The Youth Experience Survey 2.0:
Instrument Revisions and Validity Testing*

David M. Hansen[1]
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Reed Larson[2]
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

February 28, 2005

[1] Department of Human and Community Development, 211 Child Development Laboratory, MC-038, 1105 East Nevada Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801. dmhanse1@uiuc.edu.
[2] Department of Human and Community Development, 211 Child Development Laboratory, MC-038, 1105 East Nevada Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801. larsonR@uiuc.edu.

The Youth Experience Survey 2.0:
Instrument Revisions and Validity Testing

Summary

The Youth Experience Survey (YES) was developed as a self-report instrument to inventory high school-aged students' developmental experiences in an organized youth activity, such as an extracurricular activity or community-based program. This paper describes how the YES 1.0 (see Hansen and Larson, 2002) was revised to create the YES 2.0. It also describes the measurement properties of the revised YES, 2.0. The revised instrument is quite similar to the original, but it is shorter and is backed by stronger evidence of scale reliability and validity.

An Overview of the Instrument

The objectives and parameters of the YES 2.0 are the same as those of the YES 1.0. The instrument was designed to obtain reports from diverse high-school-aged youth on the types of developmental experiences they have encountered in a specific organized activity. The YES items focus primarily on positive developmental experiences within three domains of personal development (Identity Work, Initiative, Basic Skills) and three domains of interpersonal development (Teamwork and Social Skills, Positive Relationships, and Adult Networks and Social Capital). One scale represents each of these six domains[3] and there are 17 subscales composed from the items within the six higher order scales. In addition, the YES includes five scales that deal with different types of negative experiences: Stress, Inappropriate Adult Behavior, Negative Influence, Social Exclusion, and Negative Group Dynamics.

The development of the original instrument entailed multiple steps including: conducting focus groups with youth, reading the literature on organized activities, vetting potential items with diverse youth and with a set of adult "experts", and assessing item properties (Hansen & Larson, 2002). The domains of experience evaluated by the scales represent developmental domains that have been discussed in the literature on organized programs and that involve processes in which youth are active and conscious agents of their own development (and thus should be more accessible to youth's self-report). The items within the scales are worded to focus on adolescent's recent participation in the activity. Although the scales and items were selected to capture the developmental experiences that are salient in organized activities, for comparative purposes, the YES has been used to asses those same experiences in other settings of youth's daily lives,

---

[3] The domain Basic Skills includes both cognitive and emotion items, which are not strongly correlated with each other. Thus, we do not compute an overall scale for this domain. The cognitive items don't fit the general focus of the instrument on domains of socio-emotional development, therefore in some contexts we report findings only for the Emotional Regulation subscale from this grouping.

specifically school classes, leisure with friends, and work at a part-time job (Hansen, Larson, & Dworkin, 2001; Larson, Hansen, & Moneta, submitted).

Creation of the YES 2.0

Our objective in revising the YES was to create a shorter instrument that had stronger psychometric properties. The goal of this process was to reduce the number of items in each scale but retain the scale's conceptual and measurement integrity. The scales and subscales of the YES 2.0 are largely the same as those of the YES 1.0, with fewer items. In addition, there have been small changes in the wording of several items, and the names of several scales have been revised. The revised instrument is provided in Appendix A.

Revising Items

Decisions about eliminating and changing the wording of items were based in part on analyses of response to the YES 1.0. We employed data from a study with a sample of diverse students from the high school in a small city in central Illinois (Hansen, Larson & Dworkin, 2003). Each youth in this study reported on either an organized activity or on a comparison activity (a class or "hanging out with friends"). Our item analyses employed data from the 356 students who filled out the YES for an organized activity.

Item revision was focused at the subscale level. To reduce the number of items in each subscale, we generally chose items that increased the Cronbach's alpha for a subscale, while at the same time attempting to maintain the diversity of content represented within the subscale's domain. A total of 16 items were deleted from the positive YES scales and 6 items were deleted from the negative scales. The wording of items were changed when there was a compelling reason to retain an item but the item response pattern provided little spread or we had received multiple questions about the meaning of the item during the administration of the instrument. The changes in specific items are itemized in Table 1.

Changes in Scales and Scale Names

The following additional changes were made in the scales and subscales:
1. Item analysis indicated that the subscale for self-knowledge was not sufficiently distinct from the other Identity subscales, so these items and the subscale were dropped.
2. We felt that our original label for the Interpersonal Relationships scale did not adequately reflect the common content of the two dimensions within it. Thus we changed the name of the scale to Positive Relationships.
3. To more accurately reflect the items in the original Negative Peer Interactions scale, we changed the scale label to Negative Influences.
4. We changed the name of the Leadership subscale to Leadership and Responsibility
5. We added to the original name of the Adult Network scale to call it Adult Networks and Social Capital.

YES Version 2.0 Scale Properties

The revised instrument, the YES 2.0, was administered to a large sample of youth and the data were used to evaluate its scales. This section of the paper presents data on the psychometric properties of the YES 2.0, focusing first on the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the scales, second on the results of a confirmatory factor analyses, and finally on results from a study of the validity of the instrument.

Means and SD, Intercorrelations, and Reliability

Data for these analyses come from a representative sample of 2,280 11th grade students who completed the YES 2.0. These youth included 11th graders from 19 diverse high schools and approximately matched the population of Illinois in ethnicity, SES, and urban vs. suburban vs. rural residence (Larson, Hansen, & Moneta, submitted). Data were obtained using a mobile computer lab. The computer server systematically selected two target activities for each student, and the student was administered the YES for each target activity. These analyses are based on reports of 1822 students who provided YES data on at least one organized activity. In cases where a student provided YES data on two organized activities, one was chosen at random.

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for each scale, the intercorrelations among the scales, and the scale reliabilities. These data show that the correlations between the positive and negative scales were low, which suggests there are two broad dimensions or first-order factors: positive developmental and negative experiences. The positive scales of the YES 2.0 are moderately intercorrelated. Three of the 15 positive scales are correlated at .62 or higher, and the remaining 15 ranged in correlation between .50 and the .60. The negative scales are also intercorrelated, with a range of correlations between scales of .46 to .77. Although the high intercorrelations among the negative scales are a concern, that may be indicative of shared program and individual factors that influence responses to all of these scales, rather than a lack of conceptual differentiation. This is suggested by the high correlation between scales that deal with the leader and peer interactions. Indeed, research indicates that adult behavior, particularly negative adult behavior, can have a strong effect on youth's experience in a program and encourage similar negative peer interaction and negative group dynamics (Smoll & Smith, 1989; Brudstad, Babkes, & Smith, 2001).

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) were conducted to examine the factor structure of the YES 2.0 positive and negative scales. The data for these analyses come from the 1822 youth, described above, who provided YES data on at least one organized activity. There were two interrelated objectives of this CFA. First, we used CFA to evaluate if a six scale positive and five scale negative model fit the data better than a single positive scale model and a single negative scale model. This objective addressed whether each positive and negative YES scale is better conceptualized as one factor versus separate factors. Second, we used CFA to determine if it is more accurate to conceptualize the scales as statistically independent dimensions versus scales that are statistically interrelated, but conceptually distinct.

Results. For the first objective the goal was to evaluate whether the YES items loaded better on a one-factor or a multi-factor scale. Separate procedures were run for the positive YES items and the negative items. To address this goal, the Goodness of Fit Indexes (GFI) for two competing models were compared. For the positive items, the first model included the six positive latent YES scales with the covariances among these scales allowed to vary freely (the general, oblique model). The second model contained one latent positive scale with all of the items forced to load onto one scale. For the negative items, the same two models were compared using the five negative latent YES scales.

The results for the first objective indicated that the multi-factor scales fit the data better for both the positive and negative items. The GFI for the positive six factor model was .73 and .56 for the one factor model. This indicates that it is better to conceptualize the six positive YES scales as separate factors rather than as a single positive dimension. Similarly, the GFI for the five factor negative model was .92 and .63 for the one factor model, confirming the value of using the five separate negative scales.

The goal of the second objective was to test the statistical independence first of the six positive YES scales and then of the five negative scales. To address this goal the incremental fit of two models was evaluated for each set of scales. As with the analyses for objective one, the first model included the six positive, or five negative, YES scales with the covariances among these scales allowed to vary freely. The second, more restrictive model, included same scales but this time the covariances among these scales were fixed to zero (orthogonal). The chi-square of the first model was subtracted from the chi-square of the second model and evaluated for significance. If the test was significant, than the smaller of the individual chi-square was consider to be a better fit to the data.

The results indicated that the positive scales were statistically interdependent but conceptually distinct. The same was found for the negative scales The difference in chi-square for the positive scale was significant at $p < .001$, with $\chi2 = 10042$, $df = 15$. The difference in chi-square for the negative scale was also significant with $p < .001$, $\chi2 = 8048$, and $df = 10$. For both scales, the chi-square was smaller for the first model, the model that allowed the scales to be statistically interrelated.

Conclusion. The results of the confirmatory factor analyses indicated, first, that the six positive and the five negative scales were better conceptualized as distinct dimensions, rather than one dimension, of positive or negative experience. That is, the separate scales provided distinct contributions to their overall dimensions, positive or negative, and should not be treated as one conceptual dimension. Second, the results further indicated that the six positive YES scales and the five negative scales were best conceptualized as distinct, but statistically interrelated, dimensions of positive and negative development.

Validity

A separate data set was employed to evaluate the convergent validity of the YES 2.0 scales and subscales. Students in 16 youth programs completed the YES 2.0 based on their experiences in that program. An adult leader of each program also completed the YES 2.0 for each participating youth, based on their observation of the youth's experiences in the program. Correspondence between students' and leaders' reports on the students' experiences were examined to evaluate convergent validity.

Sample and procedures. Data for this study come from 118 adolescents and 17[4] adult leaders in 16 youth programs[5]. The programs in this sample included sports, community, service, arts, and faith-based programs. The were located in both urban and rural settings.

There were 63 girls (53%), 54 boys (46%) and one failed to indicate gender (0.8%). The mean age for the sample was 16, with a range in age from 12-21. (A small number of older youth had recently graduated from high school and continued their involvement in the program.) The median grade level was 11th grade, with a range of 7th to 12th. Twenty-one students in the sample were African American (17.8%), 10 were Hispanic/Latino (8.5%), 82 were White (69.5%), one was multi-ethnic (.8), and four did not indicate their ethnicity.

There were 10 female and 6 male adult leaders and one leader failed to indicate gender. The average age of the leaders was 30-35 years old with a range between 20 and 50 years old. Of the 17 leaders, 12 (75%) were White, two (12%) were African American, two (12%) were Hispanic, and one did not specify their ethnicity. The mean number of years these leaders had been in the activity was 6 years, although there was a wide range in experience: range between 1 and 25.

Results. To evaluate the correspondence of reported experiences between student and adult leader, correlation coefficients were computed along with the corresponding significance test (two-tailed t-tests). The student and leader responses were matched for each scale and subscale. Thus the coefficient represents the degree of correspondence between the youth's report and the leaders' report of the youth's experience on a scale.

As shown in Table 4, there was significant and moderate correspondence between the students' and the leaders' reports for most YES scales. Correlations were significant for five of the six positive scales, and 14 of the 17 subscales. These correlations indicated that students and leaders were in agreement about the types of developmental experiences occurring for students in the program.

There was one scale, emotional regulation, and two subscales of adult networks where the correspondence was not significant. For the emotional regulation scale, the items focus on emotional experiences that may not be observable by someone else. For the two subscales of adult networks—integration with family and linkages to community—the items deal with experiences most likely to occur outside of the program setting, and thus may be less likely be directly observed by the adult leader.

Conclusions. The results of this validity study indicate that nearly all of the developmental domains covered by the YES 2.0 represent confirmable experiences. We can infer that the YES 2.0 accesses developmental experiences that are within the cognitive abilities of high-school-age adolescents to identify and correspond to the observations of an adult. The few exceptions are experiences related to emotions and adult networks that are likely to be beyond the scope of adult leaders' observations.

General Conclusions

The YES 2.0 is a self-report instrument that concentrates on specific developmental experiences that occur in organized activities. Confirmatory factor

---

[4] In one program two adult leaders completed the YES 2.0 on separate youth
[5] Data from 65 students in this sample were included from the prior study of the validity of the YES scales (Hansen & Larson, 2002)

analyses indicated that there are two distinguishable factors, the positive developmental and the negative experiences, each with meaningful scales. The findings also suggest that youth are fairly adept at recognizing and rating the frequency of the types of developmental experiences they have. There was moderate agreement between youth's reports and leader's reports of youth's experiences, which suggests the congruent validity of the YES domains. These analyses support the integrity of the YES instrument.

References

Hansen, D. M., & Larson, R (2002). *The Youth Experience Survey*. Unpublished
manuscript, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
[http://web.aces.uiuc.edu/youthdev/].

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* (1), 25-56.

Larson, Hansen, & Moneta, (submitted). *Profiles of developmental experiences in organized
youth activities.* Manuscript submitted for review.

Smoll, F & Smith, R. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and
research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*(18), 1522-1551.

Brustad, R. J., Babkes, M. L., and Smith, A. L. (2001). "Youth in Sport: Psychological
Considerations." In R. N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas, and C. M. Janelle (eds.),
Handbook of Sports Psychology, 2nd ed. NY: John Wiley.

Table 1. Item Changes

Item Deletions and Additions within Each Scale

YES 1.0 Item Deleted	YES 2.0 Item Added

Identity Work:
    Deleted items 1 and 2 (thus eliminating the Self-Knowledge subscale)
    Deleted items: 8 and 10
	-

Initiative Deleted item 14, 17 and 24	-
Emotional Regulation Deleted item 29 and 31	-
-	Cognitive Skills Added "Communication Skills"

Interpersonal Relationships
    Deleted item 38 and 42
    Deleted item 68, 69, 70
	-

Teamwork Deleted item 52 and 54	-
Stress Deleted item 69	-
Negative Group Dynamics Deleted item 78	-
Inappropriate Adult Behavior Deleted items 83, 84, 87, and 89	-

Wording Revisions.

YES 1.0	YES 2.0
Emotional Regulation Item 27 "Learned about overcoming fear and anxiety"	"Became better at dealing with fear and anxiety"
Item 28 "Learned how to handle stress"	"Became better at handling stress"
Diverse Peer Relationships Item 40 "made friends with someone from a different ethnic group"	"Got to know someone from a different ethnic group"
Group Process Skills Item 44 "Learned to share responsibility"	"Became better at sharing responsibility"

Item 46 "Learned that my emotions and attitude can affect others in the group"	"Learned how my emotions and attitude affect others in the group"
Feedback Item 48 "I became comfortable giving feedback"	"I became better at giving feedback"
Item 49 "I became comfortable taking feedback"	"I became better at giving feedback"
Leadership and Responsibility Item 51 "Other youth in this activity counted on me"	"Others in this activity counted on me"
Linkages to Community Item 60 "Got to know people in the community (other than adult leaders)	"Got to know people in the community"
Negative Peer Interaction Item 72 "Youth in this activity made fun of me for something I did in this activity"	"I was ridiculed by peers for something I did in this activity"

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the YES 2.0 scales.

YES Scales[1]	X	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Identity Work	2.78	.83	(.84)										
2. Initiative	2.86	.84	.66**	(.94)									
3. Emotional Regulation	2.63	.98	.56**	.65**	(.87)								
4. Teamwork &Social Skills	2.90	.84	.61**	.71**	.61**	(.93)							
5. Positive Relationships	2.68	.82	.54**	.61**	.54**	.63**	(.86)						
6.Adult Networks & Social Capital	2.33	.86	.52**	.57**	.52**	.55**	.61**	(.87)					
7. Stress	1.75	.89	.20**	.15**	.20**	.13**	.12**	.24**	(.86)				
8. Inappropriate Adult Behavior	1.35	.83	-.01	-.09**	-.03	-.10**	.01	.16**	.51**	(.94)			
9. Negative Influence	1.41	.82	.00	-.10**	.00	-.09**	.03	.17**	.63**	.80**	(.94)		
10 Social Exclusion	1.66	.84	-.00	-.11**	.00	-.09**	-.02	.10**	.61**	.60**	.74**	(.82)	
11. Negative Group Dynamics	1.65	.81	.10**	.05	.10**	.08**	.10**	.23**	.58**	.75**	.71**	.58**	(.75)

Note. $\underline{n}$= 1822. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) are shown in parentheses.
[1]Range of the scale = 1-4
** $\underline{p}$ < .01

Table 3.
Youth-Leader Correspondence Correlation on the YES 2.0 (N=118)

Yes 2.0 Scale	Youth/Leader Correlation
Identity Work	.33**
Exploration	.39**
Reflection	.19*
Initiative	.40**
Goal Setting	.41**
Effort	.51**
Problem Solving	.27**
Time Management	.35**
Basic Skills	-.09 ns
Emotional Regulation	-.15 ns
Cognitive Skills	.33**
Physical	.41**
Teamwork and Social Skills	.47**
Group Process	.49**
Feedback	.35**
Leadership and Responsibility	.47**
Positive Relationships	.33**
Prosocial Norms	.40**
Diverse Peer Relationships	.22*
Adult Networks	.27*
Integration with Family	.12 ns
Linkages to Community	.09 ns
Linkages to Work	.59**

* p. < .05, ** p. < .01

Appendix A

The Youth Experiences Survey (YES) 2.0

Instructions: Based on your *current* or *recent* involvement please rate whether you have had the following experiences in [name of activity]

	Your Experiences In……		
	[Activity]		
Yes, Definitely	Quite a Bit	A Little	Not At All

IDENTITY EXPERIENCES

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

Identity Reflection			
4. Started thinking more about my future because of this activity	1	2	3	4
5. This activity got me thinking about who I am	1	2	3	4
6. This activity has been a positive turning point in my life	1	2	3	4

INITIATIVE EXPERIENCES

Goal Setting			
7. I set goals for myself in this activity	1	2	3	4
8. Learned to find ways to achieve my goals	1	2	3	4
9. Learned to consider possible obstacles when making plans	1	2	3	4

Effort			
10. I put all my energy into this activity	1	2	3	4
11. Learned to push myself	1	2	3	4
12. Learned to focus my attention	1	2	3	4

Problem Solving			
13. Observed how others solved problems and learned from them	1	2	3	4
14. Learned about developing plans for solving a problem	1	2	3	4
15. Used my imagination to solve a problem	1	2	3	4

Time Management			
16. Learned about organizing time and not procrastinating (not	1	2	3	4

	putting things off)				
17.	Learned about setting priorities	1	2	3	4
18.	Practiced self discipline	1	2	3	4

BASIC SKILL

Emotional Regulation					
19.	Learned about controlling my temper	1	2	3	4
20.	Became better at dealing with fear and anxiety	1	2	3	4
21.	Became better at handling stress	1	2	3	4
22.	Learned that my emotions affect how I perform	1	2	3	4

COGNITIVE SKILLS

In this activity I have improved:		1	2	3	4
23.	Academic skills (reading, writing, math, etc.)	1	2	3	4
24.	Skills for finding information	1	2	3	4
25.	Computer/internet skills	1	2	3	4
26.	Artistic/creative skills	1	2	3	4
27.	Communication skills	1	2	3	4

Physical Skills					
28.	Athletic or physical skills	1	2	3	4

POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Diverse Peer Relationships					
29.	Made friends with someone of the opposite gender	1	2	3	4
30.	Learned I had a lot in common with people from different backgrounds	1	2	3	4
31.	Got to know someone from a different ethnic group	1	2	3	4
32.	Made friends with someone from a different social class (someone richer or poorer)	1	2	3	4

Prosocial Norms					
33.	Learned about helping others	1	2	3	4
34.	I was able to change my school or community for the better	1	2	3	4
35.	Learned to stand up for something I believed was morally right	1	2	3	4
36.	We discussed morals and values	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.	Became better at sharing responsibility	1	2	3	4
39.	Learned to be patient with other group members	1	2	3	4
40.	Learned how my emotions and attitude affect others in the group	1	2	3	4
41.	Learned that it is not necessary to like people in order to work with them	1	2	3	4

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

Leadership and Responsibility				
44. Learned about the challenges of being a leader	1	2	3	4
45. Others in this activity counted on me	1	2	3	4
46. Had an opportunity to be in charge of a group of peers	1	2	3	4

ADULT NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

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

Linkages to Community				
49. Got to know people in the community	1	2	3	4
50. Came to feel more supported by the community	1	2	3	4

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

NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES

Stress				
54. 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
55. This activity interfered with doing things with family	1	2	3	4
56. This activity has stressed me out	1	2	3	4

Negative Influences				
57. Felt pressured by peers to do something I didn't want to do	1	2	3	4
58. I did something in this activity that was morally wrong	1	2	3	4
59. I was ridiculed by peers for something I did in this activity	1	2	3	4
60. Youth in this activity got me into drinking alcohol or using drugs	1	2	3	4

Social Exclusion				
61. Felt like I didn't belong in this activity	1	2	3	4
62. I felt left out	1	2	3	4
63. There were cliques in this activity	1	2	3	4

Negative Group Dynamics				
64. I get stuck doing more than my fair share	1	2	3	4
65. Other youth in this activity made inappropriate sexual comments, jokes, or gestures	1	2	3	4
66. Was discriminated against because of my gender, race,	1	2	3	4

ethnicity, disability, or sexual orientation				

Note: The following set of items (67-70) will not be asked if there is no adult or young adult, coach, director, teacher, or leader.				

Inappropriate Adult Behavior

	1	2	3	4
67. Adult leaders in this activity are controlling and manipulative	1	2	3	4
68. Adult leaders "hit" on me (made sexual advances)	1	2	3	4
69. Adult leaders made inappropriate sexual comments or jokes	1	2	3	4
70. Adult leaders encouraged me to do something I believed morally wrong	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B
Means and Standard Deviations For the YES, 2.0 (N=1822)

IDENTITY EXPERIENCES	M	SD
Identity Exploration		
1. Tried doing new things	3.10	1.02
2. Tried a new way of acting around people	2.55	1.13
3. I do things here I don't get to do anywhere else	2.81	1.13

Identity Reflection		
4. Started thinking more about my future because of this activity	2.64	1.16
5. This activity got me thinking about who I am	2.72	1.12
6. This activity has been a positive turning point in my life	2.84	1.11

INITIATIVE EXPERIENCES

Goal Setting		
7. I set goals for myself in this activity	2.99	1.07
8. Learned to find ways to achieve my goals	2.94	1.05
9. Learned to consider possible obstacles when making plans	2.87	1.06

Effort		
10. I put all my energy into this activity	2.89	1.04
11. Learned to push myself	2.98	1.07
12. Learned to focus my attention	3.07	1.01

Problem Solving		
13. Observed how others solved problems and learned from them	2.82	1.08
14. Learned about developing plans for solving a problem	2.73	1.08
15. Used my imagination to solve a problem	2.56	1.13

Time Management		
16. Learned about organizing time and not procrastinating (not putting things off)	2.70	1.10
17. Learned about setting priorities	2.87	1.07
18. Practiced self discipline	2.92	1.07

BASIC SKILL

Emotional Regulation		
19. Learned about controlling my temper	2.57	1.17
20. Became better at dealing with fear and anxiety	2.50	1.17
21. Became better at handling stress	2.59	1.12
22. Learned that my emotions affect how I perform	2.86	1.15

COGNITIVE SKILLS

In this activity I have improved:		
23. Academic skills (reading, writing, math, etc.)	2.35	1.12
24. Skills for finding information	2.31	1.11
25. Computer/internet skills	1.84	1.13
26. Artistic/creative skills	2.37	1.18
27. Communication skills	2.88	1.07

Physical Skills		
28. Athletic or physical skills	2.37	1.28

POSITIVE RELATIONSHIPS

Diverse Peer Relationships		
29. Made friends with someone of the opposite gender	2.94	1.17
30. Learned I had a lot in common with people from different backgrounds	2.78	1.11
31. Got to know someone from a different ethnic group	2.64	1.22
32. Made friends with someone from a different social class (someone richer or poorer)	2.81	1.16

Prosocial Norms		
33. Learned about helping others	2.99	1.07
34. I was able to change my school or community for the better	2.29	1.11
35. Learned to stand up for something I believed was morally right	2.63	1.20
36. We discussed morals and values	2.35	1.23

TEAM WORK AND SOCIAL SKILLS

Group Process Skills		
37. Learned that working together requires some compromising	3.10	1.03
38. Became better at sharing responsibility	2.89	1.06
39. Learned to be patient with other group members	3.10	1.00
40. Learned how my emotions and attitude affect others in the group	2.98	1.08
41. Learned that it is not necessary to like people in order to work with them	2.93	1.08

Feedback		
42. I became better at giving feedback	2.79	1.07
43. I became better at taking feedback	2.86	1.06

Leadership and Responsibility		
44. Learned about the challenges of being a leader	2.81	1.14
45. Others in this activity counted on me	2.89	1.09
46. Had an opportunity to be in charge of a group of peers	2.61	1.18

ADULT NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

Integration with Family		
47. This activity improved my relationship with my parents/guardians	2.37	1.14
48. I had good conversations with my parents/guardians because of this activity	2.47	1.13

Linkages to Community		
49. Got to know people in the community	2.32	1.12
50. Came to feel more supported by the community	2.26	1.13

Linkages to Work and College		
51. This activity opened up job or career opportunities for me	2.05	1.16
52. This activity helped prepare me for college	2.30	1.14
53. This activity increased my desire to stay in school	2.52	1.21

NEGATIVE EXPERIENCES

Stress		
54. Demands were so great that I didn't get homework done (skip this item if your Target Activity is a class)	1.68	0.99
55. This activity interfered with doing things with family	1.74	1.00
56. This activity has stressed me out	1.82	1.03

Negative Influences		
57. Felt pressured by peers to do something I didn't want to do	1.43	0.89
58. I did something in this activity that was morally wrong	1.37	0.88
59. I was ridiculed by peers for something I did in this activity	1.46	0.91
60. Youth in this activity got me into drinking alcohol or using drugs	1.38	0.91
Social Exclusion		
61. Felt like I didn't belong in this activity	1.55	0.95
62. I felt left out	1.48	0.90
63. There were cliques in this activity	1.95	1.07

Negative Group Dynamics		
64. I get stuck doing more than my fair share	1.88	1.07
65. Other youth in this activity made inappropriate sexual comments, jokes, or gestures	1.69	1.04
66. Was discriminated against because of my gender, race, ethnicity, disability, or sexual orientation	1.38	0.88

Inappropriate Adult Behavior		
67. Adult leaders in this activity are controlling and manipulative	1.51	0.94
68. Adult leaders "hit" on me (made sexual advances)	1.33	0.85
69. Adult leaders made inappropriate sexual comments or jokes	1.39	0.90
70. Adult leaders encouraged me to do something I believed morally wrong	1.33	0.85