UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA EXTENSION

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY:
MINNESOTA 4-H YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Leadership and Civic Engagement

Heidi Haugen and Becky Harrington, Extension Educators, 4-H Youth Development
June 6, 2008

OUTCOME

Youth demonstrate leadership that benefits the common good and reflects the principles of democracy.

KEY WORDS

- youth leadership, leadership measures, youth development, life skills, learning, youth assets, developmental outcomes

- common good, public good, common interest, individual interest, public interest

- service learning, service to community, community involvement, civic life, civic learning, civic skills, civic competence, community life, civic efficacy, civic activism, civic leadership, civic engagement, community development, social change, action research

OVERVIEW

YOUTH LEADERSHIP

DesMarais, J., Yang, T., & Farzanehkia, F. (2000). Service-learning leadership development for youths. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81 (9), 678-680.

"For young people, the best approach is to develop leadership in real situations" (p. 679, emphasis in the original). This article asserts that service-learning must include intentional leadership development in students or it is "trivial and shallow." Today's young people are concerned about building, maintaining, and serving community. However, youth must be partners in the design of such projects: simply assigning students tasks in teacher-designed service-learning projects denies them opportunities for decision making, action planning, and true leadership development. They describe in detail the elements they have found to be critical to the development of effective young leaders in a service-learning context:

- Youth/adult partnerships – where all are valued for their unique experiences, resources, skills, and perspectives, regardless of age; all have the potential to learn from each other; and "young people and adults share learning and leadership allow them to become co-creators of community" (p. 680).

- Granting young people decision-making power and responsibility for consequences – where adults need to know when to intervene and when to "let go and let be" and hold young people accountable for outcomes of the actions. "Young people aren't challenged to improve when they are constantly rescued or corrected" (p. 680).

- Broad context for learning and service – where the classroom becomes the whole community as well as young people's perception of their relationship to it and their ability to shape it.

- Recognition of young people's experience, knowledge, and skills – where all are seen as knowing and being able to do different, valuable things and where "a fresh perspective can sometimes lead to new and efficient ways of solving community problems" (p. 680).

The authors argue that service-learning is the most powerful approach in youth leadership development" where "young people become engaged leaders taking responsibility for solving complex problems and meeting the tangible needs of a defined community" (p. 679). It is intimidating "because it's challenging. It's threatening to the status quo. It allows for mistakes. It means sharing power and responsibility between youths and adults. It means blurring the line between teaching and learning" (p. 679). Doing it right means tossing such notions as case studies and simulations and tooling up on public policy, stakeholder analyses, interpersonal communication, technology, and project management which "make learning about community, self, and leadership authentic and meaningful" (p. 679).

Heifetz, R.A., & Laurie, D.A. (2001). The work of leadership. *Havard Business Review*. 97, 131-141.

"Adaptive work is required when our deeply held beliefs are challenged, when the values that made us successful become less relevant, and when legitimate yet competing perspectives emerge" (p. 2). The authors call for organizational leaders

to not offer solutions, but rather shift responsibility for problem solving to its people. Leaders ask the hard questions, support people as they identify problems and solutions, and manage distress when people are bumped out of their comfort zones. They suggest going against the notion of positional leadership to move people throughout their organization to do adaptive work.

Horstmeier, R. P., & Nall, M. A. (2006). Rural FFA leadership: Understanding members' role and the context of chapter activities. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 6(1), 129-142. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_6_1.pdf.

AND

Horstmeier, R. P., & Nall, M. A. (2006). Youth leadership development: A national analysis of FFA member role and activity context. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 6(1), 143-159. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_6_1.pdf.

Horstmeier and Nall are represented in two JOLE Research Features that study American rural youth and their connection to community leadership. The manuscript, Rural FFA Leadership: Understanding Members' Role and the Context of Chapter Activities utilized a select and purposive group in qualitative interviews to ascertain how youth in a leadership organization understand their community and potential impact. The other manuscript, Youth Leadership Development: A National Analysis of FFA Member Role and Activity Context utilized a quantitative questionnaire to identify how activities performed within their youth chapter (club) prepared them to be productive citizens. The researchers found that particular youth leadership activities did assist youth leaders in understanding themselves and interacting with others within the community. (Description by JOLE issue editors.)

Klau, M. (2006, Spring). Exploring youth leadership in theory and practice. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 57-87.

This article describes three case studies of youth leadership education programs through the lens of the "adaptive leadership" model. Klau delineates each program's conception of leadership, youth recruitment, learning pedagogies, and alignment between theory and practice. This study brings "attention, clarity, and academic rigor to the study of youth leadership education" (p. 86) and in doing so presents a rich evaluative process for youth work practitioners wishing to reflect on their own organizations. [*This may be a particularly useful way for 4-H to reflect on its own leadership approach(es) and practice(s) within MN.*]

The article first explores the problematic notion of youth leadership and how it has been applied to such a broad and varying groups of activities that any activity in which youth engage seems to qualify as leadership (or leadership development). Klau then describes the work of Ronald Heifetz, which looks at four major movements in leadership theory (trait and situational approaches, contingency theory, and transactional approach) and distinguishes between authority and leadership. Heifetz also distinguishes between technical and adaptive challenges: technical relates to problems we already know how to solve (e.g. planning a bus route), while adaptive are more complex and have no clear solution (e.g. changing

relationships between blacks and whites in the Jim Crowe south). The notions help to make distinctions in youth "leadership" activities (e.g. playing in a school band versus advocating against drink driving). Key pedagogical methods of the Heifetz model include "case-in-point learning" (looking at the dynamics of the learning environment), "below-the-neck learning" (gained through experience and reflection on long periods of emotional discomfort), and reflective practice (on particular choices and responses).

Cases studied for this article included the national or state forums of a "National Leadership Conference, a "Jewish Leadership Organization," and an "Institute for Justice and Leadership." While all of these used "out-of-context programming" (bringing together diverse youth away from their home communities), they differed in significant ways which affected youth program outcomes. Definitions of youth leadership education exemplified by one or more of the organizations studied included the following (p. 82):

- Civic leadership: Interest in and engagement with issues of broad public interest

- Charismatic leadership: Ability to influence peers through enthusiasm, extroversion, or creativity

- Leadership as formal authority: Attainment of a position of formal authority in a business or organization

- Relational leadership group Ability to manage interpersonal dynamics for the good of the group

- Service leadership: Commitment to engaging in activities dedicated to helping underserved or needy populations

- "Great individual" leadership: Recognition of one or two individuals as "the best"

- Intellectual leadership: Ability to reason clearly and persuasively in a manner that influences others

- Moral and spiritual leadership: Commitment to the cause of promoting social justice

Finally, codified pedagogical tools used by those in the case study include the following (pp. 84-85):

- Lecture: Frontal presentation by an authority to an audience

- Expert panel: Presentation by two or more authority figures to an audience

- Evaluation and selection [of youth]: Formal process of selecting "best" leader

- Reflective practice: Time set aside to reflect on feelings triggered by activities of program

- Case-in-point learning: Activity in which the real-time group process is the pedagogical focus

- Large-group discussion: Exploration of issue in a large-group format

- <u>Small-group discussion</u>: Portion of larger group breaks off for more intimate exploration of an issue
- <u>Community service activity</u>: Engaging in actual service project
- <u>Field trip</u>: Leaving the primary educational facility to visit outside location
- Cheering: Planned communal singing, chants
- Material reward: Small token granted to reward desired behaviors
- Problem-solving activity: One-time, highly goal-oriented, team-based experience
- <u>Committee activity</u>: Ongoing team-based effort to plan or execute another event
- Religious text study: Group exploration of sacred texts
- <u>Out-of-context programming</u>: Bringing together diverse youth away from their home communities
- <u>Preprogram activities</u>: Preparing participants for program with activities that occur before out-of-context programming
- <u>Follow-up activities</u>: Continuation of engagement with ideas presented at out-of-context program after participants return home

Although Klau stops short of labeling any of these "best" practices, those underlined above appeared to this writer to have specific application to the program outcomes of two more promising case models.

Klau, M., Boyd, S., & Luckow, L. (2006, Spring). Editors' notes. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 3-6.

The editors of this New Directions volume on youth leadership offer seven current "core themes" for thought:

1. The idea of social justice being core to the discourse on youth leadership,

2. The importance of differentiating between and intentionally focusing on both "inside leadership," which takes place inside existing organizations and involves youth who have access to and acceptance within them, and "outside leadership," which occurs outside of these organizations with young people who do not have this access or acceptance,

3. The definition of leadership as a position of authority versus an activity for everyone,

4. The implicit assumptions youth workers have on who can or should be a leader (everyone versus a select few),

5. Understanding how seeing youth as "future leaders" versus "current leaders" has implications for theory and program design,

6. The challenge of shared decision-making and youth-adult partnerships in leadership education, and

7. The need for a program to be clear about the core model of leadership that a program holds and the alignment between that model and the pedagogies used to teach it.

Kress, C. A. (2006, Spring). Youth leadership and youth development: Connections and questions. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 45-56.

In this brief article, Cathann Kress (Director of youth development for the National 4-H Headquarters) looks at how youth leadership connects to the youth development movement of "promoting opportunity and resilience over prevention delinquency and failure." While both concepts are somewhat ambiguous, they both involve similar goals for youth: to build competencies needed to live successfully in adolescence and adulthood. Kress defines youth leadership as "the involvement of youth in responsible, challenging action that meets genuine needs, with opportunities for planning and decision making" (p. 51). Youth development, however, has a larger goal of meeting developmental needs of youth, including "deficit" needs and higher level and continuous "being" needs. Youth development tends to focus more on the whole person within his or her context (versus a set of skills or an issue) and includes complex dynamics like character, citizenship, and leadership learned via experience and involvement with people in supportive and challenging environments. Kress further outlines the contributions of John Dewey, Lev Vygotsky, and Albert Bandura to youth development theory.

The author acknowledges that youth leadership and youth development need similar environments that offer support, challenge, growth opportunities with others, hands-on participation, caring adults of good character, recognition that youth matter and "that experiences are transformed by the youth who participated in them" (p. 55). However, she explains, leadership is only one potential outcome for youth and warns of potential risks with blurring programmatic endeavors of youth leadership and youth development, such watered down leadership programs. She implies that it is an "illusion" that all teens can become leaders, and states that "while some youth truly have the skills, talent, and character to be exceptional leaders, [such] abilities are not equally distributed." Further, "there is a difference between the outcomes we hope to build for all youth, such as character and citizenship, and those we recognize as being unique to individual youth, such as scientific inquisitiveness, musical talent, or exceptional leadership" (p. 54). She calls for work focused on how to identify "leadership potential among youth... [and] create tools to assess both capacity and achievement that would allow us to nurture leadership traits most effectively."

Good leadership programs focus not on developing a set of abilities but on connecting developmental experiences with youths' needs and concerns in a way that will "provide tools and opportunities for youth to discover their unique spirit, genius, and public life" (p. 51). The development of leadership is viewed as "a long and cumulative effort" leading to experiences that balance challenge and support needed to sustain influence. Leadership experiences must active engage youth while avoiding overwhelming them with responsibility: too little responsibility first can look like artificial status (officer in name only) or no real power, and "handing off" power and responsibility is really abandonment of youth disguised as autonomy and youth empowerment. Youth-adult partnerships thus become the goal. Kress

argues that "we must conceptualize youth leaders in different ways than we conceptualize adult leaders [or we will] doom them to failure" (p. 55). Youth have less experience and authority and different concerns than adults, and they also serve in leadership roles for a shorter span than adults in leadership roles. Rather than trying to "strengthen youth power," she suggests participation in decision-making is key. Tied to this is recognizing youth not as "leaders of tomorrow" but instead as leaders of today; failure to do so limits their power and restricts their view of themselves as actors sharing in decision-making today.

Kress also briefly addresses issues of access to and participation in youth programs, noting that even in leadership efforts focused on at-risk youth, "high-achieving," middle class youth are "overrepresented" as leaders and that there often exists a gap between youth making decisions and those affected by those decisions. "Programs must be attractive and relevant to target audiences" (p. 53).

[*Side note: the discussion of youth leadership versus youth development makes me (Heidi) wonder: if developmental needs are not met for certain youth, could not building their competencies for leadership actually be precarious for them and for the community? It reminds me of that quote by Theodore Roosevelt: "To educate a person in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society."*]

Libby, M., Sedonaen, M., & Bliss, S. (2006, Spring). The mystery of youth leadership development: The path to just communities. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 13-25.

This article explores the definition of youth leadership development and what youth leadership means for youth development. Drawing on their experiences with the Youth Leadership Institute (YLI), the authors argue that potential connections, tensions, and conflicts that exist between the two can be better understood by making the distinction between the Inside and Outside approaches—those more mainstream efforts occurring from inside social structures and organizations versus those more grassroots efforts that come from outside systems or institutions of power. To create opportunities for youth to participated in setting community priorities, solving community problems, and making shared decisions, the YLI uses models including youth philanthropy (training and supporting youth to make decisions about what youth-led projects to fund), evaluation and action research ("training and supporting youth to design and carry out research that will inform their action"), and policy advocacy ("training and preparing youth to create, adapt, or enforce policies") and finds ways to integrate opportunities for both inside and outside approaches in these models. The authors also explore notions of power related to inside and outside approaches and admit how their efforts in sharing "vocal power" fall short due to lack of understanding the factors leading to power differences and lack of acceptance of the "true depth" of youth as leaders. As a matter of equity and community change success, authors implore practitioners of youth leadership development to "create an even playing field among youth,…to explore how to create more opportunities for marginalized youth to participate in priority setting, problem solving, and decision making through Inside settings" because these youth have an expertise that is critical to transforming those institutions" that have failed them. They argue that by focusing on power structures and marginalized people, inside approaches can learn from outside approaches how

to become more committed to the value of social justice. "A full definition of youth leadership must encompass values, power, and action; without power sharing, a theory of change, and action, youth are not exercising leadership, but taking steps to plan and implement activities prescribed by adults" (p. 23).

Literature on youth leadership describes an integrated mix of individual traits and collective processes which relate directly to how to promote youth leadership. The article describes servant leadership as a powerful research-based model of youth leadership, defining such a leader as "someone who makes decisions that enhance the entire group or organization" and who supports "the values of fairness, integrity, and dependability" (p. 17). In terms of the process of leadership, servant leaders "listen to the needs, feedback, and suggestions of all members of the group, not just a select few. Servant leaders view their position as one of responsibility, not ego promotion, and will do the hard work when things get tough. They believe that the group's success is dependent on the work, support, and dedication of all members" (p. 17).

MacNeil, C. A. (2006, Spring). Bridging generations: Applying "adult" leadership theories to youth leadership development. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 27-43.

In this article, Carole MacNeil compares adult leadership literature to youth leadership literature. With a nod to the contextual and applied nature of leading, she defines leadership as "a relational process combining ability (knowledge, skills, and talents) with authority (voice, influence, and decision-making power) to positively influence and impact diverse individuals, organizations, and communities" (p. 29). Both popular and scholarly literature on leadership development and practice have very little to say about youth leadership. References to youth are as "future leaders" who "learn now and practice later," as adults.

She notes that adult leadership "tends to focus on issues of authority (voice, influence, and decision-making power)…[while] youth leadership literature tends to focus on issues of ability (skills, knowledge, and talents)" (p. 27). The most salient reason for this, says the author, is that the social construction of "youth" is seen as a social problem to be solved instead of seeing youth as resources that are part of the solution. This form of "adultism" is "a tremendous obstacle for youth leadership development" because through this lens, both adults and youth fail to identify youth as leaders.

Adults learn and hone leadership skills by practicing leadership, and so must youth. MacNeil posits that various literatures could help with the power renegotiation that is inherent on the road to greater youth developing and practicing leadership. Diversity theories could help adults understand that shared leadership with youth enhances outcomes for youth, adults, organizations and communities. "Functional framework" literature reframes the work of leaders and can help people re-evaluate power imbalances, what gets done, and by whom. Collaborative leadership literature can help us move from an "industrial leadership paradigm" (where an individual gives orders that are carried out by followers) to "postindustrial model" (where an individual needs and seeks participation and input from "followers"), which is based on values of collaboration and diversity and consensus-oriented decision-making process. Also, it is crucial for youth leadership to encompass both ability and

authority—the learning and the doing—or youth will be learning about leadership but not learning leadership itself. Adult leaders are not all alike, and neither are youth leaders: both groups have varying needs, styles, and practices, and range of leadership and other experiences, all of which are further mediated by culture and other identity factors as well as the policies and procedures of the leadership situation/context. Youth are capable and interested in leadership roles, and their contributions are useful, if not critical in solving organizational and community challenges.

MacNeil, C. A., & McClean, J. (2006, Spring). Moving from "youth leadership development" to "youth in governance": Learning leadership by doing leadership. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 99-106.

This piece is essential reading to those in 4-H who want an example of what theory-based youth leadership education looks in a 4-H context. MacNeil, a 4-H educator, and McClean, a 4-H youth, each give their perspectives on the importance of experiences in "learning leadership by doing leadership" through youth-adult partnerships. First, Carole McNeil (Statewide director of the University of California's 4-H Youth Development Program and national director of the 4-H Youth in Governance Initiative) makes a strong argument for focusing on youth in governance rather than simply youth leadership development in order to encourage "real voice and power" and authentic leadership roles for youth as leaders of today. "Our organizations and communities miss out when we simply work to prepare youth for leadership in the future. We need leaders now" (p. 100). Further, from a programmatic perspective, "some emerging research suggests that organizations doing civic engagement or activism work with youth do a better job at positive youth development (building skills, knowledge, and competencies) than those with a strict focus on youth development. There are powerful and important differences in outcomes when we engage young people in authentic experiences where they have voice, influence, and decision-making power (or to say it another way, where they are exercising leadership, not simply learning about it).We do not get the same outcomes when we engage youth in "mock" experiences or simulations of decision-making roles" (p. 100). Thus leadership practice can be seen as an essential component for leadership learning, and in a different way, strengthening an organization requires "the insights, experiences, energy, and perspectives" of youth. Bottom line: "we need to ensure that young people move into authentic and meaningful leadership roles at the program and organizational levels, where they have or share voice, influence, and decision-making power" (p. 101).

McNeil also offers some strategies gleaned from her work (with 4-H) on organizational supports, practices, and policies related to youth leadership development and practice and organizational decision-making (from pp. 101-102):

1. Organizations must assess and address the attitudes and beliefs of those who will be involved in the changes. This includes the assumptions held by adults about youth, and vice versa. Do adults believe that the inclusion of youth is simply "good for youth" or do they see it as mutually beneficial?

2. Organizations must clearly articulate the expectations for staff or volunteers in working with youth as decision makers. Is the integration of youth the responsibility of all staff? What is the time commitment expected of staff?

3. Organizations must clarify the roles and responsibilities for youth board or committee members or youth staff. Are they different from adult roles (and if they are different, does the difference facilitate or hinder authentic youth roles)?

4. Organizations must allocate [financial, human, and physical (e.g. office space)] resources to support the integration of youth in an ongoing way….

5. Training should be made available for both youth and adults to support their work in a youth-adult partnership. Repeatedly youth have told me, "Don't set us up by giving us responsibility without the skills." They have also shared that the adults needed more skills in learning to work with them (particularly around sharing power).

6. Organizations should develop a plan for monitoring and evaluating the integration of youth. These may include individual performance assessments for both youth and adults (How well did I perform in this group?), evaluations of group process (How well did we work together?), and evaluations of group product or outcome (What did the group accomplish?).

When the focus changes to that of youth in governance, the questions for youth workers change from "How can I be more effective at supporting young people in discovering and developing their own unique leadership strengths?" to "What can I do, in partnership with youth and other adult allies, to create system change to address the marginalization of youth? How can I help create openings so that young people have their rightful voice and role in the decisions that affect their lives? How can I make sure that the young person, learning about leadership, learning the skills of leadership, will find opportunities to practice that leadership? How can I make sure that opportunities are available for that young person to engage in the work of leadership, benefiting not only herself or himself, but also the group and organization in which she or he is engaged?"

Jennifer McClean (former 4-H member who served on the statewide 4-H Program Advisory Committee in 2002–03) relates her experiences with the 4-H Youth Development Program. Her story is not atypical: she joined her local club and projects in foods and nutrition, arts and crafts, and dairy goats. At the time she thought she was (just) having fun doing activities and only later understood that she was developing leadership skills from the onset. As she grew and took on "traditional" leadership roles—junior and teen project leader, chair of club and county events and project, and a county "All Star" (something akin to a Minnesota Ambassador)—she recognized parts of a "leadership puzzle": "To me, leadership meant taking on greater responsibility, taking action, [and seeing] that my ideas mattered, and that I was given more respect and trust by my peers and adults" (p. 104). Other pieces of the puzzle came together when she became involved at state and national levels of 4-H as a member of the state delegation to the National 4-H Conference and state representative to the National 4-H Youth Directions Council. It was at this level that she felt "a sense of empowerment" and "learned the key components that make up a leader." Further, McClean writes, "I learned that I had

actually been a leader all along without ever truly understanding the importance of my work and development. It became clear that I, and other youth, were not leaders of tomorrow but actually leaders of today" (p. 105). She and Carole MacNeil formed a working partnership ("not simply a mentorship") to give youth-adult partnership training to other youth and adults, which further helped McClean understand the intricacies of leadership. Thus she developed her perception of leadership through slow and steady experiences of greater and greater leadership opportunities. McClean contends that "for youth to develop a sense of true empowerment, and a personal definition of leadership, opportunities such as these must be provided where youth can act as equal decision-making partners with both youth peers and adults" (pp 105-106).

Ricketts, J. C., & Rudd, R. D. (2002). A comprehensive leadership education model to train, teach, and develop leadership in youth. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 19(1), 7-17. http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JCTE/v19n1/pdf/ricketts.pdf.

This article presents a conceptual model for teaching, training, and developing leadership in youth, particularly those in career and technical education programs. The authors explore the question of whether or not "a more formal method of leadership training would be more effective than leadership development through involvement as an officer, committee chair, or as an active group member in an organization." Literature on which the model is based mentions needed components such as youth/adult partnerships, (youth) decision making power and responsibility for consequences, broad context for learning and service, recognition of young people's experience, knowledge and skills, shared leadership, seeing leadership as relationships, and community leadership opportunities. It is unclear from the article, however, how this model for formal leadership education involves these components. The model consists of five leadership dimensions (constructs) and three stages of development. The five dimensions are: Leadership Knowledge and Information; Leadership Attitude, Will, and Desire; Decision Making, Reasoning, and Critical Thinking; Oral and Written Communication Skills; and Intra and Interpersonal Relations. The model further proposes that students learn about the five dimensions at the Awareness (orientation), Interaction (exploration), and Integration (practice and mastery) level.

Wheeler, W., with C. Edlebeck. (2006, Spring). Leading, learning, and unleashing potential: Youth leadership and civic engagement. *New Directions for Youth Development.* 109, 89-97.

"Leadership is about learning, listening, dreaming, and working together to unleash the potential of people's time, talent, and treasure for the common good" (p. 89). Often, youth are excluded from community leadership roles, but when their potential tapped it can lead to individual, local, and society-level change. This article maintains that youth leadership programs generate great outcomes by employing the following strategies for success:

- *Build young people's connections to their own identity, culture, and community.*

- *Recognize that young people are assets to and experts about their own communities.*
- *Engage young people as community leaders on issues that matter to them.*
- *Create developmental opportunities that are sustained and supported over time.*
- *Bring young people and adults together to work as equal partners. (p.90)*

Authors also touch on the importance of transformational relationships and change, but acknowledge that this is a budding area of understanding. They also use *genuine partnership*, instead of empowerment, indicating "Genuine partnership requires shared commitment and openness to a just and equitable world. It requires trust and flexibility. It requires the willingness to try new things and learn from them, to consider them valuable, even if they fail" (p. 94).

Research on Extension Educators in Youth Leadership:

Bruce, J. A., Webster, N. S., & Sinasky, M. E. (2006, Winter). Leadership practices employed by 4-H youth development educators in a northeast state. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 5(3), 79-92. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_5_3.pdf.

This quantitative study reports on research on leadership practices currently being employed by county level 4-H educators in Pennsylvania. The authors argue that, more than ever, "educators must develop the skills and capacity to work in collaborative groups to address complex problems and improve the quality of life within their communities" (p. 80) and that among these capacities are transactional and transformational leadership skills. According to the author's analysis of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), and a demographics questionnaire completed by Extension educators, educators report using of transformational leadership skills fairly often (especially individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation) and transactional skills only rarely (except for contingent reward). They report moderate use role modeling and engaging others in activities and low use of visioning, bringing people on board, and rewarding people for successes. Authors end with professional development recommendations for educators.

Organizational Examples in Youth Leadership:

Carlson, C. (2006). The Hampton experience as a new model for youth civic engagement. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2), 71-88.

Cindy Carlson describes an exemplary effort in Hampton, Virginia to engage young people in public policy at the municipal level. Starting with a city council decision to create a coalition and make the city a better place for youth, they have developed a multi-tiered system of participation opportunities, including a youth commission which involves young people in public policy and leadership development. As part of the process, they address attitudes and create cultural changes among adults that fail to recognize young people as resources. She shows that the municipality has real potential for youth participation, and identifies "adults as allies" in

addition to youth leaders as key participants (Description by Checkoway & Gutiérrez, 2006, p. 5)

The article presents two ingredients for successfully engaging youth: creation of a system of multiple engagement opportunities, and systematic efforts to address adult attitudes that fail to recognize young people as resources to their communities. The author analyzes the lessons learned from working within a system of youth civic engagement, and presents preliminary findings of the benefits of engaging young people in the civic life of a city. (Description from the summary, p. 71).

Detzler, M. L., Van Liew, C., Dorward, L. G., Jenkins, R., & Teslicko, D. (2007, Winter). Youth voices thrive in Facilitating Leadership in Youth. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 116, 109-116.

This article describes Facilitating Leadership in Youth (FLY), a neighborhood-based organization in southeast Washington, D.C that provides up to 45 youth (ages 9-18) "comprehensive support and services, caring and trusting relationships, and gradually increasing leadership opportunities" (p. 109). Youth build leadership skills via decision-making about program activities from designing their own summer camp curriculum (which is used as a basis to hire staff for the camp) to developing community organizing projects around issues of concern to them and to their communities (e.g. "the root causes of gun violence and police brutality and harassment of youth in their neighborhood"). In 2006, the FLY Youth Council focused it efforts on gaining a seat at the table of those making critical decisions around the redevelopment of their housing communities. In gaining their seat, they eventually worked with the Office of the Deputy Mayor for Children, Youth, Families, and Elders to create a retreat where youth "identified the places in their community that they valued and wanted to be maintained, rather than removed, …created a list of new places and services that they would like to see created in their community as a part of the redevelopment, …created their ideal vision for the community in the year 2011, … prioritized all the resources and opportunities they hoped to see in the redeveloped community [employment, safety, and recreation] (p. 113). They also discussed and later received funding for what forms of formal leadership roles they wanted young people to have in the redevelopment process: six youth positions on a "New Community Advisory Group." The organization's key to success lay partly in "its commitment to establishing and maintaining positive relationships with the youth participants and their families," demonstrated by bi-weekly staff communication with participant's parent or guardian and school as well as bi-monthly meetings with parents and community leaders. The program also offers various opportunities for leadership (e.g. policy researcher, training facilitator, member of a youth council).

Luluquisen, E. M., Trinidad, A. M. O., Ghosh, D. (2006). Sariling Gawa Youth Council as a case study of youth leadership development in Hawai'i. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2), 57-70.

This article describes Hawaii's Sariling Gawa (meaning "Our Own Work" in Tagalog) youth council, which uses empowerment principles and a model of youth leadership

development that includes (1) youth empowerment through building their leadership skills; (2) fostering and strengthening peer social support and

social networks among Filipino young people; (3) promoting positive ethnic identity; and (4) building community capacity by involving youth in civic, cultural, social, and community affairs" (p. 62-63). Since its inception in 1980, young people in the program have set organizational and community priorities, formulated action plans, and organize action groups to better their communities.

Matsudaira, J., & Jefferson, A. (2006, Spring). Anytown: NCCJ's youth leadership experience in social justice. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 109, 107-115.

This article describes "Camp Anytown," a four-day, residential youth leadership education program for high school students which is run by the National Conference for Community and Justice, a national organization whose mission is fighting bias, bigotry, and racism in the United States. The program helps youth recognize themselves as leaders with influence in their communities. Using exercise, discussions, and workshops, the program youth explore the roles and responsibilities of leadership by asking themselves key questions around the choices that come with the power to influence others in positive and negative ways: "Do I want to use my power to influence those around me for the better or for the worse? Will I choose to act or will I stand idly by? Will I be a leader or will I follow?" This leadership program weaves together realization and awareness of social justice issues and focuses on personal experiences and emotions (rather than the cerebral or theoretical) while creating a safe atmosphere for emotional exploration and expression, building strong relationships, and personal transformation. Demonstrating the link between the subject matter of social justice and leadership Matsudaira writes: "More than simply introducing me to new information in order to help me logically understand what social justice is or looks like in my community, Anytown forced me to feel the consequences of injustice, to relate to the plight of others, and to never forget my role and connection to it all. As has been the case for many other Anytowners I have had the privilege of working and serving with, the Anytown experience awakened me emotionally to the consequences of denying my responsibility as an advocate and a leader" (p. 113).

Otis, M. D. (2006). Youth as engaged citizens and community change advocates through the Lexington Youth Leadership Academy. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2), 71-88.

Melanie D. Otis describes the Lexington Youth Leadership Academy as an effort to prepare participants for leadership roles. Young people develop knowledge for problem solving, program planning, peer mentoring, and community collaboration through a program which includes dialogues on diversity and a community change agent project. Program evaluators assess its effects on their self-concept, social action orientation, and other measures. (Description by Checkoway & Gutiérrez, 2006)

Skuza J.A., Russo, J.P., Gates, E. F., & Kawase M. (2006). *Urban Youth Lead: Becoming the Authors of Their Lives*. The Regents of the University of Minnesota.

Written by MN Urban 4-H Youth Development staff, this guides provides a framework and curriculum to create an intentional learning environment for youth to build higher education and career awareness and leadership skills. The process involves youth *building awareness* (of self, community and career and educational possibilities), *taking a stand* (by realizing and voicing their thoughts, naming the worlds in which they live, and taking a stand on it), and *becoming a leader* (by creating a personal learning experience and recording their experiences in portfolios to "show how they are authors of their lives"). The guide includes a shorts section on the foundations of a youth leadership program (incl. non formal learning environments, experiential learning, youth leadership, and youth participation). It also provides over 20 activities to facilitate and support each of these steps with groups of youth. Like as artists, musicians, and others, youth leaders can use portfolios for reflection and evaluation for both fostering and recording personal leadership development. Re: evaluation, a Youth Leadership Essay and Learning Environment Survey bring youth voice into the process of assessing the nature of youth leadership and the quality of their learning environment. A final section includes ideas and resources for connecting youth to higher education and careers.

Other Leadership Resources:

Black, A. M., Metzler, D. P., & Waldrum, J. (2006, Winter). That program really helped me: Using focus group research to measure the outcomes of two statewide leadership programs. Journal of Leadership Education, 5(3), 53-65. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_5_3.pdf

Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. (2004). Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared-power world (2nd ed.). Public Administration Series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Connors, J. J., Velez, J. J., & Swan, B. G. (2006, Winter). Leadership characteristics of outstanding seniors in a land-grant university college of agriculture. Journal of Leadership Education, 5(3), 93-110. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_5_3.pdf

Crosby, B., Bryson, J. M., & Anderson, S. (2004). Leadership for the common good fieldbook: Tools for working in a shared-power world CD-ROM.

Engbers, T. A. (2006, Winter). Student Leadership Programming Model revisited. Journal of Leadership Education, 5(3), 1-14. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_5_3.pdf

Harter, N. (2006, Winter). Recovering the philosophical anthropology of Max Scheler for leadership studies. Journal of Leadership Education, 5(3), 15-30. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_5_3.pdf

Pennington, P., Townsend, C., & Cummins, R. (2003). The relationship of leadership practices to culture. Journal of Leadership Education, 2(1), 27-44.

Scheffert, D. R. (2007). Community leadership: What does it take to see results? Journal of Leadership Education, 6(1), 176-191. (http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_6_1.pdf retrieved June 2, 2008).

Stech, E. L. (2007). Leadership prescription paradigms 28. Journal of Leadership Education, 6(1), 28-38. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_6_1.pdf

Stedman, N. L. P., Rutherford, T. A., & Roberts, T. G. (2006, Winter). Does providing feedback to student reflections impact the development of their leadership competence? Journal of Leadership Education, 5(3), 177-190. http://www.fhsu.edu/jole/issues/Jole_5_3.pdf

Woodrum, W., & Safrit, D. (2003). Leadership practices of West Virginia University extension agents working with the 4-H youth development program. Journal of Extension, 31(3). http://www.joe.org/joe/2003june/rb3.shtml

PAGE 1

DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP

Blitzer Golombek, S. (2006). Children as citizens. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2), 11-30.

> Drawing on examples from the youth service, service-learning, and youth in decision-making field, the author of this article makes a strong case for defining citizenship (an affiliation with a nation-state and as a series of duties and rights) acquisition by the activities one undertakes rather than by formal voting age. This would help to redefine children not as "citizens in the making" but as "social agents who already participate in building strong and democratic communities" (p. 11). They are "experts" at being what they are, and their perspectives become crucial to community decision-making processes. The author also provides interesting community and program examples of youth as "fellow citizens" and of "child-sized citizenship," defined as "a status that takes into account the specific ways in which young children participate in and build their communities" (p. 19). Also described are examples of varied paths of participation from youth-led service, service-learning, youth in philanthropy, and youth in decision-making. Blitzer Golombek notes 4-H as one of several organizations that offer trainings, technical assistance, and resources for preparing "all stakeholders through trainings and open discussions about stereotypes, "shared power" and listening to children's ideas, decision-making processes that incorporate their perspectives, and logistical arrangements that meet children's needs and schedules" (p. 27). She also gives mention to the notion of parents and children engaging in civic activities together to "contribute to lifting the barriers presented by traditional parent-child roles and encourages family members to work as a team and see each other in a new light" (p. 27).

Boyte, H.C. & Kari, N. K. (1996). *Democracy of the People: Expanding Citizen Capacity.* Paper prepared for the New Partnership Project, co-sponsored by Humphrey Institute Program on Public Policy, Philanthropy, and the Nonprofit Sector and Indiana Center for Philanthropy. Retrieved February 28, 2008 at http://www.publicwork.org/pdf/ workingpapers/Democracy%20of%20the%20People.pdf.

> The study paper looks at shifting the two main understandings of citizenship (civics and community) to what is created through public work. The paper includes a chart that illustrates how public work builds on and expands civics and community by comparing definitions, end of politics, citizenship definition, and politician's role. When citizenship is equated with volunteerism, its focus turns to process (e.g. "citizen participation" or "citizen deliberation"), not to the creation of public goods that demand mutual accountability. The authors encourage the reader to consider shifting the emphasis from providing services to the development of "civic muscle" where citizens act together to meet challenges and shape a common destiny. "Democracy is the way we meet common challenges and build a common future.... Effective citizenship depends on people thinking that the nation belongs to us all. ...we come to the view that the nation is "ours" when we feel that our contributions through work with public purpose build the country" (p. 4, 7).

Kahne, J. & Westheimer, J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 85, 34-66.

This article addresses preparing youth to be effective democratic citizens. Authors studied 10 educational programs that had democratic education as a central mission. Programs shared an emphasis on youth identifying and acting on issues of importance to themselves and to society. Three broad priorities emerged: Commitments, Capacities and Connections to others with similar goals. (A figure is included in the article that outlines the relation of these priorities to civic education.) Youth become committed to change when they are exposed to compelling social programs and are motivated to make a difference. Democratic capacity is built through real-world projects and providing skill development. Finally, youth know that civic engagement is not an individual act, but a connection with others that move forward citizenship.

Democratic citizens explore, critically reflect, analyze, dialogue and take action. "A democratic citizen's effectiveness is buttressed by the skills needed for civic engagement (how to work in a group, speak in public, forge coalitions among varied interests, and protest or petition for change)" (p. 39). Democratic values of tolerance, respect for individual and group and concern for greater good are fundamentally important.

"While programs that emphasize service and character may be valuable for supporting the development of community members, they are inadequate for the challenges of educating a democratic citizenry" (p. 36). The authors write that when character education is the only emphasis it hinders youth from exploring issues and obscures the need for public ideas. Furthermore, by stressing "loyalty, patriotism, or obedience (common components of character education as well) it can lead to antidemocratic forms of civic education if it constrains the kind of critical reflection, dialogue, and action that are essential in democratic society" (p. 36). Many programs create a commitment to individual service, but often government, politics and even collective action is not part of the equation, thus reducing the commitment to democracy.

Lewis-Charp, H., Yu, H.C., Soukamneuth, S. & Lacoe, J. (2003) Extending the reach of youth development through civic activism: Outcomes of the youth leadership for development initiative. Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development. Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.theinnovationcenter.org/pdfs/Extending_the_Reach.pdf.

The report chronicles findings from a three-year learning collaborative called the Youth Leadership Development Initiative (YLDI). The initiative centered on building the capacity of participating community based organizations (CBO) and gathering lessons about civic activism as a youth development approach. "A civic activism approach to youth development is one that holds at its center a dual priority on individual and community change, while placing an emphasis on developing youth's internal capacities to interface with the larger society." Flanagan (2002) is cited "if opportunities for young people to practice their leadership skills (e.g. facilitating meetings, designing curricula, planning community events) are distributed evenly

across socio-economic groups, then CBOs 'may serve a compensatory function of democracy.'"

Democratic values include critical consciousness of equity, fairness, value of diversity, and need for public accountability. YLDI groups helped youth create a stronger investment in democratic values, such as equity and fairness. Youth also communicated a desire to personally do what they can to share their new knowledge with others so that they can do their part to contribute to social justice and social change.

Mathews, D. (1999). *Politics for people: Finding a responsible public voice* (2nd ed.). University of Illinois Press: Urbana.

In this book, Mathews argues that "people have to become a public in order to sustain a democracy—in order to do those things that only a public can do" (p. 111). To be legitimate, governments at all levels must act on behalf of a "public interest," which must be defined by the public. Mathews sets out a vision for how U.S. citizens can overcome the disconnection to, anger towards, and cynicism about politics and public institutions and instead reclaim their role in the political system by "public making"—engaging in "public work" in "public spaces." He defines the "public" as "a diverse group of citizens joined together in ever-changing alliances to make choices about how to advance their common well-being" (p. 1) The process tool for this is "public deliberation to inform both representative government (public officials) and direct citizen action. In this context, "to deliberate means to weigh carefully both the consequences of various options for action and the views of others" (p. 111). Public spaces, then, are "places in a community where people of diverse interests can come together to redefine their problems so they can come to a common understanding of the issues and determine an effective public response to them" (p. 159).

Deliberative politics is what people can do when they don't agree on what the common good is, much less how to pursue or ensure it. It is not about the work of special interests and "professional citizens" (advisory board members, trustees, etc.—"the usual suspects" of community work). The principle organizational structure of citizen politics is the citizen associations. All citizens have an equal stake in their shared future. The key to this "choice work" is not just "having" but using diversity of people—and diversity of viewpoints in particular—to ensure that all voices are heard, the intertwining complexities of issues are fully explored, and the citizens feel the full weight of responsibility of their choices decisions for course(s) of action. Moving past personal complaints and special interests, citizens can "re-form publics" that together name and frame the major issues of the day, then learn and understand them better while deliberating on various action steps in addressing them. The resultant public judgment/voice resembles not so much a set of agreements so much as "a description of a shared struggle"; such an amalgamated voice "captures the complexity of an issue and the nuances in people's responses [and] reflects the tone and texture of a public's attitudes" (p. 94). Outcomes include building common ground for action, dealing with conflict through better understanding of points of view, joining citizens with officeholders and bettering how they relate, and organizing public action and ongoing cooperation. The second edition of this book adds a chapter specifically on the

successes of National Issues Forums and explains the deliberative process in much more detail.

Leadership in this context is focused on "marshalling the resources needed for change, not the management of institutional stability" (p. 154). Leadership in communities needs to be a broad-based phenomenon as well as the responsibility of the many. Whole communities must "become leaderful" and leadership synonymous with citizenship. Further, "educating people for civic leadership requires not so much teaching as learning by reflection on experience. But teachers are needed, teachers who can draw out and help name experiences rather than just instruct a passive audience" (p. 154). What's more, "simply teaching deliberation or how to moderate forums probably isn't enough to produce a deliberative democracy. People have to have opportunities to use the experience of deliberating to reimagine politics as an activity of citizens" (p. 249). The political education program of Harry Boyte at the U of MN's Humphrey Institute reflects this approach using the concept of "public politics." The public life project helps young people "make politics their own by teaching them how to deal with the issues that they really care about…. Teenagers…learn how they can use citizen politics to deal with the problems that affect their everyday life—from crime and race relations to their relations to their schools—in public ways, by claiming responsibility, by creating their own power, and… by building public relationships" (p. 155). It exemplifies a new political thinking by teaching "theory as tied to practice" as well as concepts, not techniques, "to enable people to transform politics."

This kind of citizen politics has several benefits outside of giving directed "purpose to citizen action and broad direction to government policy" on a certain set of issues. When public officials hear a "genuine public voice" clearly, they can then act on the public's behalf in other related areas. Participants feel differently about themselves—they take on the designation, role, and responsibility of a "public being"—a citizen, as opposed to a "consumer" of government products and services or a "critic" focusing on officials' accountability. It also helps citizens to feel more confident and to regain their sense of community and connection. Citizens discover their shared assets (not simply their needs) and are able to involve more people and organizations in common solutions. The process builds capacity for the future: once in place, it can continue to take on other issues in the community, with a group of people that has an increasingly layered and textured knowledge of their community. People also gain a better understanding and higher opinion of other people's opinions that differ from their own and create new knowledge through political discourse. Larger public interests find representation and are served like never before, and public goods (such as water and air) are better protected from potential threats. Public making reinvents politics. As ownership and responsibility of politics changes, the definition broadens to encompass the civic work that people already do as well as the discourse and deliberation that of public work.

The author differentiates between a public interest, interest reflecting the best advantage and benefit of all and which must be defined through deliberation by members of a community; self-interests, which are personal but can also include "advancing the broader public interest" to protect shared, public goods or for moral reasons; and special interests, which are group that share certain common interests

and often represented by lobbying groups in the political landscape. This is an example where public is used instead of common interest.

Mathews explores notions of responsibility, capacity, power, relationships, political will and interests, action in relation to citizen politics. He specifically mentions the fragmented way in which we approach such concerns as youth at risk and suggests that using the public can unify fragmented activities of all sorts (including agency turf battles). There is also a good example from Birmingham on how the National Issues Forum (deliberative dialog) approach was used to solve a young teen violence problem with a strategy, that involved 350 young people on advisory councils that met weekly, a team employment service, a youth-run camp for those from low-income families. Interestingly, at the forums, youth organization staff served as moderators and recorders, not regular participants, which "kept the meetings from becoming the usual public hearings" (p. 214).

The book also mentions Ralph Ketcham, whose book, Individualism and Public Life, distinguishes between "expressive democracy," in which people are given opportunity to speak out or vote in a society that teems with diverse interests and factions, and "deliberative democracy," where to create a good life in the community, public interactions and opportunities to talk, think, and act morally and responsibly together are the focus of political life. [Another interesting tidbit: Mathews mentions that "for the Greeks, an idiot was not someone with a low IQ but someone who knew nothing of his or her connection to the world outside the purely personal" (p. 209).]

Morse, S. (2004). *Smart communities: How citizens and local leaders can use strategic thinking to build a better future*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

In this thought-provoking book, Morse examines how seemingly "lucky" but really just "smart" communities use a combination of strategic thinking and acting through key strategies for community change. A smart community is defined as "a geographical place, a set of interests, or a group of people that has invented a process of work that includes, discusses, anticipates, and acts on its critical common issues, building on its assets, its broad-based leadership, and its history and values" (p. x). Smart communities' strategies—described in chapters of the same name—include investing right the first time, working together, building on community strengths, practicing democracy, preserving the past, growing leaders, and inventing a brighter future.

The chapter on "Growing Leaders" interprets three trends in communities. First, because demographic diversity is increasing, leaders within this plaza need cultural framework and understanding of cultural differences in authority, communication, and public participation traditions and barriers to public participation by minority groups. Second, increased popularity of local decision making requires leaders facilitating skills-building in working "more effectively with others through partnerships, collaborations, and deliberative processes. And third, complexity of issues must be addressed multilaterally, which requires that leaders know how to identify community assets, manage conflict, communicate a broader agenda, and help groups to work together (p. 183). Finding a host of new leaders—building leader "bench strength" of backups and replacements with new skills—is crucial.

While youth are not a focus of this chapter (or this book), youth are mentioned as a group that can contribute to the leadership spectrum of a community. The author also suggests, in part, that "involving young leaders with fresh ideas, enthusiasm, and new expertise can be greatly beneficial" (p. 185). The traditional "take charge" or catalytic leader can only go so far; "what is needed are people who can convene multiple stakeholders, facilitate and mediate consensus around tough issues, and think and act strategically…[who] have a passion for change but flexibility on how to get there" (p. 187). Further, communities need to cultivate a broad-based "plaza" of leaders as opposed to a leadership "pyramid." A plaza model invites and supports shared access, decision-making, and action by all in the community, and it makes all citizen responsibility for these. For such plazas, more citizens must be recruited ("from the boardroom to the backyard") and prepared for active participation as civic leaders. Skills needed include, among others, consensus-building, asset-based development, collaboration, and communication. A true commitment to inclusion and diversity are crucial. To get started, Morse offers four main actions (which I think which have particular resonance with U of M Extension):

- Establish places and spaces where leaders at all levels can interact.

- Look at how your community is preparing people for leadership [and] make training programs available…[to] people across the community [who] have contributions to make. Everyone needs skills and relationships in order to work effectively for common purpose.

- Examine the community's expectations for leadership [e.g. treatment of elected officials for working on long-term goals, citizen's role in decision-making, "bench strength"].

- Identify the rallying points for broad-based leadership. Many issues touch all people in a community (pp.205-206).

U.S. Department of State's Bureau of International Information Programs, Overview: What is Democracy?. Retrieved February 20, 2008, from Principles of Democracy Web site: http://usinfo.state.gov/products/pubs/principles/index.html.

"Although nuances apply to the world's various democracies, certain principles and practices distinguish democratic government from other forms of government…. Democracies rest upon fundamental principles, not uniform practices. Citizens in a democracy not only have rights, they have the responsibility to participate in a political system that, in turn, protects their rights and freedoms." Democracy is People; Power and civic responsibility exercised by all citizens; Principles and practices to protect human freedom; Majority rule/individual and minority rights; Elections; Equal Protection; and Diverse, reflecting unique political, social, and cultural life. Democratic societies value tolerance, cooperation, and compromise while realizing that reaching consensus may not always be possible."

PAGE 1

YOUTH PARTICIPATION

Brennan, M. A., Barnett, R. V., & Baugh, E. (2007, August). Youth involvement in community development: Implications and possibilities for Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 45(4). http://www.joe.org/joe/2007august/index.shtml.

This article reports the results of a study conducted on key variables that affect youth involvement in community development: demographics, influences, motivations, obstacles, and efficacy (each with various facets). Authors begin with a call for youth involvement in not just 4-H programming but a wide variety of Extension activities to enhance life in communities. They report that "recent youth engagement literature… has identified that youth must be fully engaged and involved in change efforts at the community level if they are to learn to function as effective members of society" (p. 2). They used key informants (4-H youth, staff and other 4-H adults) and questionnaires by 4-H teens to learn more about the nature of youth involvement in community-building. Individually, all the variables were predictors of community involvement, but efficacy and involvement influences were strongest, particularly the influence of setting an example for others, suggesting that "Extension and community development professionals could focus more on building the kinds of opportunities that would allow youth to set an example for other youth [which] may result in increased youth involvement,… positive effects on other domains of youth and community…[and] enhancing their social and civic development" (p. 9-10). Older youth were more active, which suggests that younger youth may be an untapped resource for recruitment. Significant obstacles identified included youth not being allowed to vote and youth lacking recognition, which suggests that youth will become involved provided they have true (if shared) decision-making authority, that they are seen as valuable opinions and can make good decision, and that they are recognized for their contributions throughout the process. Finally, "youth were more active when their community was receptive to their contributions and viewed them as worthwhile to the community" (p. 10), which underscores the need for public acknowledgements of their efforts for, contributions to, and impacts on community building.

The authors end with this call to Extension staff program developers, and policy planners: "Civically active youth present a remarkable opportunity for advancing Extension programs and significantly contributing to the development of new programs and policies. Further, active youth present the opportunity for long-term involvement and ownership of community and Extension programs. Building on this opportunity, active youth can be a cornerstone of Extension efforts designed to improving local well-being" (p. 10).

Checkoway, B. N., & Gutiérrez, L. M. (2006). Youth participation and community change: An introduction. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2), 1-9.

This article serves as an introduction to a series of articles on the subject of youth participation in community building. The authors assert that numerous and varied groups of young people show that participation for social and political action has many kinds of strategies, goals, and characteristics. These activities can be described on a ladder of participation corresponding to levels of power exercised, differentiated from youth development and other models, and as steps in a process

from gathering information to program evaluation. While studies show positive effects on personal confidence, social connectedness, civic competencies, and leadership development, the potential benefits of participation on youth needs much more systematic research—especially research that focuses on quality participation and community change effects. The authors maintain a view of youth as "citizens with a right to participate and a responsibility to serve their communities" and proponents who "build on the strengths of youth by enabling them to make a difference in ways that provide them with tangible benefits and develop healthier communities (p. 3). They predict that youth participation will increase in the future—to the point of a "youth participation movement." They advocate for youth participation in participatory research and evaluation where people collaborate in defining problematic community issues, gathering information, analyzing findings, and using the knowledge to address those issues.

Hart, Roger (1992). Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship. New Florence, Italy: UNICEF.

This piece defines "participation" as the process of "sharing decisions which affect one's life and the life of the community in which one lives," and purports that such participation is a fundamental right of citizenship. Hart introduces a ladder of participation, including what he calls: degrees of non-participation (manipulation, decoration and tokenism); and degrees of participation (assigned but informed , consulted and informed, adult-initiated, shared decisions with children, child initiated and directed, child-initiated, shared decisions with adults). (Description by the Univ. of MN Youth Work Institute: http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/00016.pdf)

Irby, M., Ferber, T., & Pittman, K., with J. Tolman & N. Yohalem. (2001). *Youth action: Youth contributing to communities, communities supporting youth*. Community & Youth Development Series, Volume 6. Takoma park, MD: Forum for Youth Investment, International Youth Foundation. www.cpn.org/topics/youth/cyd/pdfs/Youth_Action.pdf.

This product from the Forum for Youth Investment follows trends in youth action, offers civic participation approaches, explores the commonalities and differences, and identifies pathways for youth engagement. A number of figures and tables illustrate the authors' points.

Trend 1 moves discussions from problem prevention to preparation, from preparation to participation, and finally from participation to power sharing. Trend 2 looks at civic participation, community development, leadership development, and youth development arenas as separate but each with opportunities for positive youth participation. Young people are seeking more meaningful ways to contribute to their communities in the third trend.

Youth must be expected to fully participate in projects that are relevant to them. Youth will respond to the call for service when there is a shift from "receiving knowledge to creating knowledge and from being service recipients to being program planners and deliverers" (p. 11). We must not forgot that young people

grow up in communities, not programs, and thus youth, especially older youth, "vote with their feet" and seek out those organizations that demonstrate positive impact on communities. A balance between individual growth and community change must be sought.

Multiple paths for youth to be civically engaged must be made available. "Young people need ongoing options for meaningful participation in organizations and activities that they believe will make a difference to someone" (p. 30). Primary lesson: "To support youth development and maximize community or civic impact, opportunities for youth action must be coupled with opportunities for young people to build skills capacity and understanding while deepening motivation and awareness" (p. 32).

O'Donoghue, J., Kirshner, B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (2003). Moving youth participation forward. *New Directions for Youth Development: Theory, Practice and Research*, No. 96. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/102524608/issue.

The authors discuss four myths that are barriers to the full participation and engagement of young people in programs and partnerships. (Description by the Univ. of MN Youth Work Institute: http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/00016.pdf)

Olson, J. R., Goddard, H. W., Solheim, C. A., & Sandt, L. (December 2004). Making a case for engaging adolescents in program decision-making. *Journal of Extension*, 42(6). http://www.joe.org/joe/2004december/index.shtml

The authors of this article researched youths' perceptions of social problems affecting their lives, how these perceptions differed from those of adults, and how youth and adult perceptions differed from actual behaviors. The researchers found that adults and youth have different perceptions of current concerns about adolescents and that these differ from actual behaviors. Authors then recommend gathering data from multiple sources (including youth) before making program decisions. Also, local-level data gathering that includes youth is warranted since local behavior trends may not mirror those at the national level. They find that adolescents are interested in community decision-making and can share their unique perspective on social issues. And finally, "including youth as partners in the prevention process can encourage them to enjoy the process, feel empowered by the process, and stay involved in the process."

Serido, J., Borden, L. M., & Perkins, D. (2006). Moving beyond youth voice. Unpublished manuscript.

The authors present research findings that suggest a connection between positive youth/adult relationships and youth voice in promoting positive youth development outcomes. Young people who have positive relationships with adults in a program perceive they have more voice in that program and, in turn, perceive more benefits

to program participation. (Description by the Univ. of MN Youth Work Institute: http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/00016.pdf)

Spring, K., Dietz, N., & Grimm, R. Jr., (March 2007). *Leveling the path to participation: Volunteering and civic engagement among youth from disadvantaged circumstances*. Corporation for National and Community Service. http://www.nationalservice.gov/pdf/07_0406_disad_youth.pdf retrieved June 1, 2008.

This report presents the results of a major national study on the different volunteering habits of youth (ages 12-18) from different economic backgrounds. The study showed that youth from disadvantaged circumstances (DAC) were less likely to volunteer than youth from non-disadvantaged circumstances. However other major findings included the following:

- When youth from DAC do volunteer, they do so at the same intensity (number of hours) as other youth.
- They are more likely to volunteer with a religious organization than with a "civic-oriented youth organization" (among which 4-H is listed).
- Youth from DAC are more likely to be motivated to volunteer in order to gain skills or work experience and to fulfill their religious or spiritual beliefs.
- Like other youth, youth from DAC volunteer when asked, and teachers most often make the ask that leads to volunteering.
- Common volunteer activities of youth from DAC include providing general labor, participating in music or art activities, collecting or distributing food, and fundraising.
- Youth from DAC show more positive civic attitudes and behaviors than those who do not volunteer.
- Certain pathways to volunteering (e.g. family volunteering, school-based service-learning, youth group involvement, and religious service attendance) are least likely to be a part of the lives of youth from DAC, except for religious service attendance.
- Volunteering among youth from DAC is related to the education level of their parents.
- Youth from DAC who volunteer are more likely to be confident in future endeavors like graduating from a four-year college and making a difference in their communities.

The report also outlines key findings related to the social identity, attitudes and behaviors toward volunteering, attitudes towards community and nation of youth from DAC. The report findings suggest that: educators are good motivators (askers) for involving youth in their communities; when recruiting youth, it helps to be clear about certain potential benefits of volunteering like skills and work experiences;

and religious organizations may be good partners for "civic-oriented" organizations looking to engage youth.

Weiss, H. B., Little, P. M., Bouffard, S. M. (2005, Spring). More than just being there: Balancing the participation equation. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 105.

Weiss contends, "enrollment and attendance without engagement do not reflect true participation" in youth programs. While providing a safe haven for youth in non-school hours is "a concern first and foremost for many families... merely being there is not what make real improvements in youth outcomes." She defines engagement as "not only motivation to be there; it is also being actively involved in cognitive and social endeavors that promote growth." She sites core program features that have been identified as key to youth engagement in out of school programs: A sense of personal safety, relationships with caring adults, opportunities for leadership, opportunities for socializing with peers, and engagement in high quality learning experiences. She asserts that more research is needed to understand what it takes to achieve meaningful participation as young people grow and mature through childhood and adolescence. (Description by the Univ. of MN Youth Work Institute: http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/00016.pdf)

PAGE 1

YOUTH CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNITY CHANGE

Andolina, M.W., Jenkins, K., Keeter, S., & Zukin, C. (2002). Searching for the meaning of youth civic engagement: Notes from the field. *Applied Developmental Science*, *6 (4)*, 189-195.

> The authors report on early findings from a youth civic engagement study and focus on what they label as the "Dot-com generation," 15- to 24-year-olds. Authors report that an expert panel they enlisted indicated the current generation of youth are focused more on local projects, not national causes.   Youth are at odds with traditional politics (politics with a capital P), but seek to make a difference in the world around them (politics with a small p). Youth of this generation work for change by "collective efforts organized over the Internet, informal gatherings of friends, and consumer boycotts" (p. 191).

Boyte, H. (2008, May/June). Against the current: Developing the civic agency of students. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*. http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/change/sub.asp?key=98&subkey=2581.

> This article describes the useful notions of "technocratic creep" and "technocracy." The first is the perception of erosion of individual and collective agency which constrains action. The second occurs when we look to (no doubt well-meaning) professionals "to rescue people and solve problems," resulting in interventions that "disempower…those without credentialed expertise [by eroding] their capacities and confidence." Boyte describes how "higher education is both a source and victim of technocracy" and argues for us to understand and revive "scholarship and teaching as public crafts." He describes briefly the turf wars, hyper-competitive norms, "star system," and erosion of apprentice relationships with graduate students at the University of Minnesota, finding that came from the 1997 investigation into the possibilities for renewing the U of M's land grant mission.[1] At the Center for Democracy and Citizenship looks to broad-based organizing to address public issues. At the center of the effort were organizers that brought together "love and power," not apolitical and disinterested outsider experts in controlled application of social principles.

> Working to develop civic capacities for action among students and to bring a more civic-agency focus to academe, the Center began the Public Achievement program in 1990. Public Achievement (PA) brings together self-directed teams of five to ten youth, who, with the help of college student "coaches," work on collective action projects of their choosing for over a year or more. Youth "learn organizing skills and concepts (e.g. one-on-one interviewing, public speaking, and collective evaluation) as well as political concepts (e.g. power, self-interest, and "public work"). Boyte gives an updated definition of public work as "sustained effort by a diverse

---

[1] More on this can be found in Boyte's *Public Engagement in a Civic Mission: A Case Study* which is accessible on the Council on Public Policy Education website: http://www.publicpolicyeduccouncil.org/publications_program/pecm.html. Also: Boyte's "Public Work: Public Work: Civic Populism versus Technocracy in Higher Education" (2008) in *Agent of Democracy: Higher Education and the HEX Journey*. (Brown, D.W., & Witte, D., eds.). Available at www.kettering.org/stream_document.aspx?rID=3126&catID=2&itemID=3124&typeID=8.

mix of people that generates lasting civic goods, material or cultural." Youth are seen as crucial to a public work process: they are "citizens of today" and not "citizens in preparation." So often youth are asked what they think others should do about public problems rather than what youth, themselves can do to address them. Public work invites their involvement. Though much in common with service learning, public work is different in that it is "explicitly political" and is not about "helping others" per se. It focuses on "civic capacities such as learning to work with others with whom one disagrees, reading the political and cultural dynamics of settings, learning how to act in open-ended situations with no predetermined outcomes, respecting others' capacities for self-directed action, and being responsible for one's actions and accountable to one's peers" (p. 7).

The article describes the role of the college student "coach": Good PA coaches are not disciplinarians, but neither are they "buddies." They see their role as helping young people to become confident, self-reliant, and powerful. Good coaches let participants learn from mistakes. They challenge them to try out new roles and skills. They get to know each member's interests and potential" (p. 8). These coaches assist youth in taking responsibility and direction for their efforts. The coach role is also to work themselves out of a job so that, in the end, students cultivate the confidence and skills to do public work without their help.

Public Achievement has seen many positive outcomes for communities and individuals: "participants have a rich record of accomplishment: building playgrounds, marching against violence, challenging racial profiling, effecting curricular reform, taking action on global warming, and so on. Deep changes often occur in young people's sense of the world and themselves. The world becomes more open and subject to change, and they begin to see themselves as agents of that change… [An outside evaluation of PA programs] found gains in the skills of working with others, planning, and organizing, as well as greater interest in public affairs and confidence that young people can make a difference. High-school students gained deliberative and communication skills such as oral presentation and an ability to listen even to those they disagreed with" (p. 8).

Challenges involved in Public Achievement include: the great amount of faculty and staff time and involvement required to create good coaches; the difficulty of staff and faculty who want to build public relationships; and the open ended, "messy" nature of the work, which is not easy to fit in educational settings and is disconcerting to coaches and teams, particularly at first. Boyte also describes the PA outcomes around civic learning on the Colgate University campus as well as institutional change at St. Catherine's. The lessons of the latter led to a public-work theory where civic engagement becomes an integral part of scholarship and teaching, which further led to the argument of democratic society-building being the overall mission for higher education at U.S. research universities in this century. Furthermore, "such a view of higher education's mission leads to a focus on cultural change: civic engagement needs to infuse organizational identity, not simply take shape in discrete activities. For example, at the University of Minnesota, …the aim should not be to *do* civic engagement; rather, it should *be* an engaged institution" (p. 10). Boyte ends by delving further into the supportive structures and programs at the U of M and plans for future partnerships, network-building, and structural change (e.g. faculty-reward structures and assessment of student learning).

Boyte, H., & Skelton, N. (1997, February). The legacy of public work: Educating for citizenship. *Educational Leadership*, 54, 12-17.

"Understanding democracy comes mainly from doing democracy." In this article, Boyte and Skelton argue that "education involving public work is a key to successful civic education" and that "a movement that educates for democracy through public work" must not only "reinvigorate civic education" but also "renew democracy itself." Public work is defined as "work by a mix of people whose efforts result in products of lasting importance to our communities and society." By building community, young people will experience ownership, authority, confidence to act, motivation to learn what is needed. This is crucial for young people "to develop the conviction that the country is theirs to shape and reshape" (to build communities). Young people are already doing public work, and these experiences shape "their attitudes toward work for the rest of their lives and [help] develop their sense of citizenship and civic responsibility" (p. 1). We should not be focusing on simply building civic knowledge and values but guiding our youth to help build our democracy directly, to become producers of democracy.

Underpinnings of this view include early 20th Century reformers of commonwealth democracy (melding social dimensions of wealth with popular government), Jane Addams, the Country Life Movement and cooperative extension movement (and Liberty Hyde Bailey). Today in MN, current legacies to this include The Center for Democracy and Citizenship and Neighborhood House in St. Paul. Public Achievement has experimented with this "work-centered approach" whereby young people have worked on various public work projects and made lasting contributions to their communities. Outcomes for the youth include learning how much they can achieve through public contribution, working together as a team, how to deal with different kinds of people, and feeling more confident. The key is for adults to guide and not lead, to allow youth to identify issues, devise strategies, and evaluate their own progress.

The article also includes a very handy table comparing three approaches to civic education, including a Civics Approach, and Community Approach, and a Commonwealth Approach. The table compares the approaches' goals, definition of citizen, role of school leaders, instructional focus, and assessment. The Civics Approach uses civic knowledge as the focus of the assessment, while the Community Approach spotlights attention to civic values (e.g. responsibility, concern for others).The Commonwealth Approach is quite different: it asks what students and schools produce, what civic capacities are developed, what learning resources were tapped, and how lessons learned are institutionalized.

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 (4)*, 213-220.

"Inclusive participation is a primary component of civil society. The assumption of inclusive participation is that all citizens have legitimate opportunities to influence decisions concerning the identification, leveraging, and mobilization of community resources" (p. 213). This article indicates that pathways for youth civic engagement

are limited and that the apparent isolation of youth and adults has translated into low expectations in civic participation. The authors offer four new pathways for youth civic engagement: Public policy consultation on youth issues; Youth infusion in organizational decision-making; Youth organizing; and School-based service learning. Real examples of the youth civic engagement are provided for each pathway.

Qualities that must be present for the pathways to succeed include Ownership; Youth-adult partnership; and Facilitative policies and structures. Youth need to own their successes and failures which come from authentic roles and having authority over decision-making. This decision-making "assists youth in becoming architects of their communities' future" (p. 218). Youth-adult partnerships are often part of civic engagement, and youth seek adult support for things like coaching, connections to resources, and conversations. Some structures and policies, such as mission statements, committees and boards, help move action forward.

Authors note "many civic involvement/development projects for youth risk becoming tokenistic when youth are equipped only with the techniques of involvement, not with the knowledge and experience of leadership and administration. Whereas involvement requires youth and adults alike to have or develop particular skills in, for example, planning, meeting facilitation, event coordination, leadership is not a skill per se. It is rather a complex set of skills, behaviors, actions, and attitudes best developed through apprenticeship- and experiential-type learning processes, which necessitate close partnership between novices and older hands" (p. 218).

Civic Engagement and Service-Learning. Retrieved May 14, 2008, from APA On-Line Web site: http://www.apa.org/ed/slce/civicengagement.html.

Definition of Civic Engagement:

"Service-learning and civic engagement are not the same thing in the sense that not all service-learning has a civic dimension and not all civic engagement is service-learning. For definition's sake, civic engagement is the broader motif, encompassing service-learning but not limited to it. One useful definition of civic engagement is the following: individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual voluntarism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy. Civic engagement encompasses a range of specific activities such as working in a soup kitchen, serving on a neighborhood association, writing a letter to an elected official or voting. Indeed, an underlying principal of our approach is that an engaged citizen should have the ability, agency and opportunity to move comfortably among these various types of civic acts."

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.

This book uses research data from the Political Engagement Project (PEP) to stress the importance of educating young people (focus here is on college students) for democratic participation as well as guidelines for educators and administrators who oversee such programs. Three dimensions encompass their notion of political development: 1. political understanding, 2. political skills (political influence and action, political analysis and judgment, communication and leadership, and teamwork, collaboration, and compromise), and 3. political motivation (politically engaged identity and sense of internal and external political efficacy). In five chapters, the book details five major strategies for political education and development, including political discussion and deliberation, political action and research projects, invited speakers and program-affiliated mentors, external placements, and structured reflection. Authors also describe examples, benefits, challenges, and guidance for each strategy.

Flanagan, C. A., & Faison, N. (2001). *Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and programs.* Ann Arbor, MI: Society for Research in Child Development. www.srcd.org/documents/publications/SPR/spr15-1.pdf.

The authors examine how research can affect youth programs and policies, and offer three points for consideration. First, adults, particularly those in public spaces (teachers, coaches, non-formal youth group leaders), must model tolerance and teamwork. Second, the younger generation and society they create are reflected by the educational and child rearing values of the current society. Young people will be more oriented to the needs of others if their individual interests are connected to the larger public rather than focused on enhancing self. Finally, if young people know the full story of history, "they appreciate that history and politics are controversial, they may see the importance of taking a stand and of adding their voice to the debate" (p. 1). This promotes a deeper democracy.

Hart, D., & Atkins, R. (2002). Civic competence in urban youth. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 227-236.

This review implies that urban youth fall behind their suburban counterparts in civic competence and civic participation. It explores the effect of family and adults, schools and neighborhood institutions on civic development. Adults in urban areas vote at a much lower rate and are less likely to trust others, hypothesizing that young people receive less positive messages from their families and affecting their level of civic participation. Schools are tasked with preparing youth to become useful citizens, but there is little evidence that schools are primarily at fault for the lag in urban civic competence. Previous research supports participation in voluntary organizations as a positive influence for civic engagement. Urban youth have fewer opportunities to participate in such organizations, thus hampering their ability to build civic competencies. The article ends by comparing urban Camden, New Jersey with its suburban neighbor, Cherry Hill, and how families, schools and neighborhoods affect civic development in both communities.

Hildreth, R.W. (2000, September). Theorizing citizenship and evaluating public achievement. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 33 (3),* 627-632.

Hildreth presents an account of his experiences and observations of Public Achievement and explains how it teaches elementary, middle school, and high school students "to be effective and reflective political and social actors." Working with undergraduate student coaches, teams of youth select issues of concern (from lunch menus to increasing public safety to eliminating land mines world wide) and develop their own means to address them. They discuss and research their issue and its context, formulate a project or series of actions to make an impact within a set time (e.g. the academic year), and evaluate the impact of their project. Hildreth also describes the research and reflective activities of youth (e.g. "power maps," action plans, group work, etc.) and the training and reflective activities done by student coaches (debriefing, journaling, readings, class discussions, etc.) before facilitating projects and "co-creating" the group and its public work space with youth.

Formal quantitative evaluation by the sponsoring foundations found that positive youth outcomes include "understanding of focal issue, self-perception of civic power and competence, mastery of teamwork, public speaking, expressing opinions and respecting others' opinions" while coaches gain "better understandings of the connections between theory and practice, better understandings of local communities, a greater appreciation of the capacities of young people, and improved abilities in working with youth" (p. 4).

Hildreth presents results of a participatory research evaluation (utilization-focused method) pinpoint how PA "works" for youth participants. First, PA invites and allows youth to take on matters of import to them and values their opinions and contributions to solutions. The process is one of "continuous co-creation of a small group that is inclusive and works democratically…a space and place where young people can 'craft' themselves in new ways" (p. 5) and try out new roles for themselves. The youth take responsibility for the consequences of their actions and thus learn to see that their actions matter in the world and that they are "competent civic actors." Youth learn to define success for themselves for their public work and beyond, and further, "through reflection and application of the theoretical framework of public work, the group can start to build and test grounded personal and collective theories of the how the world works around their issue as well as their individual places in this world" (p. 6). For their part, coaches find that the ambiguity of their role makes them reflect deeply on their personal identity, their action within their group, and their assumptions of youth, education, and democracy, which, for some, leads to a personal transformation. They often come to see the youth as role models and are inspired by youths' "passion, dedication, thoughtfulness, and practical efficacy." PA helps coaches to ground their class readings in tangible, real-world experiences. Hildreth also posits that both youth and their coaches do more than simply learn theory and instead use it to test and rethink their PA experiences. This theorizing "can be a liberating process that allows individuals to gain a sense of power over meaning-making and language, and which…can open spaces for thought, action, and being within disciplinary discourses. Therefore, it is absolutely crucial that theorizing is democratic, open,

and possible for all…citizens in a democracy [which] has important consequences for democratic theory and the conceptualization of citizenship" (p. 7).

Note: there are also annual evaluations of Public Achievement that examine participants' experiences in the program. These give more detail on outcomes for youth participants and coaches as well as the challenges associated with the program's structure and implementation. Permission is needed to cite these, however.

Hyman, J.B. (2002). Exploring social capital and civic engagement to create a framework for community building. *Applied Developmental Science*. 6 (4), 196-202.

While the article does not specifically address youth, it does recognize that communities are important to positive youth development and it is the responsibility of many, including family, friends, neighbors, and even passersby to provide environments and opportunities that youth need to thrive. Community-empowered change can happen through community building and youth can participate in, contribute to and even initiate this process.

Based on the work of two well-known social capital proponents, James Coleman and Robert Putnam, the author offers this definition of social capital: "Social capital is an asset representing actionable resources that are contained in, and accessible through, a system of relationships" (p. 197). Social capital grows out of civic engagement. While civic engagement may occur on an individual level, the more civic engagement present in a community, the more likely that energy will be created and relationships built around an issue to create social capital, and ultimately community change. The author offers five components that comprise the community building process: resident engagement, agenda building, community organizing, community action, and communications and message development.

Jennings, L. B., Parra-Medina, D. M., Hilfinger Messias, D. K., & McLoughlin, K. (2006). Toward a critical social theory of youth empowerment. *Journal of Community Practice,* 14(1/2), 31-55.

In this rich article, the authors offer their Critical Youth Empowerment (CYE) model as a way to understand youth participation. The model is based on existing models of youth development and youth empowerment including the Adolescent Empowerment Cycle (Chinman and Linney), Youth Development and Empowerment (Kim et al.), Transactional Partnering model (Cargo et al.[2]), and Empowerment Education (Friere, and Wallerstein, et al.) as well as their own participatory research experiences. Key dimensions for critical youth empowerment are (from p. 42):

1. A welcoming and safe social environment co-created by youth and adults where youth feel valued, respected, encouraged, and supported, where youth have a sense of ownership and yet are challenged and supported to move beyond their usual comfort zone

---

[2] This is akin to youth-adult partnerships. For more on this topic, see Cargo, M., Grams, G.D., Ottoson, J. M., Ward, P., & Green, L.W. (2003). Empowerment as fostering positive youth development and citizenship. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 27(Supplement 1), S66-79.

2. Meaningful participation and engagement that includes opportunities for youth to develop capacities in a meaningful forum (of youth interest) with youth responsibility and decision-making

3. Equitable power-sharing between youth and adults, with power incrementally transferred to youth as they gain capacity

4. Engagement in critical reflection on interpersonal and sociopolitical processes, where individual- and community-empowerment are viewed as interwoven

5. Participation in sociopolitical processes to affect change, within programs that emphasize societal analysis and encourage social change goals

6. Integrated individual- and community-level empowerment through varied youth-based approaches

Outcomes relating to individual- and community-level empowerment are explored at various levels and include:

- Developmental outcomes for youth: increased self-efficacy and self-awareness as well as positive identity development, positive social bonding, awareness of organizational operations and interpersonal relations, and a sense of purpose

- Inter-personal outcomes for youth and adults: opportunities for adults and youth to spend time together, recognize each other's strengths and assets, and value partnership and collaboration, thereby bridging existing divides and further integrating young people into larger social worlds

- Community engagement provides benefits for youth and beyond: social integration and expansion of life chances and social networks and also enhances participatory competence, such as the capacity to cooperation, compromise, and appreciate diverse perspectives

- Community-level empowerment outcomes: self-, collective-, and political-efficacy

The article concludes with discussion of the measurement of outcomes for individuals, organizations and communities, and the challenges and opportunities for empowerment in youth organization. While the measurement of psychological empowerment at the individual level is more developed, measuring community outcomes is particularly challenging. The authors suggest that "addressing community evaluation as a participatory process in which youth are actively engaged in the design, implementation, and analysis of evaluation studies should be considered an opportunity for meaningful engagement and empowerment. As such, empowerment evaluation is a promising area for future community based, youth-centered research" (p. 52).

Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002). The civic and political health of the nation: A generational portrait. CIRCLE: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.civicyouth.org/research/products/Civic_Political_Health.pdf.

Focusing on Americans ages 15-25, this study describes the civic and political behavior of the public and covers two modes of engagement: civic and political.

"Half of all Americans can be characterized as engaged. One in five (20%) specialize in the electoral realm (by voting, working for a candidate, or party, for example); another 16 percent confine their efforts to the civic realm (working on problems in their community, raising money for charities or volunteering). Those who are active in *both* the civic and electoral arenas (16% overall)…are unique in their means of political expression, speaking more loudly and through a broader variety of channels than other citizens" (p. 12). The study outlined 19 core indicators of engagement in three categories: Civic, Electoral, and Political Voice. Engaged citizen comparisons are also made across generations (Mature, Boomer, GenX, DotNet).

Kirlin, M. (2003, June). The role of civic skills in fostering civic engagement. *CIRCLE Working Paper 06*, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP06Kirlin.pdf.

The working paper was based on a literature review looking at civic engagement from the viewpoints of political science, education field, experiential programs (service-learning and youth development), and psychology. The author focused on civic behaviors (i.e., writing persuasive letters) rather than values or beliefs.

One model "identifies three components needed for adults to participate in public life: interest or motivation; connection to the networks of individuals involved; and resources (time and money) and the civic skills to use the resources effectively" (p. 5). The paper includes a figure on stages and factors relevant to political participation, and specifically cites clubs and groups other than sports are thought to teach civic skills necessary for later participation and develop interest in politics. Another figure outlines Components of a Common Education for Citizenship in a Democracy.

Kirlin also noted work that supports involving young people in project creation and governance of their organizations develops leadership and governance capacities that are useful for civic engagement, and that youth are often highly segregated from adults who might otherwise serve as role models for learning to become civically engaged. Multiple sources indicated the importance for young people to participate in local organizations that provides opportunities to practice basic roles, skills and processes needed for democratic citizenship. Morgan and Streb (2001) were cited as finding "when students have real responsibilities, challenging tasks, helped to plan the project, and made important decisions, involvement in service-learning projects had significant and substantive impacts on students increases in self-concept, political engagement, and attitudes towards out-groups" (p. 12).

Specific civic skills were divided into four major categories: 1) organization (i.e., planning and running a meeting, process of participating), 2) communication (i.e., writing letters, oral presentations), 3) collective decision-making (i.e., expressing own opinion, working towards consensus), and 4) critical thinking (i.e., analyzing and explaining, formulating positions on public issues). A figure in the paper includes authors, skills, empirical measurements. The author suggests that development of these skills may be missing from many community service programs.

Levine, P. (2007). *The future of democracy: Developing the next generation of American citizens.* Tufts University Press: Medford, MA.

Peter Levine argues that children should have serious civic responsibilities partly as an outgrowth of positive youth development which reflects a fundamental commitment to "treating fellow human beings as responsible agents and enabling them to develop their talents and political autonomy" (p. xi). This book is an excellent overview of the latest thinking in civic engagement of young people. In a round about way, the author defines civic engagement as "any action that affects legitimately public matters (even is selfishly motivated)...minus any forms of behavior that are morally illegitimate" (p. 13). He also explains why communities need youth and vice verse. Reasons for engaging young people include the following (pp. 60-):

1. Young people have distinct interests that need voicing.

2. Civic engagement is good for young people.

3. Improving youth civic engagement is the most effective way to enhance civil society.

4. Youth have an "autonomous culture" with powerful effects.

The book describes various measures of civic engagement (participation in associations, political participation, political voice, knowledge and "cognitive engagement," etc.) and details core civic, electoral, and political indicators. He further makes a case for adding indicators that speak to political voice (e.g. blogging, buy-cotting, giving money to think tanks) and acts of resistance (ranging from acts of non-violent civil disobedience to creating open-source software to "hacktivism"—shutting down web sites for political or moral reasons). Levine also describes trends in behavior and values of today's engaged youth, the barriers to civic education.

Particularly fascinating for the educator are the chapters on the various ways civics is and can be taught and learned in schools and in communities (in after-school settings, through digital media, and in local governments). He illustrates new development in higher education (e.g. public work), institutional reforms (e.g. in high schools and in politics) and new forms of journalism. Levine contextualizes the possibility for successful youth civic engagement within a broader civic renewal movement with essential elements that include practical deliberative democracy, community economic development, democratic community-organizing work, work to defend and expand the commons, work on a new generation of public media, development of social software, and the engaged university. He ends with ten policy proposals around youth and immigrant education, government service, public media, and political deliberation, influence and decision-making.

Mohamed, I.A., & Wheeler, W. (2001). Broadening the bounds of youth development: Youth as engaged citizens. *The Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development*, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.theinnovationcenter.org/pdfs/Broadening_the_Bounds.pdf.

The Ford Foundation commissioned this report to determine what conditions must exist for youth to be involved, and to participate as leaders, in the social change process. This publication speaks to youth leadership development as a central component to youth development and how civic engagement has "re-emerged as a viable means for young people to develop and exercise leadership while effecting concrete changes in their communities." Its primary focus is "civic activism, defined as direct action in support of or in opposition to an issue relating to the civil affairs of people at the neighborhood, local, regional, state, national and global levels" (p. 5).

The authors offer service-learning at one end of a continuum and civic activism at the other of youth participation. In citing Gibson (2000), volunteering in a soup kitchen is one thing, but understanding why there is a soup kitchen and taking steps to structurally address the problem is another. Moreover, civic activism is especially important when trying to reach older youth as they gain transferable skills.

Nakamura, J. (2001, Fall). The nature of vital engagement in adulthood. In M. Michaelson & J. Nakamua (Eds.), Supportive Frameworks for Youth Engagement, *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development,* 93. New York: Jossey-Bass. http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/91015297/issue.

Nakamura uses the term "vital engagement" to describe experiences in which one feels "vital and fully alive because he is wholly absorbed in the experience." She describes many experiential elements of vital engagement, based on a thorough review of the youth development literature in this area. She offers creative work and service work as examples of experiences that can promote vital engagement. (Description by the Univ. of MN Youth Work Institute: http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/00016.pdf)

Pearson, S. S., & Voke, H. M. (2003). *Building an Effective Citizenry: Lessons Learned from Initiatives in Youth Engagement.* Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum. http://www.aypf.org/publications/building-an-effective-citizenry.pdf

This report presents some of the activities, work, and ideas to promote the development of effective and engaged citizens that were presented and discussed during the course of a series of forums and field trips conducted by the American Youth Policy Forum in 2002-2003. Forum overviews and writings focus on a variety of topics, e.g. barriers to participation by youth with disabilities, scaling up local projects to a national level, school democracy education, students service learning, overview and contrast of civic and political behavior in "Generation DotNet," city models for engaging youth in policy-making, youth involvement in educational reform and redesign, examples of youth court and a public policy charter school. Lessons learned section has several recommendations creating successful youth engagement initiatives. These include moving beyond "token involvement" of youth, training youth in leadership skills to be effective problem solvers, training adults to avoid thinking that all youth are apathetic and to listen to youth and respect and value youths' experiences, knowledge, and perspectives. Authors also support

policies and legislation to expand service-learning opportunities for all youth. The also note that youth engagement can be "complex, messy, and difficult," and that it requires hard work, sustained commitment to problem-solving, a willingness to learn from others with different experiences, and developing trusting relationships between adults and youth. Pearson and Voke further delineate the recommendations for practices and policies (pp. 26-28):

1. Listen to the voices of youth, value their input and give them the tools to support their engagement.

2. Make service an expected and common experience for all young people.

3. Expand the number of schools and community programs in America that support youth civic engagement and service and civics instruction.

4. Promote a more supportive cultural environment for teaching democracy.

Pittman, K., Martin, S., & Williams, A. (2007, July). Core principles for engaging young people in community change. Washington, D.C.: The Forum for Youth Investment, Impact Strategies, Inc. http://www.forumforyouthinvestment.org/node/60 or http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/00013.pdf.

This paper serves as a youth engagement introduction with important but simple principles for putting the notion of youth engagement into practice. Authors state that while programs can help some youth "beat the odds" of low support communities, community members—of all ages—must come together to "change the odds" for youth in that community. They describe the effect of a "double arrow" where youth contribute to communities and communities contribute to youth for successful development of youth, families, and communities.

Authors describe four interrelated strategies to long-term change: youth and family engagement, improvement of services, align policy, and increase demand. While all of these are important, youth and family engagement is the most often overlooked. Regarding leadership, they add, "Similarly, those who focus on youth leadership should ask the question "leadership for what?" They should make sure that young people are engaged not just for the experience but for the results. They should also develop strategies for involving maximum numbers of youth" (p. 9). They also illustrate a Youth Engagement Continuum which spans a scale of intervention, development, collective empowerment, systemic change and includes details on youth services approach, youth development, youth leadership, civic engagement, and youth organizing fit on the continuum.

The principles described in this paper emerged from the research and practice that emerged from the merge of the Forum for Youth Investment and Community IMPACT! USA. The principles can be implemented in a range of organizations that want to strengthen their commitment to youth leadership. The eight principles include:

Principle 1: Design an Outreach Strategy: an aggressive and continuous strategy that ensures diversity among youth and balances youth leadership continuity with new youth who bring new ideas.

Principle 2: Create a Strong "Home Base": a base located within a neighborhood that connects youth to organizational resources and designated reliable adults and creates ownership.

Principle 3: Convey an Intentional Philosophy: a philosophy about change that young people and adults understand and own and that includes short and long-term goals and strategies and clear roles for youth and adults throughout.

Principle 4: Identify Core Issues: issues that connect with youths' lived experiences that are discovered in authentic, power-sharing partnership with youth; issues that are then connected to broader systemic challenges and their root causes in simple frames

Principle 5: Create Youth/Adult Teams: teams that share a common purpose, goals and strategies and where all members are held accountable, and youth are engaged leaders across the organization itself and compensated (via salaries, credits, or other).

Principle 6: Build Youth and Adult Capacity: capacities including both knowledge (awareness of the issues, systems, and root causes, historical context, etc.) and skills (personal, leadership, teamwork and basic) learned via training and "on the job" opportunities for leadership as well as through active, collaborative research and reflection on real issues.

Principle 7: Provide Individual Supports: personal supports and coping skills and professional skills support that ensure youth feel safe and supported but that also balance the individual development needs with the community change goal.

Principle 8: Sustain Access and Influence: access and influenced developed deliberate linkages to other organizations in the community that have a stake in community change to:

- Cultivate an audience and create demand for young people's work.

- Create deliberate linkages to other organizations in the community.

- Build a sense of collective efficacy around a shared agenda.

- Expand the range of concrete opportunities for meaningful youth participation.

- Create clear channels for youth to present their findings and recommendations (p. 26).

Principles 1 and 2 lay a foundation for youth to develop "strengths" for active engagement. The first strength, Motivation, is developed through Principles 3 and 4. Principles 5, 6, and 7 help develop youths' strength of Capacity. And finally, Principle 8 promotes the third strength—Opportunity. Sections on each principle includes a set of very useful reflection questions for organizations to use for self assessment.

Putnam, R. (2000, December). BetterTogether. *The Report of the Saguaro Seminar: Civic Engagement in America*, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.bettertogether.org/pdfs/FullReportText.pdf.

"We are a nation rich in 'social capital,' which we define as 'social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them'…yet, at the dawn of the 21st century, America faces a civic crisis. Once-commonplace activities such as the dinner parties and community arts performances…are slowly vanishing from the American landscape. Increasingly, Americans are withdrawing from communal life, choosing to live alone and lay alone. No longer participants, we are becoming mere observers of our collective destiny" (p. 2).   The report goes on to indicate that the presence of social capital has a positive effect on the economy (workers more productive); psychology (individuals less prone to depression); epidemiology (decreased rate of suicide, colds, heart attacks); sociology (reduces crime, juvenile delinquency teen pregnancy); and political science (government agencies more responsive, efficient and innovative). Building our social capital appears to cure "all sorts of social ills." Unfortunately, over the past 35 years Americans have become more and more disconnected from each other and from civic life.

The report calls for "a sustained, broad-based social movement to restore civic virtue and civic participation in America" (p. 6), and offers four principles for building social capital (Social Capital Impact (provides a lens for decision-making); Recycling (using social capital to create new capital); Bridging (connections between people who are different); and "C2C" (communication that occurs citizen to citizen, or community to community).

The section, *Youth and Social Capital*, offers recommendations within the area of youth development for turning around social decline. We are specifically reminded that extracurricular activities are a community of choice, not circumstance, and as such we "need to pay attention to the lessons propagated by these communities of choice. We need to ask tough questions. Is the youth hockey program teaching a social-capital-friendly ethic of teamwork, or a destructive ethic of winning-at-all-costs" (p. 2)? On the plus side, the percentage of high school volunteers increased over the last decade, providing a foundation for other forms of social capital and civic engagement.

4-H was acknowledged for expanding and retooling their practices to engage a larger number of suburban youth, but all non-profits are called to do more. Leaders have to make a persuasive case that participation really matters and that it is meaningful in the long term but fun in the short term. "Endless meetings governed by Robert's Rules of Order are unlikely to hold the attention of Generations X and Y…" (p. 6). Lastly, adults who work with youth must value and nurture the contributions of youth.

Recommendations for building social capital in youth were built on the following principles: Respect young people; Provide meaningful engagement; and Inculcate civic values. The report recommended the following for community organizations: Foster intergenerational mentoring; Support the Community Service Movement; Put young people on community boards and councils; Recognize the capacity of adolescents and the circumstances that support their contributions; Make contributions count; Recognize contributors and their supporters; and Strengthen intermediary organizations. Interestingly, only one recommendation was made for

building social capital in families: Revive "Family Time." Authors also indicated in many ways that building social capital in families may be easier than in any other realm.

Rivers, A., & Moore, K.A. (2008). What works for civic engagement: Lessons from experimental evaluations of program and interventions. *Child Trends Fact Sheet*, Retrieved June 3, 2008, from http://www.childtrends.org/Files//Child_Trends-2008_05_28_FS_WWCivic.pdf.

This fact sheet is based on the review of experimental evaluations of social interventions, prompting the following conclusions:

- *Connecting children with needy populations and/or providing community service opportunities is effective in increasing helping behavior and perceptions of social responsibility.*

- *Monetary compensation was not found to undermine future helping behaviors in either experimental evaluation that provided payment for performing community service.*

- *All three programs that incorporated mentoring, tutoring, or life skill training components in tandem with service learning had positive impacts on civic engagement.*

Russell, S.T. (2002).Queer in America: Citizenship for sexual minority youth. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 258-263.

This article examines the obstacles that obstruct citizen development for sexual minority youth in three developmental domains: family, faith, and education. Marginalization in these domains reduces the experiences that would prepare them for engaged citizenship. The author cites work that describes "lesbians and gay men as partial citizens because they are excluded from basic rights (and responsibilities) in each of the civil—legal, political, and social realms" (p. 259). Current policies of "Don't Ask Don't Tell" require citizenship of LGBT people be based on principles of assimilation and tolerance. Opportunities for civic engagement and citizenship development may be found through LGBT Internet communities and the development of Gay-Straight Alliances.

Sanchez-Jankowski, M. (2002). Minority youth and civic engagement: The impact of group relations. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 237-245.

In order to encourage civic engagement it's important to recognize that not everyone views it in the same way. Those who do encourage this kind of action "must work within the civic subculture of the individuals they are trying to influence" (p. 237). The author notes that as an immigrant country, all groups have been discriminated against by the group that preceded them. He maintains that there are three historical experiences that are important in influencing the type and intensity of civic engagement: racial exclusion, racial inclusion, and racial privilege. In excluded groups (American Indians, African Americans, and Mexican Americans), race is used not only to identify as not white, but also to exclude group members

from full participation in social and political arenas. The author describes racial inclusion (Irish, Italians, Chinese, and Jews) as groups that were discriminated against at one time for race but were able to "gain upward social mobility and be included as full members of the society" (p. 238). White Anglo-Saxon Protestants were the group considered to have racial privilege.

Group history is the filter that institutions must use to socialize youth towards civic engagement. Furthermore, "how the group has experienced America has a great deal to say about how they will view civic engagement" (p. 243). Civic engagement for the exclusion group is focused on its group, inclusion group tends to be more nation-oriented, and privilege group focuses on individuals.

Schneider-Muñoz, A., & Politz, B. (2007). Advancing global citizens: Afterschool and out-of-school time as common ground for civil society. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 116 (Winter), 23-33.

This article describes the experiences of three major U.S. afterschool models (Edgewood School, Search Institute, and City Year) that provide "fertile ground" for creating and strengthening civil society." Authors promote youth and adults doing service in the community to demonstrate what they have learned in afterschool activities and out-of-school-time programs, so that skills are integrated for use over the long term and growing civil society. They also endorse "civic youth work."

Sherrod, L., Flanagan, C., & Youniss, J. (2002). Dimensions of citizenship and opportunities for youth development: The what, why, when, where and who of citizenship development. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 264-272.

Editors of the issue on youth civic engagement provide a summary of the topic framed around what, why, when, where and who of citizenship development. *What* includes components of concern for others, connectedness, tolerance, and rights and responsibilities. When youth understand their self-interest for participating, that is the *why*. Some reasons youth become politically active is for the satisfaction of doing good work, impact they can make, and sense of contributing to the greater community. *When* youth become civically involved depends on history and age factors, but the authors acknowledge there are more questions than answers to this question. Schools, families, media, community organizations and the public and private sectors are *where* youth civic engagement occurs. The diverse youth population in this nation and globally offer the *who,* but "we need to understand the expression of citizenship in these different youth" (p. 270).

Stepick, A., & Dutton Stepick, C. (2002). Becoming American, constructing ethnicity: Immigrant youth and civic engagement. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 246-257.

This article addresses the limited availability of research regarding immigrant youth and civic engagement. However, noted was the alienation the youth are subjected to may actually cause youth to assimilate to a specific racial or ethnic group, not to mainstream America. Many immigrants, particularly Latinos, feel strong family

commitment that "could potentially conflict with a broader civic engagement as family may consume most of one's time outside of work and school and it may also define the boundaries of some immigrant youth's 'civic' life" (p. 250). Two areas that immigrant youth are becoming civically engaged are in community service through schools and church activities.

Stoneman, D. (2002). The role of youth programming in the development of civic engagement. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 221-226.

The author maintains that youth civic engagement can go beyond community service while not becoming partisan politics. To move past community service projects youth programs can focus on Project creation; Institution governance; and Issue-based advocacy: "Once young people have created a project they care about, and have participated in its governance, they are more interested in issue-based advocacy to protect that project or extend their impact" (p. 222). The author takes a leadership development approach versus citizenship education or civic engagement for several reasons: It's often more interesting to wonder if you're going to be a good leader than a good citizen; Society needs effective leaders; Governance is a leadership role; Challenging leadership roles can engage youth; and Responsible decision-making can boost self-esteem and increase feeling of power. Throughout the article the author gives examples related to work done at YouthBuild USA, a youth and community development program that simultaneously addresses core issues facing low-income communities: housing, education, employment, crime prevention, and leadership development.

Sullivan, T. K. (2007). Young heroes outcomes model for youth civic development.

The author presents a model to demonstrate how outcomes measured in the Young Heroes program connect to increase the probability of engaging in community engagement in youth and adulthood. Components of the model include civic commitment, capacity, and connection which come together to form civic identity, action and environment.

> *1) Civic commitment, capacities and connection are affected by the context in which individuals live their lives. These three factors come together in a sense of "civic identity" or a sense of who one is, can be and who one wants to be as a member of a community.*
>
> *2) Our civic identity impacts whether, to what degree and in what ways we act on behalf of the greater good of a community (civic action). At the same time, experiencing civic action affects our civic commitment, capacity, connection and identity.*
>
> *3) When young people take action, they impact the civic environment of a community which, in turn, may affect the civic identity of others in the community. At the same time, a community's civic environment affects the degree to which there are opportunities for young people to take action.* (p. 1)

Walker, T. (2002). Service as a pathway to political participation: What research tells us. *Applied Developmental Science. 6 (4)*, 183-188.

> This article notes that, historically, Americans connect service to political engagement. But today, service is viewed as a "friendly, morally pure alternative to the messy, dirty, compromise-filled world of politics" (p. 183). The author makes a compelling case that while helping others is admirable, it is not enough to create a sense of connection to our freedom. "The focus on service as charity or as an alternative to government can position social problems as individual concerns needing individual solutions rather than systemic problems that need sustained society-wide attention" (p. 186). Democratic institutions provide ways to bring competing interests and needs together to make hard decisions about resource allocation. Steps are offered as to how to reposition service to encourage political participation. One step of particular note: "Develop more nuanced measures of civic outcomes and political engagement, including, for example, protest and advocacy activity, attentiveness to political issues and current events, voting, union organizing, working with community decision-making structures (e.g., nonprofit boards), registering voters and working on political campaigns" (p. 187).

Wheeler, W. (2007). *Youth engagement: A celebration across time and culture*. Framing the Issue. W.K. Kellogg Foundation Seminar Series. http://www.theinnovationcenter.org/Youth_Engagement_WKKF_10_2005.pdf retrieved May 12, 2008.

> This seminar series paper defines the Search Institute's Eight Pathways for Youth Engagement, all of which can be effective with Youth and Adult Partnerships as their core principle core:
>
> 1. Youth Service—including volunteerism, community-service, and service-learning
>
> 2. Youth Leadership—focused on developing competencies, consciousness and compassion to understand and solve social problems
>
> 3. Youth in Decision-Making (a.k.a. "Youth Governance")—centered on how youth are involved in administrative and/or operational decision-making at multiple levels of a project of organization
>
> 4. Youth Philanthropy—defined as youth-to-youth support and training for civic action, support can be time, fundraising, grant-making, material resources, etc. ("time, talents, and treasures")
>
> 5. Youth Civic and Political Engagement—including civic activity, electoral activity, and political voice
>
> 6. Youth Organizing—training "young people in community organizing and advocacy, and assists them in employing these skills to alter power relations and create meaningful institutional change in their communities" (p. 12)
>
> 7. Youth Media—helping youth to imagine, produce, and distribute their own media productions focused on their own content, and including activities such as youth/organization media coordination, relationship-building between youth and media outlets, media accountability campaigns.

8. Youth Research and Evaluation (a.k.a. youth participation in community research and evaluation, youth-led research, youth-led evaluation, youth-led research and evaluation)—youth's engagement and leadership in community studies in a way that seeks to equalize power between youth and adults.

Wheeler also includes a short history of young people's participation in social change and a call to reframe the issue of youth engagement to include cross-cultural collaboration and youth-adult partnerships in order to improve the public perception of youth advocacy and increase funding and opportunities, find better ways to engage youth in all levels (personal, organization, and community), and help organizations to rethink their own roles for youth and expand youths opportunities to contribute.

Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002). Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence. 12*, 121-148.

The article focuses on what civic competence is, how it develops, conditions that affect development, and policies that might facilitate its development. Civic competence refers to "an understanding of how government function, and the acquisition of behaviors that allow citizens to participate in government and permit individuals to meet, discuss, and collaborate to promote their interests within the framework of democratic principles" (p. 122). Authors specifically speak to non-profit youth organizations to continue experiences based on local needs. They also name the Internet as a media tool that is powerful in fostering free exchange of ideas and allows ordinary people to create and sustain societal movements.

Other Youth Civic Engagement Resources:

Cahn, E. S. & Gray, C. (2005, Summer). Using the coproduction principle: no more throwaway kids. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 106 .

Kubisch, A. C. (2005, Summer). Comprehensive community building initiatives--ten years later: What we have learned about the principles guiding the work. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 106.

Nitzberg, J. (2005, Summer). The meshing of youth development and community building. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 106.

PAGE 1

YOUTH-ADULT PARTNERSHIPS

Libby, M., Rosen, M., & Sedonaen, M. (2005). Building youth–adult partnerships for community change: lessons from the Youth Leadership Institute. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1), 111–120.

The authors from Youth Leadership Institute (YLI) describe how YLI uses youth–adult partnerships (Y-APs) to support community change efforts in California. To the outside world, Y-APs are used in two principal areas: training and philanthropy (grant making, fundraising, and grant seeking). However, the YLI has formally brought Y-APs into its mission, governance structure, hiring procedures, program and project operations, and client training. Benefits of this approach in philanthropy include:

"Obvious" areas of contributions by youth and adults (Youth bring their own needs and interests, creativity, openness, and comfort with risk-taking, while adults bring expertise in decision-making processes and evaluation techniques, along with knowledge of project and program approaches and community history.),

Learning and understanding in that youth and adults educate each other and form relationships through the process, and

A means for creating Y-APs in other institutions and community settings.

Benefits within the training sphere include more engaged training participants, stronger content and delivery, and opportunities for participants to experience Y-AP in action (e.g. role-sharing and mutual respect).

Lessons learned through over 12 years of Y-AP practice show the importance of:

- Creating and making visible pathways for youth leadership development and ensuring a variety of leadership roles (and styles) within the organization,
- Organizational commitment to Y-APs (e.g. through policies outlining goals and purpose) ,
- Pre-involvement youth development training for adults,
- Pre-involvement leadership training for young people,
- Ongoing support for youth and adults (e.g. subcommittee on meeting youth needs, periodic check-ins),
- Moderating program intensity (e.g. two-year time frames, balancing training and preparation activity with action), and
- Investment of financial resources to cover the time and expertise of staff to create the necessary conditions for Y-APs.

Search Institute (2005). *The power of youth and adult partnerships and change pathways for youth work*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K Kellogg Foundation. http://www.search-institute.org/research/KelloggExecSummary.pdf.

This rich field assessment of youth work sees youth and adult partnerships as a "core element" of youth work. It also outlines how youth and adults alter the purpose and substance of making change and shows how youth, adults, power

brokers and funders operate in their varying roles. In one section, ten themes emerge from a literature synthesis across major fields of practice in youth work, fields including youth service, youth leadership, youth decision-making & governance, youth philanthropy, youth civic & political engagement, youth organizing, youth media, and youth research and evaluation (italicized excepts below from pp. 3-6):

1. *"Youth involvement is expanding beyond community service to emphasize democratic citizenship that embraces both individual rights and responsibilities and concrete group contributions for the common good."* In other words, it's about social justice and policy, not a specific charity.

2. *"Adults in multiple settings and at varying levels (local, national, and even global) have a primary role in creating opportunities for young people and supporting them in building their competencies as they simultaneously work for change."* With adult support, young people can work for change NOW—and learn and refine their skills as they do it.

3. *"Youth participation in partnership with adults can take varying forms and is shaped by the mission of the organization or initiative. There is not one prescribed way for youth and adults to partner in community and social change."* Successful partnerships can look different, and that's okay (e.g. youth-adult partnerships, youth-driven initiatives, and adult-driven initiatives).

4. *"Increasing numbers of young people from marginalized and disenfranchised communities are becoming involved as leadership models begin to take into consideration both the challenges and strengths of these young people."* "Challenged" youth are best "reached" through opportunities to engage in their own communities.

5. *"Young people's awareness of social injustice within a community often serves to stimulate involvement and a desire for change. Investigating the history and ongoing impact of inequalities within a community can help young people focus their change making initiatives."* Investigating and commenting on critical issues engenders critical thinking on the plight of all.

6. *"Emerging views of youth involvement represent a broadening of focus – from considering solely individual-level outcomes for participating youth [including youth decision-making outcomes like skill development (leadership and public speaking), increased self-esteem, better academic achievement, and enhanced identity development] to also examining changes in the external conditions that enable and support youth involvement and the organizational and community-level impacts of youth involvement."* Attending to outcomes for youth is important, but so is examining youth involvement-enabling structure and organizational and community impacts.

7. *"As adults and youth talk about making change, they are giving new meanings to words like "leadership," "philanthropy," and "empowerment." The work will be strengthened if players (youth, adults, theorists, and funders) begin to coalesce around a common language that represents the best ideas, approaches, and elements of good practice."* We need to get on the same conceptual page or risk jargon jumble.

8. *"The prevalent perception that youth development occurs only in programs may limit the creativity of youth and adults in moving beyond a given program, activity, or curriculum to the idea of community engagement and civic activism."* Measuring "involvement" via activity type, attendance, and dosage must change to reflect an asset-building approach.

9. "*For youth and adult partnerships to become a way of life in communities and a standardized practice within programs, a great deal of work must be done to change adults' perceptions of youth and to create awareness of the positive changes youths are capable of making."* Youth are community members with important perspectives and contributions.

10. *"The growth of youth involvement is occurring at the grassroots level in communities, and there is a continued need to strengthen its infrastructure and sustain and spread the work."* Foundations need to support "intermediary organizations which improve effectiveness."

Movement in the field includes that of individual to collective efforts, fragmented strategies and projects to unified vision and collective action, supporting/working within the status quo to working for justice, and isolated and limited youth roles to youth working with adults for change and taping into the power of institutions and systems. The article outlines types and motivations for engagement and supports needed to sustain engagement. The latter includes increasing involvement by youth peers, being viewed as resources, opportunities to receive and provide capacity and skill-building, collaborations of every sort, and steady and new funding. A third section describes "Touch Points" emerging from interviews with youth work activist leaders.

The fourth and final section depicts ten promising "Scenarios for Attention and Action" by efforts led by youth and adults. These scenarios include:

1. Maintain Alignment and Fidelity with Positive Youth Development

2. Ground Partnerships in an Ethos of Respect and Rapport

3. Make Improved Human Relations the Essence of Community Building

4. Use Social Capital and Cultural Pluralism to Enrich Diversity Perspectives

5. Organize to Address Discrimination and Oppression

6. Link Youth-Sponsored Social Change to Contemporary Social Movements

7. Unleash a New Wave of Organizational Transformation

8. Catalyze Policy Activism and Social Citizenship

9. Alter Adult America's Negative Mindset Regarding Youth

10. Revitalize Infrastructure through Astute Investing and Connecting Stakeholders

This section ends with an interesting depiction of "a revitalized youth work infrastructure" with three parts: innovation underwriting, innovation development, and innovation transfer. Authors also discuss common barriers to effective youth/adult partnerships.

Other Examples of Youth-Adult Partnerships:

Sirianni, C. (April 2005). CIRCLE Working Paper 31: Youth civic engagement: Systems changes and culture change in Hampton, Virginia. http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP31Sirianni.pdf. (Describes institutionalization of youth civic engagement across a city.)

PAGE 1

YOUTH PROGRAMMING

Bouffard, S., Little, P., & Weiss, H. (2006). Building and evaluating out-of-school time connections. Evaluation Exchange, 7(1&2). http://www.gse.harvard.edu/hfrp/eval/issue33/index.html.

Authors argue that a network of supports, with out-of-school time programs as a key component, are critical to positive learning and developmental outcomes for children and youth.

Gibson, C., & Levine, P. (2003). The civic mission of schools. A Reports from Carnegie Corporation of New York and CIRCLE: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://civicmissionofschools.org/cmos/site/campaign/cms_report.html.

This report shares results from a series of meetings with some of the country's most distinguished scholars and practitioners in the area of civic education. It outlines the goals of civic education (citizens are informed and thoughtful, participate in community organizations, possess skills to act politically, and are concerned for the welfare of others) and six promising approaches to civic education, including the role of extracurricular participation. The report indicates that the most effective programs in schools are the programs that "collaborate with the community and local institutions to provide civic learning opportunities" and that a climate is created for youth to "live what they learn" (p. 21). While the report supports the notion of community service, it cautions that service-learning programs can be so non-political that it may send the message that it is acceptable to volunteer in place of political participation.

Marczak, M., Dworkin, J, Skuza, J., & Beyer. J. (Winter 2006). What's up? What young teens and their parents want from youth programs. *Rethinking program for youth in their middle years. New Directions for Youth Development, 112.*

This article challenges the reader to rethink program strategies for engaging young people in out of school time. Middle school youth who are not involved by their middle school years may be reengaged through learning opportunities that are "flexible, less structured, more leisure based, and where they could spend time with their friends" (p. 52). For their part, parents want organizations to provide their children responsible adult supervision, stimulating experiences and peer socialization opportunities. The authors note that program planning must include both youth and their parents: parents support programs by encouraging participation, backing them financially, providing transportation, and scheduling around other family activities. Organizations need to listen to youth and their parents to learn what kinds of learning opportunities and supports best fit the families' needs. To reach youth who are uninterested in supervised, structured programs, the authors promote a more "organic method" of program delivery, with components that include:

- Adult "wizards" who can connect with youth and who have common interests or hobbies
- Minimal structure, with focus on activities that allow youth to succeed
- Allowing for informal, organic learning experiences that grow between the connections that develop between youth and adults
- Opportunities for social connection to friends/peers
- Youth serving organizations can help to build social networks of young and caring adults coming together around their interests by provide community members the resources they need.

PAGE 1

DIVERSITY

Putnam, R. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137-174.

In this lecture, social capital guru Robert Putnam proposes that immigration and ethnic diversity have society-level benefits including greater creativity and discovery, more rapid economic growth, and increased spreading of wealth and technology transfer through the world. He predicts that ethnic diversity will increase over the next several decades, in part through immigration. In the short run, immigration and ethnic diversity foster isolation, challenge social solidarity, and inhibit social capital: in the U.S., "in ethnically diverse neighborhoods trust (even of one's own race) is lower, altruism and community cooperation rarer, friends fewer" (p. 137). In the medium to long run, on the other hand, immigrant societies can overcome this negative social fragmentation and create new forms of social solidarity by constructing new, more encompassing identities. He concludes: "the central challenge for modern, diversifying societies is to create a new, broader sense of 'we'" (pp. 138-139).

PAGE 1

MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION

Civic competency categories. Retrieved May 1, 2008, from Education Commission of the States Web site: http://www.ecs.org/QNA/docs/Civic_Competency.pdf.

This site provides an overview of the Civics Assessment Database, including the assessment items and content categories. Assessment items include Civic knowledge (democracy and government structure, roles of citizens, and civil society); Civic thinking skills (read, understand, distinguish between facts and opinions, and articulate abstract concepts); Civic participation skills (analyze issue, mobilize group, and resolve conflicts); Core civic dispositions (respect, support for others); and Participation-related civic dispositions (confidence to create social or political action). Content categories are democracy and government structure; citizenship (rights, responsibilities and roles); and civil society (participation as expression of personal interest and common good).

Comber, M.K. (2003, November). Civics curriculum and civic skills: Recent evidence. *CIRCLE Fact Sheet*, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/FactSheets/FS_Civics_Curriculum_Skills.pdf.

The Fact Sheet presents data to support the debate that citizens must possess a minimum of civic skills to be fully engaged in civic and political life. Those civic skills include personal communication, knowledge of political systems, and critical thinking skills. Among the findings is that students who studied civics reported a higher level of confidence to understand political issues, write a letter to government officials, and make a public statement, as well as more likely to participate in student councils, read the newspaper, have something to say regarding political issues.

Flanagan, C. A., Syvertsen A. K., & Stout, M. D. (2005, May). CIRCLE Working Paper 55: Civic measurement models: Tapping adolescents' civic engagement. http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP55Flannagan.pdf.

This working paper describes the results of a project to create a set of civic measurement tools with good psychometric properties for assessing adolescents' civic behaviors, opinions, knowledge, and dispositions. Two approaches were used (rotated principal components analysis and structural equation modeling) to bring together facets of complex and abstract notions like political voice and trust in government. The analysis includes the following civic areas (with constructs):

1. Civic behaviors: competence for civic action, political voice, critical consumer of political information

2. Elected officials and government: trustworthiness of elected officials, civic accountability, government responsiveness to "the people," unconditional support for government policies

3. Conventional civic engagement: expectations for engagement in electoral politics, political interest, personal political aspirations

4. Alternative civic engagement: expectations for unconventional political engagement, alternative ways of expressing political voice, endorsement of special interest groups, expectations for engagement in community issues

5. Political efficacy: service-learning, political efficacy

6. Quality and injustice: trust in the American promise, anger about social injustice

7. Citizenship types: personally responsible citizen, justice oriented citizen, participatory citizen

8. Parents civic engagement: parents' level of civic engagement

9. Political conversation with others: communication with parents about politics, communication with teachers about politics, communication with friends about politics, communication with classmates about politics

10. Values: religion, improving race relations, helping others, protecting the environment, serving the country (in the military), participating in politics, and securing employment.

11. Media consumption and perceptions: overall media consumption, usefulness of mainstream media outlets, usefulness of popular media outlets, trustworthiness of media, most useful program or source for current events and political information

12. School climate: student ownership, open classroom climate, classroom as a caring community, perspective-taking opportunities, social analysis

13. Personal beliefs: concern about the future, social trust

14. Knowledge of government and electoral politics: civic knowledge

Gambone, M.A., Yu, H.C., Lewis-Charp, H., Sipe, C. L., & Lacoe, J. (2006). Youth organizing, identity-support, and youth development agencies as avenues for involvement. *Journal of Community Practice,* 14(1/2), 235-253.

This paper finds important differences in developmental outcomes such as civic activism and identity development among youth organizing, identity-support, and traditional youth development agencies. In brief, "youth organizing agencies show higher levels of youth leadership, decision making, and community involvement in comparison with other agencies" (p. 236). Authors also posit that civic engagement promotes both the general development of youth and youths' sense of social agency. They describe how the "promoting high quality youth leadership and community involvement experiences takes well-trained staff, time, and resources" (p. 251) as well as deliberate approaches to staffing and decision-making. Finally they put forth interesting questions for further exploration:

- Are the youth drawn to community youth development organizations fundamentally different than those who attend traditional youth development groups?
- What extraneous factors influence participation in community youth development organizations?
- Does receiving higher levels of supports and opportunities in a program setting result in higher levels of civic engagement outcomes?
- Are youth more likely to attain positive developmental outcomes the longer they stay in a program?
- Can these developmental outcomes be directly related to desired long-term outcomes including economic self-sufficiency, healthy family and social relationships, and civic involvement?

Kirlin, M. (2003, June). The role of civic skills in fostering civic engagement. *CIRCLE Working Paper 06*, Retrieved February 28, 2008, from http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP06Kirlin.pdf.

A figure in the paper includes authors, skills, empirical measurements.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2002). In Eccles J., & Appleton Gootman. J. (Eds.), *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth. Board on Children, Youth, and Families. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?isbn=0309072751.

This book describes essential elements of adolescent well-being and healthy development. It offers recommendations for policy, practice, and research to ensure that programs are well designed to meet young people's developmental needs. In the executive summary are six fundamental questions that should be part of a comprehensive evaluation design:

- Is the theory of the program that is being evaluated explicit and plausible?
- How well has the program theory been implemented in the sites studied?
- In general, is the program effective and, in particular, is it effective with specific subpopulations of young people?
- Whether it is or is not effective, why is this the case?
- What is the value of the program?
- What recommendations about action should be made?

Smith, T. A., Genry, L. S., & Ketring, S. A. Evaluating a youth leadership life skills development program. *Journal of Extension*, *43: 2*, Retrieved June 2, 2008, from http://www.joe.org/joe/2005april/rb3.shtml.

An evaluation of leadership life skills in youth in the Appalachian Regional Commission Youth Leadership Incubator Program is shared. The study used a pre-test/post-test/follow-up/hindsight format to measure outcomes. The 30-item self

report, "Youth Leadership Life Skills Development Scale" (Seevers, Dormody, & Clason, 1995) was used; participants rated their ability on a four-point Likert scale. Statements included: *Can listen to others, can set goals, and consider the needs of others.*

Watts., R. J., & Guessous, O. (2006, October). CIRCLE Working Paper 50: Civil rights activists in the information age: The development of math literacy workers in the Young People's Project http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/WorkingPapers/WP50watts.pdf.

This working paper is the final report of an evaluation project for the Young People's Project in Chicago. It describes some of the issues involved with evaluating a social justice youth program which ties learning of a subject matter (math literacy) with peer-tutoring and community development and social change. An outgrowth of the Algebra Project (which in itself was an outgrowth of the civil rights activism of Robert Moses) the YPP includes over 40,000 children in 25 cities. Due to funding issues, a planned evaluation of three cities was scaled back to evaluating just one site in Chicago mainly over a summer period, although the program has no fixed beginning or end. The evaluation focused primarily on participant surveys but also included site visit (for context) and limited information from informal interviews. The research design also included surveys of a cohort of recruited peers of participants who acted as a non-equivalent control group (friends who were very similar to participants in lifestyle and interests except for YPP participation) as well as another comparison group of participants in an After School Matters program. The evaluation measured program effects, "dosage effects," the link between program and dosage effects, the link between math and sociopolitical development, and the program's effect on that math and sociopolitical development link. The article describes numerous survey instruments used to measure social analysis, sense of agency, societal involvement, cultural and ethnoracial identity, academic and math self concept, and positive youth development.

Yohalem, N., Wilson-Ahlstrom, A., with Fischer, S., & Shinn, M. (2007, March). *Measuring Youth Program Quality: A Guide to Assessment Tools.* Washington, D.C.: The Forum for Youth Investment, Impact Strategies, Inc.

The executive summary provides a compendium for practitioners and others to consider when seeking program quality assessment tools. Cross-cutting comparisons look at target age and purpose; common and unique content; methodology (including assessment for youth leadership/participation and linkages to community); strength of technical properties; and training and support for users. One-page summaries are offered for nine assessment tools.

Other Measurement and Evaluation Websites:

Compendium of Assessment and Research Tools: http://cart.rmcdenver.com/
CART is a database that provides information on instruments that measure attributes associated with youth development programs.

National Center for Learning and Citizenship: http://www.ecs.org/QNA/default2.asp
Civic Assessment Database

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. *Assessment, Evaluation, and Performance Measurement: Selected Resources Bibliography.* Scotts Valley, CA: Author, 2007. http://servicelearning.org/instant_info/bibs/he_bibs/assess_eval/index.php.

United Way Evaluation tools: http://www.toolfind.org/
Youth outcomes measurement tool directory. Eight tools for leadership skills are provided.

Other Measurement and Evaluation Articles:

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) - Deluxe Facilitator's Guide Package.* Wiley, John & Sons, Incorporated.

Owen, J. E. (2001). *An examination of leadership assessment.* Monograph of the National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs. Leadership Insights and Applications, 11.

PAGE 1

PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES TO RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Altrichter H.; Kemmis S.; McTaggart R.; Zuber-Skerritt O. (2002). The concept of action research. *The Learning Organization: An International Journal*, 9(3), 125-131.

This pithy article delineates the difficulties in formulating a generally accepted definition of action research then argues for it being "clarified for communication and open for development." Authors also offer a useable working definition (p. 130):

If yours is a situation in which

- people reflect on and improve (or develop) their own work and their own situations
- by tightly inter-linking their reflection and action; and
- also making their experiences public not only to other participants but also to other persons interested in and concerned about the work and the situation, i.e. their (public) theories and practices of the work and the situation;

and if yours is a situation in which there is increasingly

- data-gathering by participants themselves (or with the help of others) in relation to their own questions;
- participation (in problem-posing and in answering questions) in decision-making;
- power-sharing and the relative suspension of hierarchical ways of working towards industrial democracy;
- collaboration among members of the group as a "critical community";
- self-reflection, self-evaluation and self-management by autonomous and responsible persons and groups;
- learning progressively (and publicly) by doing and by making mistakes in a "self-reflective spiral" of planning, acting observing, reflecting, replanning, etc.;
- reflection which supports the idea of the "(self)-reflective practitioner";

then yours is a situation in which action research is occurring.

Lau, G., Netherland, N. H., & Haywood, M. L. (2003, Summer). Collaborating on evaluation for youth development. *New Directions for Evaluation,* 98, 47-59.

This describes two case studies where youth workers and then youth, themselves, learned and engaged in critical reflection at youth development practices. First Youth development Learning Network staff experienced guided reflection on past and present programs practices to move toward providing environments that enabled positive youth development and the inclusion of youth in evaluation activities. Based on principles of participatory evaluation and action research, the evaluation design functioned on two levels: effectiveness and effects of stated program goals and training participants in self evaluation while evaluating the training process.

Staff participants learned about various evaluation tools (including questionnaires, surveys, observations, interviews, field notes, focus groups, checklists, and process folios) through exercises and small group work. Evaluation of the training used the same tools for modeling and transparency. Evaluators then worked with staff back at their workplaces to help them to use the tools to assess their programs and gather information to make improvements. this also helped them to gear up for working with youth. Staff then wrote up and took ownership of planned program outcomes focused on measureable intermediate effects rather than idealistic outcomes that take years to manifest. They transformed their professional practice, their attitudes towards evaluations, and their view of themselves as youth workers.

Some five years after the first staff training in evaluation, other training (esp. focused on youth development) followed for other agency practitioners, particularly leadership. New funding was found and new youth worker position description made to reflect the increased time needed for participatory evaluation with youth. Weekly meetings with stakeholder groups (of staff, agency leadership, youth, parents, and collaborators) included review of program goals and objectives, action plans, resources available, evaluation tools and processes. At first, just program leadership staff presented evaluation data for discussion, but "line staff" and youth eventually also shared findings. This process gave youth voice and decision-making power over format, length, content of the program, staffing patterns, and location of program site. Most staff responded positively to the new process of using data to improve programming. Staff who didn't like the increase in youth leadership within the program changed their role from group work to one-on-one mentoring or tutoring. Further, "the participatory experience of creating program goals, objectives and outcomes, evaluation methods and indicators, and processes and tools for data collection made the evaluation process transparent to the program staff and left no doubt regarding the veracity of findings" (p. 54).

Outcomes included young people and parents learning about after-school programs, increase in program enrollment (even among youth who typically reject programs), youth evaluators began evaluating school-day activities and presenting findings to school leadership (to positive response), and new ideas for community engagement projects that reflected youth concerns more wide-ranging than adult staff had assumed.

Other benefits of the approach include new knowledge and skills for practitioners, broadened base of support and new perspectives for managers and funders, and savings of program dollars through fewer failures in programming, lower recruitment costs, and no need for external evaluation. Youth benefits from richer relationships with adults, participation in meaningful activity, increased community involvement, more life skills developed while engaged in challenging experiences, strong youth voice and better perspective, better engagement with other youth, stronger sense of empowerment when they collect research data that defines their own experiences and improves their environments, and gains in self-confidence and peer support.

Nygreen, K. Soo A. K., & Sánchez, P. (2006). Urban youth building community: Social change and participatory research in schools, homes, and community-based organizations. *Journal of Community Practice,* 14(1/2), 107-123.

This article posits that age is used as an "axis of oppression" and argues that "urban youth can become a vital resource for community transformation" (p. 108). The authors describe three projects that engage normally marginalized urban youth in community change through participatory research:

- Participatory Action Research Team for Youth (PARTY), a multi-ethnic, school-based youth group transforming curriculum in an alternative high school,

- Transnational Latinas (TNL), a Latina group researching transnational experiences, and

- Asian and Pacific Islander Youth Promoting Advocacy and Leadership (AYPAL), pan-ethnic Asian and Pacific Island community-based organization working on youth organizing and social justice.

The authors share their experiences as "adult allies" on these projects and examine the importance of: exploring positionality ("the relative power, privilege, and position of all group members"); strengthening the role of adult allies in youth-led projects and naming the "non-negotiables," creating of safe and supportive spaces to interact meaningfully with each other, and building trusting relationships among and between youth and adults with activities throughout the project (as opposed to a few "ice-breaker" activities at the beginning).

Wang, C. C. (2006). Youth participation in photovoice as a strategy for community change. *Journal of Community Practice,* 14(1/2), 147-161.

Caroline C. Wang describes photovoice as a participatory action research strategy which can contribute to youth mobilization for community change. Photovoice is based on "health promotion principles and the theoretical literature on education for critical consciousness, feminist theory, and a community-based approach to documentary photography" (p. 148). Using photovoice, youth employ cameras to record their community's strengths and concerns and promote critical dialogue about community issues through group discussion of photographs. Then they communicate their concerns to policy makers to influence future policy directions. The author details the following nine steps (from pp. 149-152):

1. Select and recruit a target audience of policy makers or community leaders.

2. Recruit a group of photovoice participants.

3. Introduce the photovoice methodology to participants, and facilitate a group discussion about cameras, power, and ethics.

4. Obtain informed consent [from project participants/parents, photo subjects, and rights for publication].

5. Pose initial theme/s for taking pictures.

6. Distribute cameras to participants and review how to use the camera.

7. Provide time for participants to take pictures.

8. Meet to discuss photographs and identify themes.

9. Plan with participants a format to share photographs and stories with policy makers or community leaders.

Wang highlights ten projects from the U.S and abroad which illustrate how young people use photovoice to represent, advocate for, and enhance community health and well-being. She notes that all projects were characterized by "(1) the involvement of young people in all aspects of the research; (2) a co-learning process in which youth, policy makers, and researchers contribute to and learn from one another's expertise; (3) a reflective process that involves education for critical consciousness; (4) an enabling process; and (5) a balance among the goals of research, action, and evaluation" (p. 156).

For more on participatory approaches to research and evaluation, see also:

Arnold, M.E., & Wells, E.E. (2007). *Participatory Evaluation with Youth: Building Skills for Youth Community Action.* Oregon State University 4-H Youth Development Education: Corvallis, OR.
(Curriculum for training teams of youth and adult partners to conduct community participatory research through the use of community issues forums.)

Chawla, L., & Driskell, D. (2006). The Growing Up in Cities Project: Global perspectives on children and youth as catalysts for community change. *Journal of Community Practice,* 14(1/2), 183-200.
(Example of shared community planning project with 10- to 14-year-old youth from low-income families in Sathyanagar—"Truth Town"—India).

Lynn, A. (2005, Summer). Youth using research: Learning through social practice, community building, and social change. Putting youth at the center of community building. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 106.

Suleiman, A. B., Soleimanpour, S., & London, J. (2006). Youth action for health through youth-led research. *Journal of Community Practice,* 14(1/2), 125-145.

Wilson, N., Minkler, M., Dasho, S., Carrillo, R., Wallerstein, N., & Garcia, D. (2006). Training students as partners in community based participatory prevention research: The Youth Empowerment Strategies (YES!) project. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14 (1/2), 201-217.
(Example of youth-to-youth training and partnership model for the Youth Empowerment Strategies project designed to promote problem-solving, social action and civic participation among underserved elementary school youth from West Contra Costa County, California.)

PAGE 1

OTHER INTERESTING READING

Boyte, H. C., & Farr, J. (1997). The work of citizenship and the problem of service-learning. In R. Battistoni & W. Hudson (Eds.), *Experiencing citizenship*. Washington: American Association of Higher Education.

Cargo, M., Grams, G.D., Ottoson, J. M., Ward, P., & Green, L.W. (2003). Empowerment as fostering positive youth development and citizenship. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 27(Supplement 1), S66-79.

Checkoway, B. et al. (2003). Young people as competent citizens. *Community Development Journal*, 38(4), 298-309.

Conover, P.J. and Searing, D.D. (2000). "A Political Socialization Perspective." In L.M. McDonnell, P.M. Timpane & R. Benjamine (Eds.), Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education (pp. 91-124). Lawrence, KA: University Press of Kansas.

Driskell, D. (2002). *Creating better cities with children and youth.*

Felix, A. (2003, October) Making youth voice a community principle. *Youth Service Journal*. Youth Serve America: Washington, DC.

Flanagan, C., & Van Horn, B. (2001). *Youth civic engagement: Membership and mattering in local communities.* Focus. Davis: 4-H Center for Youth Development, University of California.

Fung, A. (2006). *Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy*.

Ginwright, S., & Cammarota, J. (2002). New terrain in youth development: The promise of a social justice approach. *Social Justice*, 29(4), 82-96.

Ginwright, S., & James, T. (2002). From assets to agents of change: Social justice, organizing, and youth development. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 96, 27-46.

Halperin, S. (2001) *Guide to the powerless—and those who don't know their own power*. American Youth Policy Forum. http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED459088.

Hart, R. (1997). *Children's participation: The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development and environmental care.*

McLaughlin, M. (2000). *Community counts: How youth organizations matter for youth development.* Washington,DC: Public Education Network. Available online at www.publiceducation.org/pdf/communitycounts.pdf.

O'Donoghue, J., Kirshner, B., & McLaughlin, M. (2002). Introduction: Moving youth participation forward. *New Directions for Youth Development*, (96), 5-7.

Pittman, K., Ferber, T., & Irby, M. (2000). Youth as Effective Citizens. Takoma Park, Maryland: International Youth Foundation - US.

Sirianni, C., Fiedland, L. (2001). *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal.* Berkeley, CA:. University of California Press.

Tolman, J., & Pittman, K. (2001). Youth Acts, Community Impacts: Stories of Youth Engagement with Real Results. (Vol. 7). Takoma Park, MD: The Forum for Youth Investment, International Youth Foundation.

Tannock, S. (2004). *Exploring the limits of participatory research in social change.* Unpublished paper.

VeLure, R., Hildreth, R. W., & Baizerman, M. (in press). *Civic youth work.* Child and Youth Services.

Yablon, Y. B. (2007). Feeling close from a distance: Peace encounters via Internet technology. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 116 (Winter), 99-107.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (Eds.) (1999). Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zeldin, S. (2002). Sense of community and positive adult beliefs toward adolescents and youth policy in urban neighborhoods and small cities. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*(5), 331-343.

Zeldin, S. (2004). Youth as agents of adult and community development: Mapping the processes and outcomes of youth engaged in organizational governance. *Applied Developmental Science, 8,* 75-90.