.48**
Integration with family	.25*
Linkages to community	.17
Linkages to work and college	.57**

¹ One-tailed t-tests or correlation coefficient, * p < .05, ** p < .01. Correlation coefficients based on Validity study data.

Appendix A
YES Version 1.0

Note: We have provided scale and subscale titles here, but they do not appear in the version given to youth

Your Experiences In The Target Activity

Instructions: Based on your current or recent involvement in the TARGET ACTIVITY, please rate whether you have had the following experiences.

Learning Experiences

Yes, Definitely Quite a Bit A Little Not At All

EXPERIMENTATION AND IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT

Self Knowledge

1. Learned about what I am good at	1	2	3	4
2. Learned about my likes and dislikes	1	2	3	4

Exploration

3. Tried doing new things	1	2	3	4
4. Tried a new way of acting around people	1	2	3	4
5. I do things here I don't get to do anywhere else	1	2	3	4

Identity

6. Started thinking more about my future because of this activity	1	2	3	4
7. This activity got me thinking about who I am	1	2	3	4
8. This activity made me feel that I can make a difference in the world	1	2	3	4
9. This activity has been a positive turning point in my life	1	2	3	4
10. This activity helped me think about my ethnic or racial heritage	1	2	3	4

AGENCY SKILLS/ INITIATIVE

Goals

11. I set goals for myself in this activity	1	2	3	4
12. Learned to find ways to achieve my goals	1	2	3	4
13. Learned to consider possible obstacles when making plans	1	2	3	4
14. Learned to think about how other people fit into my plans	1	2	3	4

Effort and Perseverance

15. I put all my energy into this activity	1	2	3	4
16. Learned to push myself	1	2	3	4
17. Learned that hard work pays off	1	2	3	4
18. Learned to focus my attention	1	2	3	4

Problem Solving

19. Observed how others solved problems and learned from them	1	2	3	4
20. Learned about developing plans for solving a problem	1	2	3	4
21. Used my imagination to solve a problem	1	2	3	4

Time Management				
22. Learned about organizing time and not procrastinating (not putting things off)	1	2	3	4
23. Learned about setting priorities	1	2	3	4
24. Learned not to over-commit myself	1	2	3	4
25. Practiced self discipline	1	2	3	4

EMOTIONAL REGULATION

26. Learned about controlling my temper	1	2	3	4
27. Learned about overcoming fear and anxiety	1	2	3	4
28. Learned how to handle stress	1	2	3	4
29. Learned to relax	1	2	3	4
30. Learned that my emotions affect how I perform	1	2	3	4
31. Learned when to express emotions	1	2	3	4

COGNITIVE AND PHYSICAL SKILLS

In this activity I have improved:				
32. Academic skills (reading, writing, math, etc.)	1	2	3	4
33. Skills for finding information	1	2	3	4
34. Athletic or physical skills	1	2	3	4
35. Computer/internet skills	1	2	3	4
36. Artistic/creative skills	1	2	3	4

TEAM WORK AND SOCIAL SKILLS

Group Process Skills				
37. Learned that working together requires some compromising	1	2	3	4
38. Learned to share responsibility	1	2	3	4
39. Learned to be patient with other group members	1	2	3	4
40. Learned that my emotions and attitude can affect others in the group				
41. Learned that it is not necessary to like people in order to work with them	1	2	3	4

Feedback				
42. I became comfortable giving feedback	1	2	3	4
43. I became comfortable taking feedback	1	2	3	4

Leadership and Responsibility				
44. Learned about the challenges of being a leader	1	2	3	4
45. Other youth in this activity counted on me	1	2	3	4
46. I have done things to be supportive of others	1	2	3	4
47. Had an opportunity to be in charge of a group of peers	1	2	3	4
48. Learned to stand up for myself	1	2	3	4

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Diverse Peer Relationships				
49. Made friends with someone of the opposite gender	1	2	3	4
50. Learned I had a lot in common with youth from different	1	2	3	4

backgrounds				
51. Made friends with someone from a different ethnic group	1	2	3	4
52. Made friends with someone from a different social class (someone richer or poorer)	1	2	3	4

Prosocial Norms				
53. Learned about helping others	1	2	3	4
54. I was able to change my school or community for the better	1	2	3	4
55. Learned I could make a difference in my community	1	2	3	4
56. This activity got me thinking about obstacles people face due to ethnic discrimination, poverty, physical disabilities, or other things	1	2	3	4
57. Learned to appreciate other people's backgrounds	1	2	3	4

ADULT NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

Integration with Family				
58. This activity improved my relationship with my parents	1	2	3	4
59. I had good conversations with my parents/guardians because of this activity	1	2	3	4

Linkages to Community				
60. Got to know people in the community (other than adult leaders)	1	2	3	4
61. Came to feel more supported by the community	1	2	3	4
62. Came to feel more a part of my community	1	2	3	4

Linkages to Work and College				
63. This activity opened up job or career opportunities for me	1	2	3	4
64. This activity helped prepare me for college	1	2	3	4
65. This activity increased my desire to stay in school	1	2	3	4

Negative Experiences

Stress				
66. Demands were so great that I didn't get homework done (skip this item if your Target Activity is a class)	1	2	3	4
67. This activity interfered with doing things with family	1	2	3	4
68. This activity has stressed me out	1	2	3	4
69. Have felt over-worked in this activity	1	2	3	4

Negative Peer Influences				
70. I did something in this activity that was morally wrong	1	2	3	4
71. Felt pressured by peers to do something I didn't want to do	1	2	3	4
72. Youth in this activity made fun of me for something I did in this activity	1	2	3	4
73. Youth in this activity got me into drinking alcohol or using drugs	1	2	3	4

Social Exclusion				
74. Felt like I didn't belong in this activity	1	2	3	4
75. I felt left out	1	2	3	4
76. There were cliques in this activity	1	2	3	4

Negative Group Dynamics				
77. I get stuck doing more than my fair share	1	2	3	4
78. Participants say negative things about this activity	1	2	3	4
79. Other youth in this activity made inappropriate sexual comments, jokes, or gestures	1	2	3	4
80. Was discriminated against because of my gender, race, ethnicity, disability, or sexual orientation	1	2	3	4

Note: The following set of items (90-98) are not asked if there is no adult or young adult, coach, director, teacher, or leader.

Inappropriate Adult Behavior				
81. My ideas were put down by adults in this activity	1	2	3	4
82. Adult leaders in this activity are controlling and manipulative	1	2	3	4
83. Adult leaders blamed us for things beyond our control	1	2	3	4
84. Adult leaders in this activity made unreasonable demands on my time	1	2	3	4
85. Adult leaders "hit" on me (made sexual advances)	1	2	3	4
86. Adult leaders made inappropriate sexual comments or jokes	1	2	3	4
87. Adult leaders played favorites	1	2	3	4
88. Adult leaders encouraged me to do something I believed morally wrong	1	2	3	4
89. Adults in this activity talked down to teens	1	2	3	4