Police Working with Youth in Non-Enforcement Roles
Outcome Evaluation 2002 – 2004

Prepared for

**The State of Connecticut
Office of Policy and Management**

By

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

April 2005

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This report summarizes the results of a two-year evaluation of the **Police Working with Youth in Non-enforcement Roles** program funded through the State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. Police worked with youth in a variety of contexts including Police Explorers, Police Academies, Police-led athletics programs, Police sponsored adventure activities, and School Resource Officers.

Youth involved in Police programs were contrasted with a comparison group of youth who participated in a variety of in-school or out-of-school activities that did not include working with Police.

Youth involved in the program generally found their experiences to be very satisfying and rewarding. When asked to retrospectively report on their year in the program, a large majority reported making friends, feeling safe, involved, and supported by staff. A large majority also reported being involved in stimulating and engaging activities.

Another important finding was that overall, youth who participated in Police programs appeared to be a uniquely talented group of individuals. They scored higher initially on a composite measure of developmental competency when compared to youth who participated in the comparison group. However, not all youth involved in the Police programs showed these high competencies initially.

A subgroup of youth who began the Police Working with Youth programs lower on the composite measure of personal and social competency were most likely to report positive changes in self-assertive efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy, and empathy for others as a result of participation in the program. In short, the ones who needed it most reported the most benefit. Those who entered the programs with a higher level of social and emotional competence generally showed little positive changes or even modest declines, but these changes were not statistically significant. In addition, youth who participated in Police Working with Youth programs, regardless of their initial level of personal and social functioning, reported significant increases in the presence of caring and supportive adults in their lives. This later result was only found when participants' gender and the level of functioning were included in the analysis.

Implications of the findings and recommendations for youth programs and future evaluation efforts are also presented.

Introduction

This report summarizes the evaluation of the **Police Working with Youth in Non-enforcement Roles** program funded through the State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. This program for local public agencies provides funds to increase or enhance positive Police interactions with youth outside of the traditional enforcement role. Examples include Police Explorers; Police Academies; Police-led athletics, skill training, or social events for youth; Police participation with youth in adventure activities; Police as School Resource Officers; Police assistance with improving school attendance; Police educating youth about the internet. A detailed list of participating communities and their program emphasis are provided below.

The projects were expected to work with individuals between the ages of 12 and 18 to foster positive youth development. The evaluation was conducted between September 2002 and August 2004. It was intended to examine the widely held view among youth development specialists that youth who engage in community-based activities are likely to achieve positive developmental outcomes.

Participating Programs

The communities that participated in the program are listed below along with a description of their programs' emphasis.

Location	Type of Program
Bloomfield	Youth Activities with Police
Bridgeport	Youth Police Academy
Burlington	Police Explorers
Hartford (State Police)	Police Explorers
Killingly	Mountain Bike Club
New Fairfield	Youth Activities with Police
Newington	Police Mentoring Group
Newtown	Youth Police Academy
Old Saybrook	Youth Activities with Police
Plainfield	After School Program
Simsbury	Youth Police Academy & Police Explorers
Somers	Police Explorers
Tolland	Youth Activities with Police
Torrington	Police Explorers
Vernon	Youth Police Academy
Waterbury	Youth Police Academy & Police Explorers
Waterford	Youth Activities with Police

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design included pre-testing and post-testing of youth who were engaged in youth development activities in the participating communities. Each program was asked to target all youth who had participated in their program.

A comparison group was also used within this study. The youth within the comparison group were drawn from a variety of sources. Several community comparison groups were drawn from local high schools, such as a homeroom class or English class, or by randomly selecting children in cafeterias during their lunch periods. Others were recruited by having youth in the program ask a friend who was not involved in the program to complete the survey or by asking youth who attended one-time activities such as a dance or party to complete the survey.

The evaluation sought to answer the following question: **Do youth who participate in Police Working with Youth programs report increased developmental outcomes?**

Outcomes Included in the Evaluation

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

Personal Adjustment

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

Social Competencies

A social competency thought to be affected by Police working with youth was the capacity for **empathy with others**. Empathy is defined as the ability to be sensitive to the feelings and experiences of others. It was thought that the demands of the program participants to work closely together with staff and peers would enhance skills in this area.

4

Adult-Youth Connections

The nature of Police Working with Youth programs is such that youth who become involved spend a good deal of time interacting with adults in a variety of experiences. It was hypothesized that as a result, youth in these programs would develop **supportive relationships with adults** (staff) and that they would perceive them as resources for dealing with social and emotional experiences.

Youth-Community Connections

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

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

Sample: Characteristics of Youth Participants

The participants in this research were participants in Police Working with Youth programs funded by the State of Connecticut, Office of Policy and Management. A total of 17 programs were evaluated, which included 367 participating youth at the time of pre-test. The participants in the comparison group had no involvement with the Police programs. A total of 337 youth made up the comparison group. Only youth between 12 to 18 years of age were included in this evaluation.

The sample was comprised of 354 males (50.3%) and 316 (44.9%) females; 34 participants did not report their gender. Their grades ranged from sixth grade through college, with tenth grade being the average. Eighty-eight percent fell within grades seven through twelve. Nine percent of the participants did not report their grade in school. The average age of participants was 16 years. Sixty-seven percent of the youth reported a B grade point average or better in school. The average GPA was a B-. Only 4.3%, or 13 participants, reported a D to F grade point average in school. Another 8.7% of the youth did not report their GPA.

This sample was comprised of mainly Caucasian youth with 394 of 704 youth being Caucasian (56%). Among the remaining participants, 12.4% were African American, 21.5% were Hispanic, 1.7% were Asian, and 1% were American Indian. Another 7.4% reported "other." In addition to these demographics, youth were also asked to report their family status, or the caregivers living with them in the home. The majority (52.5%) reported living with both their

mother and father. About 18% reported living with their mother only, and another 10% reported living with their mother and stepfather. A little over 3% reported living with their father only, and another 2.7% reported living with their father and stepmother. The remaining youth lived with other relatives (2.7%), foster parents (.7%), or non-relatives (1.3%). Almost 9% of the sample did not answer this question.

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

Measures

Self-Assertive Efficacy & Self-Regulatory Efficacy

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

Social Self-Efficacy

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

Neighborhood Support & Neighborhood Activities

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

Empathy for Others

This outcome was measured using a subscale of the Teen Conflict Survey (Bosworth & Espelage, 1995). The scale has been shown to have an internal reliability coefficient of .83

6

(Dahlberg, Toal, & Behrens, 1998). Previous research has demonstrated a significant relationship between lack of empathy and high rates of violence and interpersonal conflict between individuals (see Barnett et al., 1997).

Presence of Caring

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

Reliabilities

Pre-test alpha coefficients are reported in table 1. Overall, the alpha coefficients for the pre-tests indicated moderate to high internal consistency, ranging between .69 (empathy) and .95 (neighborhood support).

Table 1
Pre-test Alpha coefficients (N=704)

Measure	Number of Items	α	Sample Item
Social Self Efficacy	8	.73	How well can you become friends with other children?
Self Assertive Efficacy	4	.71	How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?
Self Regulatory Efficacy	9	.86	How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?
Neighborhood Support	8	.95	People support each other in my neighborhood.
Neighborhood Activities	3[1]	.75	There are things for kids my age to do in my neighborhood.
Empathy	5	.69	I get upset when my friends are sad.
Presence of Caring	9	.77	There are people I can count on in an emergency.

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

Post-test alpha coefficients are reported in table 2. Overall, the alpha coefficients for the post-tests indicated good internal consistency, ranging from .71 (empathy) to .97 (neighborhood support).

Table 2
Post-test Alpha coefficients (N=350)

Measure	Number of Items	α	Sample Item
Social Self Efficacy	8	.77	How well can you become friends with other children?
Self Assertive Efficacy	4	.81	How well can you stand up for yourself when you feel you are being treated unfairly?
Self Regulatory Efficacy	9	.90	How well can you resist peer pressure to drink beer, wine, or liquor?
Neighborhood Support	8	.97	People support each other in my neighborhood.
Neighborhood Activities	3[2]	.71	There are things for kids my age to do in my neighborhood.
Empathy	5	.71	I get upset when my friends are sad.
Presence of Caring	9	.84	There are people I can count on in an emergency.

[2] The same item ("people in my neighborhood can be really mean") was deleted from this scale as in the pre-test scale because it was poorly correlated with the total scale (r= .03).

Evaluation Results

Participants' Satisfaction with the Police Programs

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

	Percent Who Said Yes
Made friends in the program	93%
Felt accepted and supported	97%
Felt like I belonged	97%
Felt safe	99%
Were involved in stimulating and engaging activities	95%
Staff really cared about me	97%
Felt part of a community	94%
Was a staff person who helped me solve my problems	91%

Youth Outcome Results

Total Sample of Youth

This study was designed as an evaluation of Police Working with Youth programs. Indicators of developmental maturity and adjustment were administered to two samples – a sample of youth involved in the "Police" programs and a contrasting sample of youth who did not participate in these programs. Specifically, pre-test and post-test responses to the outcome measures that were administered at the beginning and end of each project year were examined for these two contrasting groups. These analyses, involving youth between the ages of 12 and 18, were conducted using repeated measures analysis with pre-test and post-test scores as the within subjects factor and group membership (Police, comparison) as the between subjects factor.

In addition, gender was included as a between subjects factor. Gender was included as a between subjects factor because t-test analyses revealed that males and females in the Police group differed on two of the outcome measures included within the study. Specifically, females scored higher than males on both the pre-test and post-test indicator of self-regulatory efficacy ($t = 3.34$; $p < .001$ and 3.30; $p < .001$, for the pre-test and post- test contrasts, respectively) and on the pre-test and post-test indicator of empathy ($t = 7.02$; $p < .001$ and $t = 3.34$; $p < .001$).

Summary. Analyses that included the entire sample of youth participants revealed no significant changes over the program period for those who participated in Police Working with Youth activities.

High and Low Functioning Youth

The analyses to this point highlighted no consistent differences between the youth participating in Police programs and the youth making up the comparison group. We, thus, decided to conduct a second level of analysis that was designed to explore the possibility that the youth who are most likely to show changes as a result of participating in the Police programs may be those who were less skilled or competent prior to beginning the program.

The rationale for this analysis was based upon the hypothesis that youth who participate in Police Working with Youth programs are self-selected. That is, youth who are interested in working with Police may already be highly motivated and competent individuals. This hypothesis is somewhat supported by the finding that 67% of the participants reported having an A or B average in school. Or, alternatively, youth may be recruited into the programs by teachers, staff, or others because they are seen as having relevant interests and potential. In either case, such individuals are likely to show little change over the course of the program year because they started out at a high level of personal and social functioning already. Participants most likely to show changes in such youth programs may be those who are less motivated or competent prior to beginning the program.

In order to accomplish this objective, the total sample of youth involved in both the Police programs and the comparison group were split into two groups. The split groups were derived by computing the grand mean among all pre-test measures used in the outcome evaluation and dividing the total sample into thirds using this statistic. Youth whose grand mean scores fell within the top and bottom thirds of the sampling distribution were retained for further analysis. This method produced two separate groups of youth in the Police programs and two separate groups of youth in the comparison groups. The high functioning groups included individuals who reported the highest level of functioning on composite youth development metric prior to beginning the program year (N = 203). The low functioning groups included those youth who reported the lowest level of functioning on the youth development measures on the pre-test (N = 208).

Initial contrasts between the high and lower functioning youth groups indicated that they significantly differed on two characteristics. First, the two groups differed significantly with respect to gender of the participants. A greater percentage of males than females comprised the low functioning group (χ^2 (1) = 5.59; p< .02).

	High Functioning	**Low Functioning**
Males	98	124
Females	105	83

Second, a statistically significantly higher proportion of youth from the Police programs, as contrasted to the comparison group, were among those youth in the higher functioning group. Conversely, a much higher percentage of youth within the comparison group were among those classified as being within the low functioning group (χ^2 (1) = 26.69; p< .001). This later finding supports our suspicion that the youth who are interested in working with police may be a select group of highly motivated and competent individuals.

	High Functioning	**Low Functioning**
Comparison	81	136
Police	122	72

This analysis, thus, examined whether participants in four categories reported changes between their pre-test survey scores and their post-test survey scores. The categories were high- and low-functioning youth participating in the Police programs and high- and low-functioning youth included in the comparison groups. The analysis was conducted using a repeated measures analysis with pre-test and post-test scores as the within subjects factor and group membership (Police, comparison) and functioning (high, low) and as the two between subjects factors. In addition, because a significantly higher proportion of girls were found to comprise the high functioning group, gender was added as a third between subjects factor in the analyses.

Our expectations in doing these analyses were that (1) participants in Police programs would report greater changes than participants in the comparison group and (2) low-functioning youth in the Police programs would show the greatest level of change following participation in the program.

When high and low functioning participants were considered in analyzing pre-test and post-test changes, significant 3-way interactions between level of functioning (high, low), group (Police, comparison), and time (pre-test, post-test) were found for the following outcome measures: Self Assertive Efficacy, Self Regulatory Efficacy, and Empathy. One significant 2-way interaction also was found. This was between level of functioning (high, low) and group (Police, comparison) for the Presence of Caring. These results are summarized below.

Self-Assertive Efficacy

As noted above, a significant 3-way interaction was found for level of functioning, group status, and time on reported levels of Self-Assertive Efficacy ($F(1, 236) = 7.45$; $p < .001$). The pattern of mean scores, depicted in the Table below, suggests that the largest increase in reported levels of self-assertive efficacy occurred for the youth involved with the Police Programs who were classified as low-functioning at the beginning of the program. Interestingly, the youth within the comparison group who were classified initially as high functioning showed a notable decrease in their reported levels of Self-Assertive Efficacy over time.

Self-Assertive Efficacy

	Low Functioning		High Functioning	
	Pre-Test	**Post-Test**	**Pre-Test**	**Post-Test**
Police	20.0	21.9	24.3	24.5
Comparison Group	21.1	21.4	24.4	23.4

Self-Regulatory Efficacy

A similar result was found for Self-Regulatory Efficacy. Specifically, a significant three-way interaction was found between level of functioning, group status, and time on reported levels of self-regulatory efficacy ($F(1,232) = 3.98$; $p< .05$). Low-functioning participants in the Police Working with Youth programs reported significantly more positive changes than did higher functioning participants in the program, or members of the comparison groups. That is, participants in the lower functioning Police groups reported increased abilities in resisting peer pressures to engage in antisocial behaviors or use drugs, alcohol, or tobacco. The changes in mean scores are presented below.

Self Regulatory Efficacy

	Low Functioning		High Functioning	
	Pre-Test	**Post-Test**	**Pre-Test**	**Post-Test**
Police	44.1	48.8	59.8	59.1
Comparison Group	50.9	52.6	58.2	56.3

Empathy

Empathy scores changed in similar ways for the youth working within the Police Programs when compared to those of the comparison group (F(1, 231) = 4.09; p < .05). Though the changes over time are modest in scope, the empathy scores of the low functioning youth participating in youth programs involving the Police increased at a much higher rate over time than any of the other groups. Interestingly, the empathy scores of the high functioning youth within the comparison group dropped considerably over time.

Empathy

| | Low Functioning | | High Functioning | |
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Police	14.4	15.3	18.8	18.7
Comparison Group	15.9	16.1	17.9	16.5

Presence of Caring

When the pre-test and post-test scores for youth involved in the Police versus Comparison groups were contrasted, a significant 2-way interaction between group status and time was noted (F(1,227) = 4.55; p < .03). Youth working with the Police, regardless of initial level of functioning, showed a statistically significant increase in their presence of caring scores. In other words, youth participating in the Police Working with Youth programs reported feeling that there were now more trustworthy people in their lives outside of home and school compared to the youth in the comparison group. They could depend upon these people for help, guidance, advice, and support. Positive relationships with supportive adults have consistently been shown in previous research to be associated with improved social and emotional development (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 2002; Larson, 2000; McCauley & Van Velsor, 2003; McLaughlin, 2000).

Presence of Caring

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Police	20.6	21.7
Comparison Group	20.4	20.5

Summary. The results were consistent in showing that youth who participated in Police Working with Youth programs at a lower level of social and emotional competencies were most likely to report positive changes in self-assertive efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy, and empathy for others as a result of participation in the program. In short, the ones who needed it most reported the most benefit. Those who entered the programs with a higher level of social and emotional competence generally showed little positive changes or even modest declines, but these changes were not statistically significant. In addition, all youth who participated in Police Working with Youth programs, regardless of their initial level of personal and social

functioning, reported significant increases in the presence of caring, supportive, and trustworthy adults in their lives. This later result was only found when gender and the highest and lowest functioning thirds of the total sample were included in the analysis. Finally, gender was not found to be a significant factor in any of these findings.

Conclusions

Several conclusions can be drawn from this evaluation of Police Working with Youth programs.

First, youth generally found participating in Police Working with Youth programs to be a very positive experience. When asked to retrospectively report on their year in the program, well over 90% reported feeling safe, accepted, a sense of belonging, and part of a community. Most made new friends, were involved in stimulating activities, and felt supported by the staff.

The group of participants, as a whole, did not report significant changes on the youth development outcomes included in the evaluation. However, subgroups of youth showed significant changes on four of the seven outcomes assessed in the evaluation survey. The most consistent subgroup to report positive changes was that comprised of individuals who had reported a lower level of overall functioning on youth outcome measures prior to beginning the project years. Boys and girls at the lower end of the personal and social competencies continuum were the ones most likely to benefit from their involvement in the program. Specifically, it was this subgroup of youth who showed significant increases in their **self assertive efficacy**, **self-regulatory efficacy** and **empathy**. These skills reflect on the abilities of youth to competently manage the demands of social and interpersonal situations.

The youth participating in the Police Programs also increased their scores on the measure assessing the **presence of caring adults** in their lives. Following participation in the program, youth reported more guidance, advice, and support from adults outside of their families. Supportive relationships with staff and other non-familial adults is one of the most frequently identified characteristics of effective youth programs (Anderson-Butcher, Cash, Saltzburg, Midle, & Pace, 2004; Catalano et al., 2002; Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Loder & Hirsch, 2003; Noam & Fiore, 2004; Roth, et al, 1998). It is important to note that these findings only pertain to the analyses involving the youth who were classified as being high versus low functioning based on their pre-test scores on all of the outcome measures.

The findings that the participant group as a whole did not show positive changes while subgroups did makes sense when one considers that a community program, such as Police Working with Youth, is generally available to any youth who wants to participate. Youth are not targeted on the basis of some predetermined set of characteristics (e.g., high-risk for school failure, crime, etc). Some youth will likely enter the program with better developmental competencies than others. It is significant that those who entered with less social and emotional competencies were able to develop those skills in the program.

These findings also raise several additional questions. What motivates youth to become involved in Police Working with Youth programs? What kinds of individuals are likely to

enroll, participate regularly, and complete the program? What other characteristics differentiate the lower functioning from the higher functioning participants on developmental competencies. The present evaluation found that the two groups differed by gender with a greater percentage of females comprising the more functional group. What other factors not included in this evaluation might also differentiate the two groups? For instance, do those with less developmental competencies enter the program with different goals and incentives? Do they differ in terms of certain family characteristics (parental involvement, family support, family stress) or socioeconomic backgrounds? Finally, how might Police Working with Youth programs be restructured to meet the needs of youth who start out with a higher level of social and emotional competence?

A process evaluation would be useful in addressing the questions posed above, such as who participates and why. Furthermore, additional efforts directed towards collecting attendance data could address the question of whether regular (in contrast to infrequent) attendance improves youth outcomes. Finally, it might be useful to document more clearly what kinds of activities are offered in Police Working with Youth programs. This would help answer the question of whether some program components are more successful than others in reaching youth.

References

Anderson-Butcher, D.A., Cash, S.J., Saltzburg, S., Midle, T., & Pace, D. (2004). Institutions of youth development: The significance of supportive staff-youth relationships. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 9* (1/2), 83-99.

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

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

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

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

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

Catalano, R.F., Berglund, M.L.; Ryan, J., Lonczak, H.S., & Hawkins, D. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention and Treatment, 5,* 15, 1-106.

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

Connecticut Governor's Prevention Partnership (2001). Prevention Works! *Core prevention strategies that work fostering the healthy social development of children and youth in communities.* Hartford: State of Connecticut.

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

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

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

Loder, T.L., & Hirsch, B.J. (2003). Inner-city youth development organizations: The salience of peer ties among early adolescent girls. *Applied Developmental Science, 7, 1,* 2-12.

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

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

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

Noam, G.G., & Fiore, N. (2004, Fall). Relationships across multiple settings: An overview. *New Directions for Youth Development, 103,* 9-16.

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

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

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

<u>YOUTH WORKING WITH POLICE QUESTIONNAIRE –</u>
<u>POST TEST 2004</u>

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

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

First and Last Initials   Birth Month   Birth Day   Birth Year

Example: ☐ ☐   ☐ ☐   ☐ ☐   ☐ ☐

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

First and Last Initials   Birth Month   Birth Day   Birth Year

Your ID: ☐ ☐   ☐ ☐   ☐ ☐   ☐ ☐

Today's date_____

In what town do you live?
_____

Gender: _____ Male   _____ Female

Year of Birth: 19_____

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

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

Grade in school:

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

What are your average grades in school:

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

Race / Ethnicity: Check the one that best applies:

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

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

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

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

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very well

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21. How well can you control your temper?

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

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

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

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

24. People support each other in my neighborhood.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all true				Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
Not at all true   Completely true

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

       1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true   Completely true

33. People in my neighborhood can be really mean.

       1   2   3   4   5
Not at all true   Completely true

34. I can listen to others.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

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

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

36. I get upset when my friends are sad.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

37. I trust people who are not my friends.

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

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

Never   Seldom   Sometimes   Often   Always

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

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

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

    YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

    YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

    YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

    YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

    YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

    YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

   YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

   YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

   YES!   yes   no   NO!

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

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

   Good   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Bad

   Healthy   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unhealthy

   Pleasant   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unpleasant

   Wise   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Foolish

Beneficial   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Harmful

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

Good   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Bad

Beneficial   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Harmful

Pleasant   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unpleasant

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

Good   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Bad

Beneficial   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Harmful

Pleasant   ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ Unpleasant

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

51. Did you make friends in the program?	Yes	No
52. Did you feel accepted and supported in the program?	Yes	No
53. Did you feel like you belonged?	Yes	No
54. Did you feel safe in the program?	Yes	No
55. Were you involved in stimulating and engaging activities?	Yes	No
56. Did you feel like the teachers/staff really cared about you?	Yes	No
57. Did you feel like part of a community?	Yes	No
58. Was there a staff person who helped you solve your problems?	Yes	No

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

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

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

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for completing this survey.