

2016

Impact of Positive Youth Development Services on Resilience Among Adjudicated Girls

Shaunette Roberta Byers Parker
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Developmental Psychology Commons](#), and the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Shaunette Parker

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Susan Rarick, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Martha Giles, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty

Dr. Georita Frierson, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University

2016

Abstract

Impact of Positive Youth Development Services on

Resilience Among Adjudicated Girls

by

Shaunette R. Parker

MS, Martin University, 2007

BS, Indiana University 2002

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Educational Psychology

Walden University

Summer 2016

Abstract

Positive youth development (PYD) frameworks that guide PYD services suggest at-risk youth need to develop resiliency attitudes and resiliency skills in order to prevent long-term failure in their adult lives. This concept is based on multiple developmental theories that suggest increased levels of resiliency make it easier to navigate challenging situations. Adjudicated youth have faced a major setback in their short lives, yet they still have an opportunity to become successful and avoid additional jail time, if they are able to display a strong sense of resilience. Many youth development programs geared toward serving adjudicated youth, lack the appropriate structure and services to ensure youth are able to develop strong resiliency attitudes and skills. The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of PYD services on the resiliency attitudes and skills of teenage girls at an all-girls Department of Juvenile Justice residential facility. Archival data from the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) were used. RASP identifies the following domains as indicators of resiliency attitudes and skills: humor, creativity, insight, initiative, independence, relationships, and values orientation. Multiple regression analysis showed that the longer residents are in the program, the better they scored on the relationships, insight, humor, and creativity domains. Since culture can have an impact on youth development, race and ethnicity were analyzed. Hispanic residents did better on the overall RASP and the values orientation, insight, initiative, and creativity domains. These findings may help youth development professionals understand the importance for troubled youth to remain in a developmental program for a longer time while engaging in activities geared toward increasing resiliency.

Impact of Positive Youth Development Services on
Resilience Among Adjudicated Girls

by

Shaunette R. Parker

MS, Martin University, 2007

BA, Indiana University, 2002

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Educational Psychology

Walden University

Summer 2016

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to all of the young people who endure struggles I could not imagine even as an adult. I hope that this research has an impact on creating positive change in your lives.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank God for blessing me with the time, energy and patience to complete this dissertation. A special thank you is sent to my loving children and husband David. Without your support, encouragement, and patience this would not have been possible. Mom, I appreciate your time and energy spent with Eli at the residencies. I know he was a handful. Also, thank you mom and Auntie Donna for your years of encouragement.

Lastly, it is extremely important for me to thank Dr. Susan Rarick. Your guidance and knowledge has been invaluable. Dr. Susan Rarick, I thank God you were able to step in when you did. Thank you for being there with me since the beginning. Dr. Giles, your feedback is very encouraging and appreciated. Thank you for your patience. And Dr. Frierson, your final touches have helped me put forward my best work.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	2
Problem Statement.....	6
Theoretical Foundation.....	9
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	10
Nature of the Study.....	11
Operational Definitions.....	12
Assumptions.....	14
Limitations and Delimitations.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	15
Summary.....	15
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	17
Introduction.....	17
Adolescent Development.....	18
The PYD Concept.....	21
Prominent PYD Frameworks.....	27
The Search Institute.....	28
The National Research Council.....	33
America’s Promise Alliance for Youth.....	35

Forum for Youth Investment	37
Juvenile Delinquency.....	39
Resiliency Attitudes and Skills	43
Summary	47
Chapter 3: Research Methods	50
Introduction.....	50
Research Design and Approach	50
Setting and Sample	51
Demographics	51
Power Analysis	52
Procedures.....	52
Instrumentation	53
Interventions	56
Data Analysis	57
Threats to Validity	58
Ethical Considerations	60
Summary.....	60
Chapter 4: Results.....	62
Data Collection	62
Independent Variables	63
Research Instrument.....	64
Dependent Variables.....	66

Study Results	67
Summary	76
Chapter 5: Interpretation, Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusions.....	78
Introduction.....	78
Interpretation of Findings	79
Limitations of the Study.....	83
Recommendations.....	86
Implications.....	88
Conclusions.....	89
Appendix A: Email Permission from Authors of RASP	101
Appendix B: Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile.....	102
Appendix C: Survey Key for Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile	105

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

The purpose of this preexperimental study was to examine the impact of pedagogies and services delivered from a positive youth development (PYD) perspective on the resiliency skills and resiliency attitudes of adjudicated girls.

There is a wide array of research on various topics concerning the youth population, for example, high school graduation and college readiness and access are topics of current interest in light of the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act (now known as the Every Student Succeeds Act). Conley (2007) studied the concept of college readiness, while Deke and Haimson (2006) studied which student competencies predict postsecondary educational attainment and earnings. Many organizations seek to address youth issues such as education, abuse, neglect, and the outcomes of at-risk behaviors. But a growing number of researchers have addressed youths' developmental needs by focusing on PYD frameworks (Pittman & Fleming, 1991; Scales & Leffert, 2004; Scales, Benson, & Mannes, 2006). However, because of the punitive nature of most juvenile justice programs (Nelson et al., 2010), few programs in the juvenile justice system have focused on a PYD framework as a means of rehabilitation. This research studied the effect of the PYD services received by adjudicated girls while serving a court-ordered sentence at a Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facility. This DJJ facility in this study emphasized a youth development approach that targets the strengths and the potential of youth as opposed to focusing on the fact that they have been brought into the facility for truancy, oppositional defiance, and other negative behaviors (Caldwell, 2000).

It is expected that this research will impact DJJ programs because it should provide insight into preventative measures for at-risk youth and deepen support services for youth who find themselves in the juvenile justice system.

Background

PYD

Currently, several well-known organizations are focusing on PYD frameworks: America's Promise Alliance, the National Research Council, the Forum for Youth Investment, and the Search Institute (Benson et al., 2006; National Conference of State Legislatures [NCSL], 2010). According to the NCSL (2010), the frameworks are centered on the physical, cognitive, social, and emotional needs of youth. Each of these four organizations is glossed below.

America's Promise Alliance (2013) is an organization with more than 400 national partners that focus on mobilizing Americans to act to end the high school dropout crisis. Its work centers on the Five Promise framework: (a) caring adults, (b) safe places' (c) A healthy start (good nutrition and healthy lifestyle habits), (d) effective education' and (e) opportunities to help others. Children who experience at least four of the five promises are more likely to succeed academically, socially, and civically. Children who experience none or just one of the promises are more likely to engage in risky behaviors, such as violence and delinquency.

According to the National Research Council (2002), 25% of youth in the United States are at an alarming risk of not achieving "productive adulthood" (p. 2). Without intervention, these young people will likely find themselves facing substance abuse, early

pregnancy, school failure, or involvement in the juvenile justice system. To combat these risky behaviors, the National Research Council (2002) identified the following characteristics of programs that serve youth and promote PYD: “(a) physical and psychological safety, (b) appropriate structure, (c) supportive relationships, (d) opportunities to belong, (e) positive social norms, (f) support for efficacy and mattering, (g) opportunities for skill-building, (h) integration of family, school and community efforts” (p. 9).

The Search Institute has also been a leader in PYD research. Its 40 developmental assets constitute a set of factors that youth must have in order to become successful and thriving adults. The Search Institute provides comprehensive constructs for embedding the developmental assets into families, communities, and schools. According to Scales and Roehlkepartain (2003), developmental assets are either external or internal. The external assets relate to relationships and opportunities. They include the following categories: support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, and constructive use of time (Roehlkepartain, Benson, & Sesma, 2003, p. 10). The internal assets are related to personal qualities and include: “(a) commitment to learning, (b) positive values, (c) social competencies, and (d) positive identity” (Roehlkepartain, Benson, & Sesma, 2003, p. 10). According to Scales et al. (2000), youth who have a larger number of the developmental assets are likely to display thriving behaviors that lead to success in adulthood.

The Forum for Youth Investment (The Forum) contributes to the field of PYD by supporting research on the Five C’s: connection, character, competence, confidence, and caring/compassion (Benson et al., 2006). The Forum also leads or manages three

initiatives geared toward advocacy, improving youth outcomes, and improving or managing/ the quality of youth programs. These initiatives include the Ready by 21 initiative, Spark Action, and the David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality. The literature review will discuss organizations that focus on PYD.

United States Juvenile Justice System

The first juvenile court in the United States was created in Cook County, Illinois, in 1899 (Nelson et al., 2010). The purpose was to have a system that could focus on the rehabilitation of youth apart from adults. However, as public attitudes about safety changed, the juvenile justice system grew into one that focused on the belief that punishment is more effective for juvenile delinquents (Grisso, 2007). Furthermore, the 1994 Federal Gun-Free Schools Act gave way to a zero-tolerance policy for weapons in schools. As a result, schools quickly began to adapt other zero-tolerance policies for contraband and behavioral infractions (Nelson et al., 2010). When schools began to demand the removal of students from schools because of the disciplinary violations, the increase in student infractions became the students' point of entry into the juvenile justice system (Weissman et al., 2008).

In early 2000, the juvenile justice system began to look more like make-shift psychiatric hospitals than disciplinary reform centers (Nelson et al., 2010). At this point the nation was experiencing a decline in violent youth crime. Many were being moved through the juvenile justice system as a way to receive mental health services (Grisso, 2007). The problem was that many of the juvenile justice facilities lacked the staff, money, and programs to address the developmental needs of youth who had mental

health disorders, educational disabilities, and other problems related to being mentally and physically abused and substance abuse (Grisso, 2007).

Now, the juvenile justice system is faced with trying to meet the mental health and academic needs of youth and to focus on changing the delinquent behaviors that brought the youth to the system. In some cases, facilities respond with fear to the need to attend to mental health issues. The facilities either fail to respond because there is a belief that they cannot improve the mental health issues youth face, or they forego mental health screenings so youth can receive admission into the facility (Grisso, 2007). On the other hand, some facilities went overboard with the focus on mental health issues. As a result, many began to implement services and programs with little thought or planning. At times, the services were no more ineffective than doing nothing (Grisso, 2007). Nelson et al. (2010) also noted another glaring problem with the juvenile justice system: its lack of uniformity. There seemed to be no consistent policies, regulations, or philosophy. If Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico are included, there are 52 separate juvenile justice systems (King, 2006). Among the different systems are individual facilities that differ in terms of staff, treatment programs, education, communication, and conditions of confinement. This difference is attributed to different state laws and varying funding structures. In addition, the overall juvenile justice system is divided; some think that incarcerated youth deserve punishment and some think they should receive youth-centered developmental services (Nelson et al., 2010).

Problem Statement

Studies on PYD suggest that in order for young people to grow into productive members of society, youth must have access to, and develop, specific assets that will enable them to make appropriate decisions and set achievable goals (Benson, 2006). PYD emphasizes opportunities for young people to develop competence, a sense of belonging, and self-empowerment (Woods & Conderman, 2006). A PYD perspective suggests that when young people have positive life experiences, they grow into successful, mature adults (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2010).

Unfortunately, some youth experience barriers that push them off the path toward a successful adult life. When youth find themselves in trouble, they are urged to participate in services that are aimed at “fixing” their problems. Often, this approach focuses on youths’ negative behavior (Pittman & Fleming, 1991) as opposed to putting the child at the center of the intervention. A PYD perspective focuses not on treating problems but proactively addressing youth’s needs (Zeldin, 1995). When youth-serving programs and institutions, such as schools, focus on developing students’ skills and assets, it is possible that youths’ achievement barriers can be overcome. As a result, their achievement motivation increases (Gomez & Ang, 2007).

There is, however, a population of youth who are more susceptible to making poor choices when it comes to social interactions, academic achievement, and general choices that affect their growth. This population is often referred to as the “at-risk” population, a term used to describe not just the person, but also to make a prediction about an increased possibility of hardships that can put youth in danger of experiencing

social and emotional setbacks, economic disparities and low academic achievement (Chen & Kauffman, 1997). Therefore, to suggest that a young person is at-risk means she or he has acquired a set of risk factors that increase the likelihood of various developmental and educational problems (Chen & Kaufman, 1997). Typically, the risk factors are related to demographic or historic factors—such as low socioeconomic status, foster care placement—or other characteristics of background and experience that do not match those of their peers in the dominant culture (Chen & Kaufman, 1997). Therefore, to suggest that a young person is “at risk” means that he or she has acquired risk factors that may put him or her in danger of dropping out of school and not achieving socially acceptable achievements such as obtaining a job (Gambone, Klem, & Connell, 2002). In many cases the youth’s school experiences may not have included opportunities to create supportive relationships, manage long-term assignments, or engage in reading and analysis that requires high-level thinking and problem-solving skills. As indicated in a 2008 report issued by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, at-risk or disconnected youth are more likely than other students to remain low-income, to lose jobs during economic downturns, to engage in criminal activities and to become teenage parents (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2008)

Furthermore, students who may be at risk of academic failure often need more support outside standard academic interventions to help them be successful. They may have few positive adult role models and may often have had little opportunity to participate in building positive relationships. At-risk youth also lack access to adults with whom they can collaboratively explore ideas (Horn & Carroll, 1997). Further they often

have had less exposure to planning ahead and may be less likely to use effective problem solving skills to analyze cause and effect for effective decision making. For example, many at-risk youths have not had experience in budgeting, thus they may lack the planning skills needed for daily living. In many cases, immediate gratification and short-term goals are given priority over long-term goals. Further complicating the situation is that these students may have low self-esteem. This causes them to doubt their potential to achieve success in academics or life. Students may even begin to sabotage their own progress when faced with the discomfort of finding themselves achieving goals they do not believe they deserve or can sustain (Gambone et al., 2002). It does appear, however, that these thinking patterns can be remapped, and cognitive processes can be restructured (Horn & Carroll, 1997).

Although many school systems and out-of-school time programs are beginning to focus their efforts on addressing issues (Gambone et al., 2002) with at-risk students prior to a crisis, several students may find themselves unable to adapt to traditional school settings (Pittman & Fleming, 1991). In turn, they become truant and involved in other destructive behaviors. To address issues with constant truancy and other minor offences, some government-funded programs partner with educational institutions to develop interventions for students who have been delinquent from school and are on the brink of dropping out entirely. Clemson University's Youth Learning Institute (YLI) and the South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice (SCDJJ) have partnered to provide services for youth, ages 12-18, at the Youth Development Center, in a city located in the southwestern region of South Carolina. This residential program houses delinquent,

nonviolent girls referred by SCDJJ. While at the program, the girls participate in educational and recreational modules that focus on traditional academic subjects and youth development needs (YLI, 2013). Specifically, YLI focuses on building vocational skills, basic living skills, consumer empowerment, self-efficacy, and resiliency (YLI, 2013).

Similar to the world of PYD, there is no uniform juvenile justice system. As a result, there is no consistent philosophy, school of thought, or regulations that govern how youth within the system are treated or moved through various programs (Nelson, Jolivette, Leone, & Mathur, 2010). It is assumed that after serving time within these programs the youth receive skills necessary to return to their homes and schools and become successful. According to current research (Grisso, 2007), juvenile facilities lack appropriate resources such as staff, funding, and program development to address the wide array of needs adjudicated youth have. Furthermore, there needs to be additional research to identify effective evidence-based practices and staff training for programs geared toward the rehabilitation or redirection of adjudicated youth (Nelson et al., 2010).

Theoretical Foundation

Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943), Ryff's features of adult psychological well-being (1989), Roger's view of the fully functioning person (1961), Allport's conception of maturity (1961), and Wolin and Wolin's resiliency theory guided this study (1993). PYD research has been centered on assets that young people require to be successful. Proponents of PYD focus on building these assets, making sure youth's needs are met. Maslow's hierarchy of needs (1943) identifies various levels of needs that people must

have satisfied to reach the levels of self-actualizing and self-transcending (Koltko-Rivera, 2006). When people meet this level of Maslow's needs hierarchy, they are at peace and have a sense of satisfaction of what they are capable of accomplishing. Moreover, research by Rogers (1961), Allport (1961) and Ryff (1989) provided an extension of needs theory and further discussion of positive development.

Purpose of the Study

In this study, I explored the relationships among services rendered at a DJJ facility and the incarcerated girl's resiliency attitudes and the skills set or behaviors attributed to a person who is resilient. The residential facility used in this study focused on services and classroom instruction grounded in PYD philosophies. Using archival data from a pre- and posttest given to the residents, this study was conducted to determine a relationship among the residents' rating for resiliency attitudes and resiliency skills and the time they spent in the program. This study also examined whether race or ethnicity and the residents' initial score on the survey were predictors of a positive change on the survey.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

1. Does the amount of time spent in the PYD program predict a change or higher score on the RASP?

H1. Residents who are in the program longer than 30 days have significantly increased RASP scores.

H₀¹. There is no significant increase/change in resident's scores on the RASP based on their length of time in the program.

2. Does the resident's initial RASP score predict whether there will be a significant positive change in the post RASP score?

H2. Residents who have low RASP scores on the pretest will show an increase on their post-RASP.

H₀². There is no significant difference in the amount of change a resident shows on their pre- and posttest RASP given a low or high pretest score.

3. What role does youth's race have on predicting higher levels of resiliency attitudes and skills?

H3. There is a significant difference between the residents' self-reported resiliency attitudes and skills based on their race or ethnicity.

H₀³. There is no significant difference between the race or ethnicity of residents and their self-reported resiliency attitudes and skills.

Nature of the Study

This quantitative study used archival data to determine if the South Carolina DJJ program predicted higher levels of resiliency attitudes and skills. The dependent variable was residents' gain/change score between the pretest and posttest RASP. Each domain was analyzed individually and the overall score was analyzed. The independent variables were length of time in the program and race or ethnicity. Using multiple regression determined if length of time in the program and race or ethnicity predicted a change in resiliency attitudes and skills. Also, separate logistic regression analyses were conducted to determine if a resident's initial pretest score was a predictor of an increase in the

overall RASP. Then a comparison was made between the prediction equation for Black, Latino, White, and other/Biracial residents to see if length of time in the program differed in predicting a gain/change in RASP for on race or ethnicity over another.

Upon orientation into the program, the youth took a pre-test to assess their resiliency attitudes and skills. On the day youth are released, they take the assessment again to determine if there has been a change in their resiliency attitudes and skills. While the residents' resiliency attitudes and skills could have been affected by services prior to entering the program, gathering pre- and posttest data is a way to assess any changes as a result of entering into the program. Youth are residents of the program for a minimum of 30 days and a maximum of 90 days. The length of stay is determined by a judicial court. Youth also have an opportunity to leave the program 15 days early if they earn good behavior time. Typically, youth must stay a minimum of 15 days regardless of good behavior. However, if they exhibit more violent behaviors, youth are removed from the program early and sent to a higher security facility. I compared archival data of youth who were 30 day residents, 75 day residents and 90 day residents as well as Black, White, and Latino residents and those who identify as other/Biracial.

Operational Definitions

At-risk youth: Youth can be labeled at-risk for many reasons. Research indicates that the term is used to identify youth who may be at-risk for involvement in the juvenile delinquency system (Nelson et al., 2010), at-risk of academic failure, and at-risk for engaging in unhealthy, unproductive behaviors (Gambone, Klem, & Connell, 2002). In any case, youth are deemed "at-risk" due to demographic or historic factors such as low

socioeconomic status, foster care placement, or other characteristics of background and experience that do not match those of their dominant culture peers. As indicated in a 2008 report issued by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, at-risk or disconnected youth are also more likely than other students to remain low-income, lose jobs during economic downturns, engage in criminal activities and become teenage parents.

Development: According to Larson (2000), in a psychological context, development is a process in which one grows and competence increases.

Positive youth development: This is a concept that does not have one universally accepted definition. However, research indicates that PYD is centered on youth's abilities to acquire a set of assets or skills that would move them toward becoming thriving individuals (Benson & Scales, 2009). Research also shows that PYD is the ability to display cognitive and behavioral competence, confidence, strong character, caring, and positive social connections (King et al., 2005). Ultimately, PYD places an emphasis on the strengths, resources and potential of young people (Durlak et al., 2007). In addition, Pittman and Fleming (1991) assert that "PYD should be seen as an ongoing process in which all youth are engaged and invested" (p. ii).

Resiliency: This is the youth's ability to adapt to change and challenging/stressful situations in healthy and flexible ways (Catalano et al., 2002).

School-to-prison pipeline: This is a metaphor for the national trend of criminalizing children rather than educating them. According to Nelson et al. (2010) criminalizing is the act of pushing children toward incarceration for minor offenses which then starts a pattern of illegal behavior. It is said that the school-to-prison pipeline exists

because of the reactive and exclusionary nature of school discipline practices and the pressure to improve academic test scores. Schools tend to marginalize at-risk students who make it difficult to focus on students who do not cause problems (Nelson et al., 2010).

Assumptions

For the purpose of this research, I assumed that all participants responded to the survey prompts honestly. It is also assumed that the participants fully understood each item of the survey. Furthermore, I assumed that the staff person administered the survey with integrity. In other words, the staff person did not intervene in a way that would lead the participants to respond in a way that was based more on the staff person's thoughts as opposed to her own thoughts.

Limitations and Delimitations

One limitation of this study was the diversity of its population. The sample was drawn from youth living in a state in the southeastern part of the United States. While the DJJ facility houses students from many different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, this study was limited to those who were sent to the facility to participate in the youth development residential program. The DJJ facility tends to receive primarily youth who identify as Black, White, and Hispanic.

Another limitation of the study is that there is no comparison group. Thus, true cause and effect cannot be studied. This study was only able to analyze the changes over time in the same group. Furthermore, this study used archival data from one DJJ facility in a small rural city in the state of South Carolina. I focused only on archival data from

youth who were residents in the youth development DJJ program at this facility within the last 5 years.

Significance of the Study

A growing number of researchers have begun to address youth's developmental needs by using PYD frameworks (Pittman & Fleming, 1991). However, because of the punitive nature of most juvenile justice programs (Nelson et al., 2010), many of them have not focused on using the PYD framework as a means of rehabilitation. This research sought to study adjudicated youth and the PYD services they receive while serving a court-ordered sentence at a DJJ facility. The DJJ facility used in this study emphasizes a youth development approach that targets the strengths and potential of youth as opposed to their negative behaviors (Caldwell, 2000). It is expected that this research will improve DJJ programs by providing insight into preventative measures for at-risk youth and deepening service practice for youth who do find themselves in the juvenile justice system.

Summary

Youth who do not receive the right developmental support in their early years are more at risk for low success in school and are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviors. When youth are connected with out-of-school programming, strong adult allies, and structure at home, they are more likely to flourish as adults. Prior studies have linked PYD to educational achievement and college readiness. Other studies have also researched youth in after school programs, specialized school services (Guilamo-Ramos,

Litardo, & Jaccard, 2005; Lerner et al., 2005; National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2002).

The present study was designed to study the relationship among youth's resiliency attitudes and skills and their time spent in a juvenile detention center. While the goal of PYD is to reach young people prior to negative behaviors such as truancy, drug use, and other illegal activities, there is also a need for PYD services when youth succumb to delinquent behaviors. With this study I sought to determine whether resiliency attitudes and skills changed with statistical significance in response to a sentence at the youth development detention center. This study could also assist program coordinators, policy leaders, and other youth workers connected to the DJJ who seek to determine whether their services improve behaviors in juvenile offenders.

Researchers have identified PYD frameworks that have been shown to help diminish risky behaviors and violent acts in youth. A more detailed discussion of three prominent frameworks will be presented in Chapter 2. Also provided in Chapter 2 is a more in-depth discussion of theoretical frameworks that provide further explanation for the validity of the identified PYD frameworks. The research design and approach to this study is provided in Chapter 3. Also, the results are presented in Chapter 4 along with a discussion of the findings in Chapter 5.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter focuses on prominent PYD frameworks and the challenges adjudicated youth face in academics, social interactions, and soft skills. This chapter also elaborates on the history of the United States Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), specifically, the South Carolina DJJ system.

This review was based on peer-reviewed journals. The following three electronic databases were used: PsycINFO, PsycARTICLES, and Academic Search Complete. The following set of keywords was used: *positive youth development, juvenile, justice, at-risk, youth*. A set of websites also proved valuable: Search Institute, The Forum for Youth Investment, National Research Council, and America's Promise Alliance.

There is a large amount of research in the area of academics and the current United States dropout crisis. Typically, these are the issues addressed as it relates to the challenges at-risk youth face. This literature review will present several studies that analyze this phenomenon and how issues with school completion relate to youth development issues. Through the review of this literature it is also clear how youth's resiliency is related to academic success and overall development. To that end, the theoretical framework for this study is based on resiliency theory and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. However, to better understand adolescent development (a foundation for understanding PYD) I also present findings on the science of adolescent development written by Hall, Freud, Erickson, and Piaget. This review will elaborate on each theoretical framework written by Hall, Freud, Erickson, and Piaget and the overall connection to the concept of PYD.

To better understand the foundation of PYD perspectives, it is appropriate to step back and take a deeper look at the scientific study of adolescent development, theoretical frameworks that have guided the concept of PYD and major developmental issues with America's youth that prompt PYD efforts to be employed by youth workers.

Adolescent Development

Adolescence is the stage of life that spans between ages 10 and 20 (Lerner & Steinberg, 2004). Research describes this phase with the start of changes related to puberty and ending when most of a young person's biological, cognitive, psychological and social characteristics have grown from what is considered childlike to that which is more adult-like (Lerner, 2005). While a person is in the midst of these changes, he or she is considered an adolescent. Research shows (Baumrind, 1987; Fischhoff, 1992; Shedler & Block, 1990) that during adolescence risky behavior increases.

Early scientific studies of adolescent development conducted by Hall in 1904 showed that adolescence is marked by "storm and stress" (Arnett, 2006; Lerner, 2005). Hall, considered the founder of the scientific study of adolescent development (Arnett, 2006) believed that human evolution involved changes that move people from an animalistic, beastlike nature to being more civilized (Lerner, 2005). Hall argued that adolescence is indeed a time when young people endure some level of emotional and behavioral distress before establishing a stable state of adulthood (Arnett, 2006).

In a two-volume book, Hall (1904) discussed his observations of adolescent phenomena. Of particular relationship to the concept of PYD are adolescent mood, excitement seeking and risk behaviors, crime, delinquency and relational aggression. If

indeed the adolescent youth experiences a deep level of unrest, poor adjustments or responses to each of these areas could result in poor overall development and thus lead a young person down a destructive path and negative behaviors in adulthood (Hall, 1904).

According to Hall (1904), adolescence is a time when people are more likely to experience depressed moods. Hall (1904) indicated that the depressed moods can begin around age eleven, and they increase steadily and rapidly until age fifteen. The moods then begin to decrease until about age twenty-three. Hall's (1904) research found that causes of adolescent depressed moods were marked by "Suspicion of being disliked by friends, of having faults of person or character that cannot be overcome, the fancy of ...hopeless love" (Vol. 2, p. 78). Arnett (2006) also noted that modern studies on adolescence indicate that friendships and romantic relationships contributed to the likelihood of depressed moods in adolescent youth. Research also shows that the desire to gravitate more toward friends could leave adolescent youth more prone to what modern psychology calls "relational aggression" (Arnett, 2006). Relational aggression is aggression that is expressed when an adolescent experiences rumors, being excluded from a group and gossiping (Arnett, 2006).

Also evident during adolescence is a young person's desire for excitement and new pleasurable sensations (Hall, 1904). This sensation seeking (Arnett, 2006) behavior is most noticed when youth in their teens to early twenties seek to fulfill their need for excitement without regard for morally and ethically correct behaviors (Hall, 1904). Often times this means youth will begin to incorporate sex, drugs, and alcohol into their lives to gain the most pleasurable experiences.

While modern psychology research has found some discrepancies in some of Hall's research, most scholars who researched this area agreed that adolescence is a stressful period in life (Lerner, 2005). Moreover, after conducting a thorough search of the literature, Hall's research was most widely referenced providing a springboard for further research in the area of adolescent development.

Since Hall, other research has alluded to the unrest youth experience during adolescence. Freud (1969) described the period of adolescence as normative development disturbance. Erickson (1968) described adolescence as a time of crisis and conflict. He further noted that it was most important for adolescents to develop a sense of identity (Petersen, 1988). Piaget (1972) focused on cognitive development indicating that formal reasoning takes place between the ages of 12 and 15. Lerner (2006) asserted that the second phase of adolescent development research (beginning in the 1960s) consisted of "more molecular theories" (p. 6) about the development of a particular facet of either individual development or social development.

As scientific research in the area of adolescent development began to grow, it was becoming more evident that adolescence was not a stage in life that was inevitably the same for all youth. Youth were being seen as vessels to be developed as opposed to problems to manage until adulthood (Roth et al., 1998). Adolescent research was pointing to evidence that youth have the potential to be affected by positive interventions as they grow (Lerner, 2002). It is this evidence in adolescent development that has led to the PYD concept.

The PYD Concept

PYD is not just about a decrease in negative or risky behaviors. It is also about promoting behaviors that lead to positive outcomes in adulthood. Supporters of PYD philosophy may say that the goal is for adolescents to grow into “healthy, happy, and competent adolescents and grow to have productive and satisfying adulthoods” (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003, p. 96). Variation in how to define the PYD concept and how to move youth along a positive path toward successful adulthood arises as a result of the discrepancy about what it means to be a healthy, happy, and competent adult.

Some argue that economic self-sufficiency is the primary desired result (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003). Others may argue that psychological well-being is the most important outcome (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003). Ryff (1989) identified six essential features of adult psychological well-being: (a) self-acceptance; (b) positive relationships with others; (c) autonomy; 4) environmental mastery; 5) purpose in life; and 6) personal growth. These features of adult well-being were identified through the integration of multiple theories on psychological well-being. According to Ryff (1989), the problem with the individual theories was that they lacked empirical evidence. Moreover, Ryff (1989) argued that the theories were more so “hopeless pronouncements” in how people *should* function. Nevertheless, the theories on psychological well-being do provide some foundation for understanding psychological well-being and ultimately the development of various PYD frameworks.

Maslow (1943) articulated his theory for motivation, which is seen as a model for psychological well-being. This theory is commonly known as the hierarchy of needs

theory. Maslow (1943) argued that there is a hierarchy or chain of needs that must be met before a person can move on to having the next need met. In theory, once each need is met, the person is said to be self-actualizing. This needs theory articulates people's motivation comes from the drive to have each need met.

Maslow first noted that there are basic needs that must be met. First in the order of needs are physiological needs. If a person is consumed with thoughts of hunger and thirst, it is likely that that person will only be motivated to seek food and drink (Maslow, 1943). Maslow also indicated that while there are other physiological needs aside from food and drink, these are the two that a person would most seek before anything else.

When a person's physiological needs are met, according to Maslow (1943) he or she will at once be motivated to seek other needs. Next in the hierarchy are safety needs. This means that people seek peace and comfort in their daily lives. A person may seek safety in having a secure home, safety in secure and desired employment and perhaps safety through medical insurance and health protection.

The next set of needs is love needs. Maslow (1943) indicated that people will become motivated to seek out love, affection, and belongingness if their basic physiological and safety needs are met. It is at this point that Maslow argued the most psychopathology and maladjustment happens. At this stage, people are motivated to give and receive love.

Once this need is met, Maslow explained that people become concerned with prestige and reputation. People find it important to evaluate themselves on a level of self-respect, achievement and confidence. Maslow (1943) called this esteem needs. Maslow

argued that the “satisfaction of the self-esteem need leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth, strength, capability and adequacy of being useful and necessary in the world” (Maslow, 1943, p. 382). He further asserts that not meeting these needs can produce feelings of inferiority, feelings of weakness and helplessness.

The final stage in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is the need for self-actualization. At this stage, people seek to fulfill their ultimate dream. People become motivated to be what they feel or what they were meant to be. For example, a mother, who may have been gratified in all other areas, may not feel complete until she feels she has become a good mother. Likewise, a musician must make music; a painter must create paintings, and so on.

Rogers's (1961) view of the fully functioning person is an extension of Maslow’s hierarchy theory. Rogers agreed with Maslow’s concept of the self-actualizing person. For Rogers, when people are able to achieve their goals, desires, and dreams they became self-actualizing or fully functioning. Rogers (1961) believed that in order for a person to grow into a fully functioning person, one’s environment or rather relationships need to provide openness, acceptance, understanding, sensitivity, and empathy.

Rogers (1961) identified four characteristics of the fully functioning person. First a person has openness to experience. According to Rogers, this is the opposite of defensiveness. When people are open to experience they tend to become more openly aware of their own feelings and attitudes. They become more aware of the outside world. People who are more open to experience tend *not* to make overgeneralizations of people and experiences. For example, one could have a bad experience at a restaurant. A person

who is open to experience will refrain from assuming all experiences thereafter will be the same. The open person may give the restaurant another chance.

The second characteristic of the fully functioning person according to Rogers (1961) was existential living. Existential living means that people have the ability to trust their own decisions in varying situations. People who subscribe to existential living live in the moment and avoid prejudging and preconceptions. Rogers (1961) noted that a tendency toward existential living appears most in people who are involved in “the process of the good life” (p. 189).

The third characteristic is the ability trust in one’s own organism or in other words, the ability to trust in one’s own feelings (Rogers, 1961). This type of person tends to move forward in life without regret, feeling free to trust his or her own feelings and impulses. Furthermore, while people who possess this characteristic may make mistakes, they have already accepted openness to experience and thus have the ability to move on or quickly make corrections to mistakes (Rogers, 1961). Rogers (1961) described this characteristic as the ability to rely less on the opinions and judgments of others. As opposed to looking for external approval and disapproval, these type of people will feel that it is up to them to evaluate their own lives (Rogers, 1961).

The fourth characteristic of a fully functioning person asserted that a person recognizes that being is a process. The person recognizes that life is ever-changing and that problems may never be solved. Living in life is the acceptance of change through varying experiences and processes. The person accepts that being a fully functioning

person is a process in which a person can live fully with his or her feelings and reactions.

The fully functioning person tends to live a somewhat fearless life (Rogers, 1961).

Through an analytical psychology perspective, Jung's (1933; Von Frenz, 1968) process of individuation indicated that a person reaches psychological well-being through a pattern of dreams. Through studying dreams, Jung found that dreams have varying degrees of relevancy to a person's life. If a people are able to follow their dreams and make connections, they will perceive slow changes within themselves. Von Frenz (1968) articulated that Jung suggested people receive appropriate interpretation of their dreams to accelerate change. Jung suggested that a more mature personality will eventually emerge.

Allport (1961) identified six criteria for the basis of maturity. First is an extension of the sense of self. Allport (1961) indicated that mature people care about others as much as they care about themselves. Immature people tend to be self-absorbed and ego-centric. Second is the ability to show warm relating of self to others. Mature people possess the ability to accept people for who they are. They can be intimately involved with others void of jealous or controlling behaviors. The third criterion is identified as emotional security. Mature people have self-control. Mature people do not over indulge. On the other hand, immature people lack self-control, and they over-react to disappointments. The fourth criterion is realistic perception of skills. Mature people are able to recognize their own strengths and limitations. However, immature people may show grandiose thinking and not have a realistic view of their talents. The fifth criterion indicates a person should have insight and humor. Mature people recognize their

shortcomings and accept themselves for who they are. Mature people also admit their mistakes and can laugh at themselves. And finally the sixth criterion indicates a person should have a unifying philosophy of life. Allport (1961) found this to be the key to possessing maturity. It is important to have something to live for beyond oneself. Mature people have a clear sense of what life is all about, and they focus on living life with purpose.

Each of these theories on psychological well-being has contributed to various perspectives on the PYD concept. While the theories focused on the ultimate goals for adult psychological well-being, PYD concepts echo characteristics of the theories of psychological well-being. An assumption made by PYD proponents (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003) is that in order for a young person to grow into a self-actualizing (Maslow, 1943), fully functioning (Rogers, 1961), or mature (Allport, 1961) individual, there needs to be intentional efforts that will ensure her or she is on an appropriate developmental path that will lead to some sort of psychological well-being. PYD supporters believe that the foundation for healthy adult behaviors begins during childhood and adolescence (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003).

Given that multiple theories on adult psychological well-being, also multiple perspectives on the PYD concept. Larson (2000) asserted that the core quality of PYD is initiative. Larson (2000) argued that initiative consists of the ability to have intrinsic motivation to work toward challenging goals. He further asserts that “initiative is a core requirement for other components of positive development, such as creativity, leadership, altruism, and civic engagement” (Larson, 2000, p. 170).

Benson et al. (2006) asserted that PYD first takes into consideration the context in which young people live. This includes one's community such as peers, family, schools, neighborhoods, congregations, workplaces and programs. PYD philosophy, according to Benson et al (2006), then acknowledged the child's developmental strengths. This then leads to developmental success seen in a reduction of high risk behaviors and the promotion of health and well-being and thriving behaviors (Benson et al., 2006). Thriving behaviors are often thought of as opposite risk behaviors. For example, adolescents are thought to be thriving if they are *not* truant from school, but have good attendance and excelling grades. Thriving means they are *not* engaging in risky sexual and drug related behaviors, but they are participating in extracurricular activities that promote academic and social growth and they are working to maintain physical health through diet and exercise. To ensure young people have access to programs and services that provide a platform for launching thriving behaviors many organizations devote a great deal of time to research and developing resources, programs and services that can be adapted by youth workers to infuse a PYD perspective into their programs.

Prominent PYD Frameworks

Using the Community Action Framework, Gambone, Klem and Connell (2002) found that developmental outcomes in youth to early adulthood can be predicted by looking at the supports and opportunities available to them. Their framework emphasizes the importance of youth being involved in and challenged with various experiences that stimulate growth and exploration. Threshold indicators for risk behavior and growth in three critical areas of PYD include: productivity, connection, and navigating the social

environment. To that end, this research demonstrates that a young adult who feels safe and supported, and has at least one adult mentor in his or her life, a parental support mechanism in place, and a wide range of academic and extracurricular experiences, usually has better outcomes later in life. The long-term outcomes highlighted by Gambone et al. (2002) include: economic self-sufficiency, healthy family and social relationships, community involvement, supportive relationships, meaningful involvement, challenging and interesting activities, and safety.

PYD is increasingly gaining credibility among scholars and practitioners. Benson et al. (2006) identify four organizations that have conducted extensive research on PYD. These organizations, comprised of various professionals who have worked with youth, have identified frameworks that illustrate the contexts in which PYD takes place, the characteristics of the individual, and the developmental success that is a result of the overall PYD approach.

The Search Institute

The Search Institute is best known for its work on the 40 developmental assets (Benson et al., 2006). The 40 developmental assets are a list of positive factors in youth's families, communities, schools, and other environmental settings that have been found to be important in promoting healthy development in young people (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003). The developmental assets are separated into two larger categories: internal and external assets. They are then further separated into smaller categories that include: support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, constructive use of time, commitment to learning, positive values, social competencies, and positive identity. The

Search Institute indicates that longitudinal research shows that youth who report higher levels of developmental assets are less likely to engage in risky behaviors such as the use of drug and alcohol and premature sex. The research also indicates higher levels of developmental assets lead to outcomes such as school success and participation in philanthropic opportunities (Scales et al., 2000). Supporters of the developmental assets view them as the building blocks of success (Benson & Scales, 2009).

The external assets consist of four categories. The first sub-category is support. This category deals with meeting needs of love and affection (Maslow, 1943). The assets are:

- family support,
- positive family communication,
- other adult relationships,
- caring neighborhood,
- caring school climate, and
- parent involvement in schooling (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003).

Essentially, this category of assets acknowledges that youth need supportive parents, teachers, friends, and other adult allies that can be a source of encouragement and counsel. The second sub-category of external assets is empowerment. The four assets in this category are:

- community values youth,
- youth as resources,
- service to others, and

- safety.

These assets indicate a young person feels the confidence to act in leadership roles within the community. Youth recognize that adults value the role of youth, and the young people feel safe within their homes, schools, and communities. This level of assets typically does not occur without first having supportive assets (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003). The hierarchy that occurs with the assets is reminiscent of Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

The third subcategory of external assets is boundaries and expectations. The six assets in this category relate to the function of supportive and empowering environments.

These assets include:

- family boundaries,
- school boundaries,
- neighborhood boundaries,
- adult role models,
- positive peer influences, and
- high expectations.

Youth who have these assets live in homes that have clear rules and consequences and parents who monitor their whereabouts. The youth understand school expectations and consequences. Furthermore, youth have adults and peers who display positive characteristics such as responsibility. Youth who have these assets have expectations that parents and teachers will encourage them to do well and work toward success (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003).

The final category of external assets is constructive use of time. The assets in this category include:

- creative activities
- youth programs
- religious community, and
- time at home.

This set of assets indicates that youth utilize their time wisely. Youth who have more of these assets are less likely to engage in negative behaviors (Benson & Scales, 2009).

When youth have these assets it means they are participating in clubs, sports, and other organizations and programs at school.

The external assets must be in place to prevent unhealthy conditions that could lead to youth doing poorly in school, the development of a sense of meaninglessness, engagement in high-risk behaviors, and the tendency to isolate themselves from others (Bruyere, 2010). Research conducted by Dworkin, Larson, and Hansen (2003) found that participation in extracurricular or community-based activities may lead to

identity exploration; development of initiative and goal-directed behavior; growth in emotional competencies; formation of new and varied peer network connections; development of social skills; and acquisition of social capital through developing relationships with nonfamily adults (pp. 18-19).

In other words, youth who are exposed to these assets begin to form a better self-identity and they develop stronger social and emotional wellbeing.

The internal assets focus on the personal qualities that youth have. The first sub-category is commitment to learning. The assets are:

- achievement motivation
- school engagement
- homework
- bonding to school, and
- reading for pleasure.

Young people who have more of these assets value education and understand the benefits education can have on their lives (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003). The next set of internal assets is called positive values. The assets included in this category are:

- caring
- equality and social justice
- integrity
- honesty
- responsibility, and
- restraint.

This set of assets speaks to a young person's ability to stand up against peer pressure and stand up for what he or she believes in. Having a strong foundation of positive values can lead to having more of the assets in the social competencies and positive identity categories. The assets in this category are:

- planning and decision making
- interpersonal competence

- cultural competence
- resistance skills
- peaceful conflict resolution
- personal power
- self-esteem
- sense of purpose, and
- positive view of personal future (Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003).

Longitudinal research involving the 40 developmental assets shows positive correlations between higher GPA's and higher levels of assets. One study of sixth through twelfth grade students showed that those who had 31-40 assets had on average a 3.2 GPA.

Students with 0-10 assets had an average GPA of 2.1(Scales & Roehlkepartain, 2003)

The National Research Council

According to the National Research Council (2002), four developmental domains that PYD settings should focus on in order to increase the healthy development of youth and successful transition into adulthood. The four domains are: (a) physical development, (b) intellectual development, (c) psychological and emotional development, and (d) social development. After taking a closer look at the developmental domains, it is clear to see that there is a similar conceptual thought process among the National Research Council and the Search Institute. Furthermore, the hierarchal structure of the domains further relate to needs theory presented by Maslow (1943) and further researched by Rogers (1961).

First, the National Research Council indicates physical development as an important domain. Young people need to have good health habits and good health risk management skills (2002). Second, intellectual development means that a young person is acquiring knowledge of essential life and vocational skills. The young person exhibits school success, and displays higher levels of critical thinking and reasoning skills. The young person is also aware of a world or culture outside his or her home or smaller community and as a result he or she has the ability to navigate multiple cultural contexts. Third, psychological and emotional development relates to a young person's mental health and having positive self-regard. This area of development means that a person has good emotional self-regulation skills and he or she has developed an ability to cope during stressful situations. To that end, it is also likely then that the young person has developed good conflict resolution skills and displays a confidence in his or her own personal efficacy. This developmental domain is also identified by a mastery of motivation and motivation for positive achievement; a sense of personal autonomy; positive personal and social identity; strong moral character; and a commitment to using time wisely. The fourth developmental domain describes characteristics of social development. A young person who has acquired this asset will show connectedness to peers, parents and other adults. The young person will have a desire to be involved in civic engagement, and he or she will work toward positive social relationships in multiple social contexts (National Research Council, 2002).

The National Research Council (2002) found that while youth have been known to be successful when they have varying combinations of the assets, youth who have

assets in each domain are able to better manage life. Furthermore, the only way a young person will be able to acquire assets is through the continued exposure to “positive experiences, settings, and people, as well as opportunities to gain and refine life skills” (National Research Council, 2002, p. 7). The National Research Council further asserts that community programs that seek to aid in PYD should base their services on personal and social assets that promote youth’s current adolescent well-being and their transition into adulthood (2002). A well-structured PYD program will include the following:

- physical and psychological safety
- appropriate structure
- supportive relationships
- opportunities to belong
- positive social norms
- support for efficacy and mattering
- opportunities for skill building; and
- integration of family, school, and community efforts (National Research Council, 2002, p. 9-10).

America’s Promise Alliance for Youth

The America’s Promise Alliance for Youth (The Alliance) originated in 1997 and now encompasses “more than 400 partner organizations representing the business community, nonprofits, communities and policymakers” (America’s Promise Alliance, 2013, p. 1). The partner organizations have a focus on supporting the well-being of America’s youth. As such, The Alliance has identified five promises that are thought to

be the fundamental resources youth need in order to succeed. All of the work supported by the Alliance is built around ensuring youth experience more of the promises.

Caring adults. This promise is not just about youth having supportive parents. According to the Alliance (America's Promise Alliance, 2013) youth need and deserve support from different adults in their communities. This may include parents, mentors, teachers, coaches, etc.

Safe places. Whether they are in their homes, at school, or other places in the community, children need to be physically and emotionally safe. Moreover, it is important that the safe places provide a constructive use of time for youth (America's Promise Alliance, 2013).

A healthy start. Youth need to have access to good healthcare. Youth should not only visit healthcare professionals regularly, they should also have opportunities to learn about healthful habits so that they have what it takes to work toward having healthy bodies and healthy minds (America's Promise Alliance, 2013).

Effective education. Intellectual development, achievement motivation, and having marketable skills are important to equipping youth to be successful for work and lifelong learning. These skills are likely gained through high quality learning environments, regular guidance and mentoring and high expectations for achievement (America's Promise Alliance, 2013).

Opportunities to help others. When youth are given opportunities to volunteer and help others they develop a sense of leadership and responsibility. It is likely that

youth will grow from being dedicated to helping in their smaller communities to having a desire to work within the larger world (America's Promise Alliance, 2013).

Forum for Youth Investment

Thus far, the PYD frameworks discussed have been mostly centered on youth, their experiences and the nature of the environments surrounding them. In the Forum for Youth Investment (The Forum), while the ultimate focus is on ensuring all youth are ready by the age of 21 for college, work and life, a large focus is put on helping adults obtain the resources they need to effectively support young people. The Forum works with state and city leaders to change business practices that effect young people. Often times tangible change is established through the strengthening of state and local partnerships that focus on youth, the expansion and improvement of learning opportunities for youth and the alignment and advancement of policies and resources to ensure the best interests of youth are being met (The Forum for Youth Investment, 2013).

As a result, The Forum invests in research on youth development, youth services and community change projects. The Forum regularly publishes briefs and reports from policy makers, out-of-school time practitioners, and other partners in the community. The purpose of these publications is to continue and increase discourse about effective youth development services. Often times the various newsletters and reports offer concrete advice to practitioners so that they can change and improve youth services. The Forum also seeks to offer hands-on services to youth development practitioners and stakeholders (The Forum for Youth Investment, 2013).

The Ready by 21 initiative was developed by the Forum to provide a set of innovative strategies to partners that can be delivered in local communities to make measurable differences in youths' lives. Specifically, Ready by 21 offers a set of standards and solutions designed to assist state and local leaders in creating stronger partnerships that work toward building better services and opportunities for youth (The Forum for Youth Investment, 2013).

Spark Action, a division of The Forum, is a website that covers a wide variety of child and youth issues. This website is a knowledgebase for youth centered news, stories and interactive advocacy tools. This website also gives organizations, leaders, and young people a chance to share their knowledge and ideas. The ultimate goal is to raise awareness on youth centered issues and spark ideas that will lead to change (The Forum for Youth Investment, 2013).

Another major focus for The Forum is to improve youth program quality and learning experiences. The David P. Weikart Center for Youth Program Quality (CYPQ) is a division of the Forum that focuses on youth programs' service quality. CYPQ provides practitioner training, program assessment tools, and practical strategies on ways to improve youth program quality (The Forum for Youth Investment, 2013).

While the conceptual frameworks on PYD vary, PYD approaches have an appeal to practitioners working with youth because research shows benefits in using strength-based program models with adolescents (Benson et al., 2006). Moreover, the intersection of the PYD frameworks suggests youth face many challenges that could lead to

adulthoods filled with many more challenges and struggles if they do not receive proper guidance and support.

Juvenile Delinquency

PYD perspective suggests that when young people do not acquire enough developmental assets (Benson et al., 2006) or if community programs are not structured properly (National Research Council, 2002), then young people are more likely to engage in risky behaviors. Also, in many cases, young people have the misfortune of living in extreme poverty, or they are homeless. In 2008, there were an estimated 13 million children living in poverty (Faas & Cauthen, 2008), and 1.3 of them were homeless (National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 2007). Although other life situations can cause increased susceptibility to risk accumulation, poverty and homelessness without an extended community support system will most likely increase the likelihood that a young person will succumb to violent behaviors, early sexual activity and school failure (Bruyere, 2010).

To that end, there is a need for a structured system to deal with youth behavior problems. The United States Juvenile Justice system began in 1899 in Cook County, Illinois with the first juvenile court (Nelson et al., 2010). The separate court was developed because social and public discourse indicated a desire to better rehabilitate youth. However, increased youth violence in the mid-1990s resulted in a public attitude that youth should endure more severe punishment for their actions (Grisso, 2007). Statistical research on youth violence during this time indicated that youth would be more capable of cold-blooded murder and that the only way to curb this trend would be to

enforce stricter laws for juvenile offenders (Grisso, 2007). As a result, the number of youths transferred from juvenile court to criminal court doubled between 1987 and 1994 (Grisso, 2007).

The 1994 Federal Gun-Free Schools Act also encouraged the creation of a zero tolerance policy for weapons of any kind in schools. This then seemed to lead to a zero tolerance for most types of contraband, which often turned into the criminalization of student misbehavior (Nelson et al., 2010). As a result, many youths entered into the juvenile justice system through the violation of school disciplinary policies that mandated suspension, expulsion, and referral to the police (Nelson et al., 2010). And while the reasons youth enter into the DJJ system have not changed much, the ways in which DJJ facilities serve young people has undergone change.

Early DJJ facilities tended to utilize more boot camp like tactics (Grisso, 2007). However, in 1999 the U.S. Surgeon General indicated there was a mental health crisis with youth who entered the juvenile delinquency system (Nelson et al., 2010). It seemed that many of the DJJ facilities agreed that they had become make-shift psychiatric hospitals (Grisso, 2007). Many of the facilities were charged with the redirection of youth who had a wide variety of needs such as educational disabilities; diagnosed mental disorders; substance abuse, and physical and sexual abuse (Nelson et al., 2010). The problem was that many of the facilities did not have the staff, funding or programmatic structure to address the needs of the youth (Nelson et al., 2010). So despite the recognition that there needed to be widespread change within DJJ facilities, the resources to make substantial changes were few and far between for many facilities. What's more,

the DJJ system as a whole lacks uniformity in philosophy, policy, and regulations on how youth are to be processed and treated (Nelson et al., 2010).

Nelson et al. (2010) provided an analysis of some DJJ facilities and programs that seek to offer more positive, treatment-based approaches to the rehabilitation of youth. These facilities and programs have focused on training staff so that they can implement evidence-based practices that focus on positive behavioral interventions and supports. To reduce what is known as the “school-to-prison pipeline” (Nelson et al., 2010) the focus has turned to prevention services for youth. The Appleseed Initiatives is a nonprofit network of 16 public interest justice centers that focus on providing underprivileged children with access to justice, education, and opportunities. Appleseed Initiatives are responsible for positive impact on services youth receive before and while incarcerated (Nelson et al., 2010). In multiple states, the initiatives have worked to change school discipline practices and standards regarding suspension and expulsion. The overall goal is to ensure youth are being treated fairly and all steps were taken to prevent youth from dropping out of school.

The state of Missouri has developed a model for adjudicated youth who are incarcerated in residential facilities. These environments include intensive counseling and support and that are non-punitive. Despite not having a large amount of empirical evidence to support such a model, many states have adopted similar approaches with small residential facilities. According to the Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice (2010) these types of systems have lower rates of recidivism and fewer incidents of abuse and neglect. Youth in the Missouri system’s facilities are typically placed in

dormitory settings in groups of no more than 12. The residents have an individual treatment and education plans in which they regularly participate in reviews of their treatment.

To further address challenges with adjudicated youth, some states have also focused on transition projects for youth once released. The Arizona Detention Transition Project (ADTP) works to assist youth with disabilities to improve in school, work, and their communities after release. Youth receive individualized plans, a transition portfolio, and a seamless transfer of educational records across sending and receiving agencies. Arizona has also increased communication among servicing agencies; and they have established a youth tracking system to monitor the engagement and recidivism of all youth with disabilities on release (Nelson et al., 2010). Research shows that ADTP has been able to increase education and treatment for youth and decrease recidivism for youth with disabilities (Griller et al., 2007).

The overall goal of the current trend in juvenile justice programs and services is to recognize the mental health needs of youth (Grisso, 2007), but seek an appropriate combination of prevention interventions to prevent entry into the DJJ system (Nelson et al., 2010). In the event young people do end up incarcerated, DJJ facilities need to focus on appropriate treatment plans that will reduce the likelihood of recidivism (Clark & Unruh, 2010). Current stakeholders in DJJ reform seem to echo concepts found in a PYD perspective. According to Nellis and Hooks- Wayman (2009) to reduce levels of youth delinquency, we “must establish a national policy agenda which supports reentry services that connect youth with meaningful opportunities for self-sufficiency and community

integration” (p. 6). Organizations such as the Search Institute, the Forum for Youth Investment, America’s Promise Alliance and the National Research Council have been working to establish a standardized understanding of PYD. To that end, it is possible that continued research can lead to widely acceptable services that have a proven record of successful prevention and reentry.

Resiliency Attitudes and Skills

Resiliency has been operationally defined as “the process of overcoming the negative effects of risk exposure, coping successfully with traumatic experiences and avoiding the negative trajectories associated with risk” (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005, p. 399). According to Garmezy (1991), resilience research is important because the concept of resiliency is deeply rooted in American tradition to overcome societal challenges. Researchers have identified characteristics of resilient people who have been subjected to adversities such as: low socioeconomic status, exposure to drug use, domestic violence, sexual abuse, and foster care placement (Anderson, 1997; Garmezy, 1991; Leve, Fisher & Chamberlain, 2009; Pierce & Shields, 1998). Common characteristics of resilience are categorized as individual factors, familial factors, and support factors (Garmezy, 1991). Individual factors relate to an individual’s cognitive skills, responsiveness to others, and an ability to reflect on new experiences (Garmezy, 1991). Positive familial factors are also important to resiliency. Despite a family’s economic status, resilient people often have at least one person in the family who is caring, warm, and supportive (Garmezy, 1991). Furthermore, where there is a lack of family support, resilient people may also have external support factors that contribute to success. Often times these external

supports are found in schools, churches, and other community based organizations (Garmezy, 1991).

The discussion on PYD shows that the primary goal is to prevent adverse situations for youth and put them on a path toward healthy development and success. However, there are situations in which youth are unable to avoid risky behaviors, and for various reasons they end up in the juvenile justice system. Therefore, for these youth, the focus must move from identification of risk factors and prevention services to intervention services that focus on building resiliency (Kumpfer, 1999). Not unlike PYD, defining the resiliency construct for youth can be complex. According to Masten (1994) resilience refers to successful adaptation regardless of adverse situations and risk. Doll and Lyon (1998) posited that resilience is about successfully coping with risk or overcoming risk and adversity. Moreover, it is about developing competence despite stressful situations or hardship.

Although many practitioners have found it difficult to empirically study the resiliency construct in individuals, research conducted by Wolin and Wolin (1993) established seven characteristics of resilient individuals. These characteristics are: insight, independence, creativity, humor, initiative, relationships, and values orientation (morality) (Wolin & Wolin, 1993). Wolin and Wolin (1993) argued that when young people are able to develop some combination of the seven resiliencies or lasting strengths, they are able to successfully navigate life and move forward with a strong sense of determination.

- *Insight* is the process of asking questions about troubling situations and being able to make interpretations about verbal and nonverbal cues. An insightful person will know how to adjust his or her behavior so that it is appropriate in changing situations (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).
- *Independence* is about having a balance between what is right for one's self and still being able to accommodate others. Individuals who show independence in adverse situations have an ability to say no (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).
- *Creativity* is the dimension that involves being able to imagine alternative coping mechanisms to challenging situations. Those who display creativity can often avoid negative behaviors because they can foresee consequences of their actions (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).
- *Humor* is the ability to see the "lighter side" of things. Being able to see the humor in stressful and challenging situations may make dealing with the situation more bearable (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).
- *Initiative* is a resilient person's ability to take charge in one's own life. Individuals who show initiative tend to have an internal locus of control in which they believe they have the power to shape and change their life trajectories (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).
- *Relationships* are important to a resilient person's quality of life. Resilient individuals tend to have honest, healthy, and supportive relationships with family and friends (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).

- *Values orientation* indicates that a person has a desire to lead a good and productive life. When individuals possess this resilience domain, they also tend to focus more on serving others as opposed to just fulfilling their own self-interests (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).

Other research on the topic of resilience similarly discussed the concept of “promotive factors” or factors youth must have that will help them become more resilient (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005, p. 399). According to Zimmerman et al. (2013), some promotive factors are racial identity, relationships with adults, and prosocial involvement. In this article, Zimmerman et al. (2013) suggested resiliency theory is a conceptual framework that shows how promotive factors can disrupt the path from being at-risk to succumbing to negative outcomes.

One study indicated that youth who are exposed to violence and other risk factors are likely to have increased depression. However, when they are exposed to promotive factors such as supportive relationships, overtime their depressive symptoms will decrease (Eisman, Stoddard, Heinze, Caldwell, & Zimmerman, 2015). Specifically, Eisman et al., (2015), found that youth with increased support from their mothers showed a decrease in depressive symptoms. Following the tradition of resilience research and PYD research, this study emphasizes development is shaped by many interacting systems, both positive and negative interactions will have an impact on the individual, and people follow unique pathways due to a wide range of influences (Masten, 2014).

Summary

The scientific study of adolescent development identified the various biological, psychological, and social changes youth experience in an ever changing world. It seems that even in a perfect world adolescents would encounter situations in which their decisions could yield unfavorable circumstances. While there are many cases in which an adolescent child is able to successfully overcome this stressful period in life, many young people need appropriate support and resources to avoid succumbing to risky behavior and turmoil.

To that end, drawing on various theories of psychological well-being, scholars have begun to delve into a concept known as PYD. Just as there are several perspectives on what it means to be mentally stable, there are also several perspectives on the PYD concept. Ultimately, most would agree that PYD is about ensuring that adolescents grow into healthy, self-sufficient adults. The PYD conceptual frameworks presented in this chapter leads one to understand that young people need opportunities for positive experiences, caring adults, and supportive communities to ensure they grow into healthy adults.

Even still, young people at times are unable to resist risky behavior, and their ability to remain resilient in troubling situations is diminished. Due to changing political landscapes and tougher zero tolerance policies in schools, many young people end up involved in the DJJ system. While the system was first designed to rehabilitate adolescents separate of adult criminals, many efforts to truly rehabilitate them have been

masked by a need to treat their mental illness. The DJJ system is inconsistent and under resourced.

To address the need to better support youth in the DJJ system, some DJJ facilities and programs have changed practices to a more developmental, strengths-based approach. Resiliency research is directly compatible with the youth development approach. It seems then, that it would be appropriate to consider a focus on resiliency for youth who are incarcerated in DJJ facilities that seeks to improve behaviors through a PYD approach. Resiliency is considered a useful framework to identify specific skills, attitudes, and abilities that lead to young people being able to successfully navigate through life's challenges.

Furthermore, resiliency research among youth has focused more on youth becoming successful adults despite their upbringing with the idea that they are able to avoid negative situations all together (Leve, Fisher, & Chamberlain, 2009; Pierce & Shields, 1998). However, this study will focus on youth who are on a path to succumbing to their negative environments and repeating many of the negative behaviors of which they have been exposed. This research seeks to explore a population of youth who are being challenged to acquire new resiliency attitudes and skills and change their trajectories in life. According to Garmezy (1991) being resilient does not mean a person is immune to negative life events. To that end, this study will be useful to program providers who work with youth who have already begun to repeat negative life cycles.

Chapter 3 discusses the quantitative research methods including the setting, sampling, analysis, and ethical considerations for this study. Also articulated in chapter 3

is a discussion of the archival data representing a pretest and post-test assessment of the residents' resiliency attitudes and resiliency skills.

Chapter 3: Research Methods

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to identify whether or not there is a change in the residents self-reported resiliency attitudes and resiliency skills after serving their sentence at the DJJ facility. This chapter includes a description of the study's design, setting and sample, instrumentation, data analysis, and ethical considerations. An overview of the study's design includes a rationale for why this particular research design was selected. Also presented is a description of the participants, the program setting (including program interventions), and instrumentation. The data collection process and analysis are also discussed.

Research Design and Approach

This preexperimental research used archival data. It sought to determine if there was a change in youth's resiliency attitudes and skills after spending a mandatory amount of time in a DJJ facility and whether race and/or ethnicity is a factor. When youth are court-ordered to enter into this particular DJJ facility, they are given a pretest of the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP, Hurtes & Allen, 2001). The full version of the document is shown in Appendix B. The assessment is administered by the intake coordinator who reads each question or statement to the residents. The assessment is given with minimal instruction. Youth are asked to respond to the items to the best of their ability. They are not given any further assistance outside of the statements or questions being read. When youth are released from the program they take the same

assessment. The DJJ facility assumes that that after being a part of the program, the youth will show marked improvements on the RASP assessment.

Setting and Sample

Demographics

The participants in the study were young women between the ages of 12 and 17. The DJJ facility just changed its service population to females in 2014. The demographic data were gathered from the archival records kept by the DJJ facility and included age, race or ethnicity, length of time in program, and whether they successfully completed the program. Successful completion is determined by the residents' behavior level. Three behavior levels can be achieved by residents in the program. When admitted, the new resident begins at the Explorer level. Explorer level is considered level two. Residents begin at this level and are given an opportunity to maintain this level. If she receives no more than five clips (behavior infractions), she can move up to the Inventor level once half her sentence is served. If she receives 10 or more clips, she drops down to the lowest level called discoverer. Successful completion of the program, which is determined by the program director, is usually based on the behavior level the resident is on at the end of the sentence and whether she completed the tasks specified by the mental health counselor. A resident is determined to unsuccessfully complete the program if she is removed for violent behaviors or if she fails to meet her personal growth goals set by the mental health counselor.

Participants of the Study

Archival data was collected from youth who were adjudicated girls from a DJJ program in South Carolina. All residents were court-ordered into the residential facility for redirection through PYD. The youth are considered nonviolent offenders charged with substance use, truancy, multiple school expulsions, or being a runaway.

Power Analysis

As suggested by Cohen (1992), the accepted value of power of .80, an alpha level of .05 and a medium effect size. According to Cohen's (1988) power table, the necessary sample size for each group was 16. The groups include residents who were in the program for less than 30 days, 31-60 days, 61-75 days, 76-90 days and more than 90 days. However, I was able to use all of the data that the facility had available. The facility previously served male residents, however in the past year it has change to only serving female residents. As a result, some of their data has been moved. I was only able to access data beginning in 2014 for residents. For this study, participants will be grouped by the length of stay in the program, race or ethnicity, and whether or not they have successfully completed the program. Based on the amount of data available to date I was able to access 123 of the residents' pre and post-tests.

Procedures

Archived data on former residents were accessed. The DJJ facility is required to keep a 2-year record on all youth who enter the program. The campus director granted verbal and written permission to implement the study using data of past residents who took the RASP. Since the research was conducted using archival data and the pre and post tests are a part of the intake of the adjudicated youth, no other permission is needed.

The data files were provided by the records clerk. The records clerk made available all of the data he still had access to. The criteria was that the youth completed the RASP and were residents for 30 days, 75 days, or 90 days. Due to the restructuring of the program, many of the data files have been removed from the facility and the data clerk only had access to the files that represent the new structure (serving only female residents). I received all files available for female residents.

Instrumentation

The RASP or Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile was designed to assess the seven dimensions of resiliency identified by Wolin and Wolin (1993). The full version of the RASP can be found in Appendix B. According to Hurtes and Allen (2001), the items on the RASP were chosen to reflect the behavioral manifestations of the seven dimensions of resiliency-insight, creativity, independence, humor, initiative, relationships, and values orientation. The RASP uses a six point Likert scale where 1=strongly disagree and 6=strongly agree. The RASP can be completed in 10 to 15 minutes. According to Hurtes and Allen (2001) the even number of answer responses was used to force choice and to encourage respondents to reveal their true feelings. Hurtes and Allen (2001) indicate the RASP can be a useful tool for program evaluation for general youth populations to gain an idea of youth's resilient functioning.

Internal consistency for the RASP was found through computing Cronbach's Alpha for each of the seven subscales. As a whole the RASP had an alpha coefficient of .91 which shows a strong internal consistency. The alpha values for each subscale were lower, with most being below the desired 0.70. The subscale values were: insight = .65,

independence = .62, creativity = .68, humor = .49, relationships = .71, initiative = .53, and values orientation = .68. According to Hurtes and Allen (2001) the lower values may be due to the fact that each of the dimensions are multidimensional and they would directly reduce internal consistency. To test stability, the RASP was administered five days after an initial administration to control for possible differential increases in participants' resiliency due to participation in the program. Results showed that from the first administration to the second administration the relationship between the overall concept of resiliency was .94, showing good stability.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was used to examine the construct validity of the RASP. SEM examines the significance of the relationship between the items on the scale and the seven dimensions of resiliency and the relationship between the items themselves. This was shown using Bentler's Comparative Fit Index (CFI). CFI values of .90 or higher suggest that a proposed model provides a good fit to the data (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). Chi-square/degrees of freedom ratios also show good fit if the value is less than 2.0. This is often used to account for sample size. The CFI for this model was .85 and the chi-square/df ratio was 1.71 ($X^2=879.90$, $df = 517$). Convergent validity of the RASP was also examined. This was examined using the Mental Health Inventory (MHI) which is considered a hypothetically related concept to resiliency (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). CFI value for this analysis was .85 and the chi-square/df ratio was 1.61 ($X^2 = 832.49$, $df = 518$). Table 1 shows each item on the RASP and the dimension it measures.

Table 1

Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile

Dimension	Item	Question
Creativity	6	I can imagine the consequences of my actions.
	22	When I'm faced with a tough situation, I come up with new ways to handle it.
	23	I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings.
	39	I can entertain myself.
Humor	11	My sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.
	25	I look for the "lighter side" of tough situations.
	33	Laughter helps me deal with stress.
	36	When I'm in a bad mood, I can cheer myself up.
Independence	2	I can deal with whatever comes in the future.
	9	I say "no" to things that I don't want to do.
	16	It's OK if I don't see things the way other people do.
	19	It's OK if some people do not like me
	20	I am comfortable making my own decisions.
	26	I control my own life.
	34	I avoid situations where I could get into trouble.
	38	I share my ideas and opinions even if they are different from other people.
Initiative	1	When my work is criticized, I try harder the next time.
	3	Once I set a goal for myself, I don't let anything stop me from reaching it.
	13	I can change my surroundings.
	30	I try to figure out things that I don't understand.
	37	When something bad happens to me, I don't give up.
Insight	4	I learn from my mistakes.
	5	I notice small changes in facial expressions.
	7	I know when I'm good at something.
	10	I can change my behavior to match the situation.
	15	When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was my fault.
	2	I can deal with whatever comes in the future.
	27	I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.

(table continues)

Relationships	12	My friends know they can count on me.
	14	My family is there for me when I need them.
	18	I avoid people who could get me into trouble.
	24	I choose my friends carefully.
	31	I'm good at keeping friendships going.
	32	I have friends who will back me up.
	35	I can be myself around my friends.
	40	I make friends easily.
Values		
Orientation	8	I'm prepared to deal with the consequences of my actions.
	17	Lying is unacceptable.
	28	I try to help others.
	29	I stand up for what I believe is right.

Interventions

This section describes the regular program procedures at the participating facility. On the first day, new residents complete intake paperwork that includes the RASP. Other paperwork consists of program rules and regulations and detailing personal property. After completing paperwork, new residents are issued the clothing they are allowed to wear while at the facility. They are also given personal hygiene items. After this they are immediately integrated into their assigned dorm. Each dorm consists of no more than 16 girls. This particular program is conducted in a wilderness camp environment. A large part of the program allows youth to explore the natural environment and engage in experiences such as ropes courses, boating, and wildlife preservation. Each activity is designed to lead to developmental change in the youth.

The primary goals for the program are behavior modification, an improvement in study skills, and increase/develop a passion for learning. Moreover, the DJJ facility gears

its services toward leadership development, life skill development and a greater focus on career options. While the program now only serves girls, it still uses a 12-week cycle of week-long educational and recreational modules. Regardless of the week in which the resident enters the program, she should complete the full 12-week cycle before departure. The modules focus on the following topics: environmental science, technology, aerospace, food and nutrition, horticulture, health, marine science, electricity, zoology, physical science, high adventure, and mechanical science (Youth Learning Institute, 2013).

Residents also meet regularly with a mental health counselor who works with them to develop an individual plan of care. Together they identify specific goals that the resident wishes to improve on. The purpose is to also identify target dates and specific actions that will lead to the outcomes. Residents also work with the field instructors (24-hour youth supervisors who monitor the children and lead activities) to identify things they can do to work toward their specified goals.

Data Analysis

Data for this study was analyzed using the SPSS statistical software package. For the archival data collected, frequency tables and descriptive statistics was used to summarize the frequency, means, and percentages of demographic information for the entire sample. This includes length of stay in program, race or ethnicity, age, and successful completion of program rating. Descriptive statistics was also used to summarize the frequency and means for the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile.

For RQ1 (*Does the amount of time spent in the PYD program predict a change or higher score on the RASP?*) and RQ3 (*What role does youth's race or ethnicity have on predicting higher levels of resiliency attitudes and skills?*), a multiple regression analysis was conducted to describe a relationship between the independent variables length of time and race or ethnicity and the dependent variable, the overall change score on the RASP. Length of stay in the program is categorized as 30 days or less, 31-60 days, 61-75 days, 76-90 days, more than 90 days. Race or ethnicity is categorized as Black, Hispanic, White, Asian and other/Biracial residents. The way residents are asked to code their race or ethnicity is a limitation of this study. Residents are only given the choice of Black, Hispanic, White, Asian and other/Biracial. It is understood that Hispanic is considered an ethnicity while Black, White, Asian and other/Biracial are considered a race. However, Hispanic residents at this facility are not further identified by their race. The change score is the difference between the posttest and pretest scores. Furthermore, multiple regression analyses were also used to describe the relationship between length of stay in the program and race or ethnicity and the change score for each subscale (insight, independence, creativity, humor, initiative, relationships, and values orientation) on the RASP.

For RQ2 (*Does the resident's initial RASP score predict whether there will be a positive significant change in the post RASP score?*) A linear logistic regression was run so that predictions could be made about the dependent variable (RASP change score).

Threats to Validity

Whenever research is conducted it is important to consider any threats to internal or external validity. A threat to internal validity compromises the confidence of saying

that a relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables. As it pertains to this study, some threats to internal validity could include maturation, testing to show successful completion of the program, and instrumentation delivery. Evidence provided in the literature review shows that adolescents inherently struggle through many aspects in life. However, in many cases they learn to self-regulate and mature in ways that allow them to cope with tough situations. It may be possible that a change in resiliency attitudes and skills for residents could be due to a normal developmental process and not due to any of the interventions of the program. Another threat to internal validity may lie in the way in which young people are brought into the program. Youth are told that in order for them to get off of probation and in order for them to be released on good behavior, they must successfully complete the program. Thus when given a test (albeit a short questionnaire), the residents will try to respond to the items in a way that they believe will show they have successfully completed the program, as opposed to responding in a way that they truly feel. Lastly, internal validity can be threatened due to the way the RASP is administered. If the RASP is administered by different staff members, it could be that the residents are given different instructions.

External threats to validity refer to the degree to which empirical research can be generalized across settings and various populations. In this case, one cannot be certain that the findings from this research are applicable to other DJJ facilities or other programs that serve similar populations. Moreover, this research will examine resiliency attitudes and skills among a very specific population. The participants in the study have been

mandated to participate in the program. What's more, the DJJ facility does not have any control over the demographics of each resident.

Ethical Considerations

Since the study used archival data of past residents' RASP scores, the only ethical consideration is maintaining the confidentiality of residents. When residents are admitted into the program they are informed of their rights. It is their understanding that any information obtained by the facility will remain confidential. The researcher for this study will be the only person to review the raw data. The records clerk for the facility ensured names or other identifiers were marked out. Moreover, data is being stored in a safe for two years and then it will be destroyed by a paper shredder. In addition, the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and evaluated the study design and data collection method to ensure I followed the established ethical standards. Walden University's IRP approval number for this study was 03-03-16-0224541.

Summary

This chapter discussed the essential components of this study's research methods. Through the use of archival data sets, the purpose of this study is to determine whether or not interventions at a DJJ residential facility have any effect on residents' resiliency attitudes and skills. The use of archival data from a pre-and post-test method will eliminate ethical issues related to harm to participants. Furthermore, using a multiple regression analysis will determine which predictor variables better predict increases in resiliency attitudes and skills. The next chapter articulates the results of the data collection.

Chapter 4: Results

The overall purpose of this study was to determine if residents of a DJJ facility saw a change in their residents' resiliency attitudes and skills after serving a mandatory sentence. The DJJ facility is designed to focus on youths' developmental needs. This chapter describes the results of the RASP, the data analysis procedures, and the RASP findings. The data analysis process and logistic regression findings are organized according to the three research questions:

1. Does the amount of time spent in the PYD program predict a change or higher score on the RASP?
2. Does the resident's initial RASP score predict whether there will be a positive significant change in the post RASP score?
3. What role does youth's race or ethnicity have on predicting higher levels of resiliency attitudes and skills?

Data Collection

On admission and release from the DJJ center, residents are required to take the RASP survey. Because residents must complete the survey, there was no issue with response rate. There was, however, an issue with the amount of data available. Initially, the facility served both male and female youth. But in 2014, the service population was limited to young women—a maximum of 32 girls at a time. When this change took place, many of the residents' files were moved, and according to the data clerk, could not be accessed. As a result of the moved files, only 123 data sets were available. Since the time the facility changed to an all-girls facility, 155 different girls have been served. At the

time of data collection, 16 residents were still in the program and had yet to complete the post-survey. Thus, the amount of data made available accounted for 80% of the population served since 2014.

Independent Variables

Descriptive statistics were used to organize the independent variables. Table 2 shows the frequencies and percentages for the independent variables. While age is not being used as one of the independent variables, it was included in the descriptive statistics as well as the logistic regression to analyze whether it was a confounding, or extraneous variable that correlates with both the dependent and independent variables. The majority of the residents at the DJJ facility complete the program successfully in the amount of time they are required to complete. The average length of stay for the 123 residents was 72 days. The majority of the 123 residents (43.9%) were in the program for 61-75 days. This is typically the timeframe for residents who are released on good behavior. There were 30.9% of residents who were in the program for 76-90 days, the typical assigned sentence length.

Table 2

Independent Variables

Demographics	Frequency	%
Age		
13	3	2.2
14	20	16.5
15	29	24.2
16	50	39.6
17	21	17.6

<i>(table continues)</i>		
Race or Ethnicity		
Black	62	49.5
White	52	42.9
Hispanic	6	4.4
Asian	1	1.1
Other/Biracial	2	2.2
<hr/>		
Length of Stay		
Less than 30 days	8	7.7
31-60 days	16	12.08
61-75 days	54	40.65
76-90 days	38	34.06
More than 90 days	7	5.5
<hr/>		
Completion Status		
Successful	112	91.1
Unsuccessful	11	8.9

Research Instrument

The RASP, which is available in Appendix B, was designed to measure the behavioral manifestations of the seven dimensions of resiliency outlined by Wolin and Wolin (1993). Through qualitative research, Wolin and Wolin (1993) identified the following dimensions as characteristics of resilient people: insight, independence, creativity, humor, initiative, relationships, and values orientation (morality). According to Hurtes and Allen (2001), an appropriate measure of resiliency would include a scale that included items focused on measuring the seven dimensions.

When the residents answer the questions they are told that they are answering questions that relate to their opinions about themselves and their personal characteristics.

Residents are informed that there is no right or wrong answer. Each item is presented with a 6-point Likert-type scale. *Strongly disagree* was given a score of 1. *Strongly agree* was given a score of 6. For values 2-5, no wording was provided. It is implied that 2 is *disagree*, 3 is *somewhat disagree*, 4 is *somewhat agree*, and 5 is *agree*. According to Hurtes and Allen (2001), the even number of response options was used to force choice and encourage respondents to be honest about what they feel.

In order to apply the multiple regression analysis, the means for each domain were calculated. Table 3 displays the number of items for each domain and the lowest and highest scores, and the group mean for each domain for the pretest. Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for the posttest. Both tables also show the lowest and highest scores and the group mean for the overall RASP.

Table 3

Number of Items and Descriptive Statistics for the RASP Domains Pretest

Domain	Number of items	Total possible domain score	Lowest individual score	Highest individual score	Group mean	Standard deviation
Humor	4	24	7	24	18.19	4.24
Creativity	4	24	8	24	18.49	4.13
Independence	8	48	17	48	38.24	6.18
Initiative	5	30	10	30	23.71	4.80
Insight	7	42	16	42	33.67	5.96
Relationships	8	48	14	48	40.07	6.49
Value Orientation	4	24	8	24	20.67	3.51
RASP	40	240	89	240	193.03	30.41

^a*n* = 123

Table 4

Number of Items and Descriptive Statistics for the RASP Domains Post Test

Domain	Number of items	Total possible domain score	Lowest individual score	Highest individual score	Group mean	Standard deviation
Humor	4	24	13	24	21.58	2.49
Creativity	4	24	13	24	21.13	2.64
Independence	8	48	30	48	42.50	4.58
Initiative	5	30	17	30	26.78	3.38
Insight	7	42	27	42	37.37	3.76
Relationships	8	48	27	48	43.52	4.34
Value Orientation	4	24	15	24	22.15	2.29
RASP	40	240	154	240	215.06	19.39

^a*n* = 123**Dependent Variables**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the independent variables and the change scores for each domain and the overall Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile. To determine the change score for each domain, the value for the pretest score was subtracted from the post test score. This was done for each domain and the overall RASP. Table 5 shows the lowest and highest individual change score means as well as the group means for the change scores. This table shows that for each domain and for the RASP as a whole, the average change score was an increase. However, there are some cases in which residents showed a decrease in their resiliency attitudes and skills. This information was then used to calculate the inferential statistics.

Table 5

RASP Change Score

Domain	Lowest Individual Change	Highest Individual Change	Group Mean	Standard Deviation
Humor	-5	15	3.39	3.78
Creativity	-7	13	2.64	4.03
Independence	-8	26	4.26	5.32
Initiative	-7	20	3.07	4.65
Insight	-8	22	3.71	5.81
Relationships	-11	30	6.18	6.18
Value Orientation	-8	11	3.37	3.38
RASP	-29	117	27.67	27.67

^a*n* = 123**Study Results**

A set of multiple logistic regression analyses was conducted to analyze length of time and race or ethnicity as predictors of the change score for each domain and the overall RASP. Length of time in the program was categorized as 30 days or less, 31-60 days, 61-75 days, 76-90 days, and more than 90 days. Since the typical length of time residents are court ordered to complete is between 76-90 days, this category was used as the comparison variable for the multiple regression analysis. Race or ethnicity was categorized as Black, White, Hispanic, Asian, and others/Biracial. Black was used as the comparison variable.

The multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant model for the humor change score, $F(8, 114) = 2.661, p < .05, \text{adj. } R^2 = .098$. Residents who were in the

program for only 31-60 days significantly scored 2.753 points less than residents who were in the program for 76-90 days on the humor domain. Race or ethnicity did not predict a significant difference for the humor change score. Furthermore, the effect size for this model shows that only 9.8% of the variability in the humor change score can be explained by length of time. Table 6 shows a summary of the findings for the humor change score.

Table 6

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Humor

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	.046	.708	.006	.065
Hispanic	3.052	1.555	.174	.052
Asian	-2.842	3.647	-.068	.437
Other/Biracial	4.217	2.614	.141	.110
Less than 30 days	1.050	1.446	.069	.469
31-60 days	-2.753	1.078	-.246	.012*
61-75 days	-.818	.773	-.108	.292
More than 90 days	2.905	1.491	.179	.054

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE_β* = Standard error of the coefficient; *β* = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

The multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant model for the creativity change score, $F(8, 114) = 2.132, p < .05, \text{adj. } R^2 = .069$. Residents who were in the program 31-60 days scored 2.336 points lower on the creativity domain change than

residents who were in the program for 76-90 days. Also, Hispanic residents scored 4.556 points more than Black residents on the creativity domain. The effect size for this model shows that only 6.9% of the variability can be explained by length of time and race or ethnicity for the creativity change score. Table 7 shows a summary of the findings for the creativity change score.

Table 7

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Creativity

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	-.310	.765	-.038	.687
Hispanic	4.556	1.681	.245	.008*
Asian	-4.764	3.943	-.107	.229
Other/Biracial	1.364	2.826	.043	.630
Less than 30 days	-.033	1.563	-.002	.983
31-60 days	-2.336	1.166	-.196	.047*
61-75 days	-.039	.836	-.005	.962
More than 90 days	1.526	1.612	.088	.346

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

The multiple regression analysis did not show a statistically significant model for the independence change score, $F(8, 114) = 1.381$, $p > .05$, adj. $R^2 = .024$. Table 8 shows a summary of findings for the independence change score.

Table 8

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Independence

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	.521	1.034	.049	.616
Hispanic	2.698	2.272	.110	.237
Asian	-6.438	5.329	-.109	.230
Other/Biracial	5.666	3.820	.135	.141
Less than 30 days	1.639	2.112	.076	.440
31-60 days	-2.393	1.575	-.152	.132
61-75 days	.907	1.130	.085	.424
More than 90 days	2.538	2.179	.111	.247

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

The multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant model for the initiative change score, $F(8, 114) = 2.389, p < .05, \text{adj. } R^2 = .083$. Hispanic residents showed a statistically significant higher change score on the initiative domain that African-Americans at 7.519 points higher. The effect size for this model showed that only 8.3% of the variability can be explained by race or ethnicity for the initiative change score. Length of time was not a statistically significant predictor for change on the initiative domain. Table 9 shows a summary of findings for the initiative change score.

Table 9

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Initiative

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	-.265	.811	-.028	.763
Hispanic	7.519	1.926	.350	.000*
Asian	-2.690	4.518	-.052	.553
Other/Biracial	2.046	3.239	.056	.529
Less than 30 days	.170	1.791	.009	.925
31-60 days	-1.216	1.336	-.088	.365
61-75 days	-.373	.958	-.040	.698
More than 90 days	.976	1.847	.049	.598

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

Although the multiple regression analysis did not show a statistically significant model for the insight change score, it was close, $F(8, 114) = 1.954, p > .05$ ($p = .059$), $adj. R^2 = .059$. This analysis showed that residents who were in the program more than 90 days scored 5.455 points higher on the change score than residents who were in the program for 76-90 days. Hispanic residents scored 5.995 points higher than African-American Residents. The effect size for this model showed that only 5.9% of the variability can be explained by length of time and race or ethnicity for the insight change score. Table 10 shows the summary of findings for the insight change score.

Table 10

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Insight

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	.495	1.110	.042	.656
Hispanic	5.995	2.438	.223	.015*
Asian	-4.842	5.718	-.075	.399
Other/Biracial	4.989	4.099	.109	.226
Less than 30 days	-.764	2.267	-.033	.737
31-60 days	-1.641	1.690	-.095	.334
61-75 days	-.489	1.212	-.042	.688
More than 90 days	5.455	2.338	.218	.021*

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

The multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant model for the relationships change score, $F(8, 114) = 2.729, p < .05, \text{adj. } R^2 = .102$. This regression analysis shows that residents who were in the program more than 90 days had a RASP change score of 5.951 points higher than residents who were in the program for 76-90 days. Also, residents who identified as Biracial or belonging to some other racial group scored 10.958 points higher than Blacks on the relationships change score. For the relationships change score model the effect size shows that only 10.2% of the variability can be explained by length of time and race or ethnicity. Table 11 shows the summary of findings for the relationships change score.

Table 11

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Relationships

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	-.561	1.153	-.045	.627
Hispanic	4.562	2.532	.160	.074
Asian	-4.128	5.939	-.060	.488
Other/Biracial	10.958	4.258	.225	.011*
Less than 30 days	.308	2.354	.012	.896
31-60 days	-3.033	1.756	-.166	.087
61-75 days	-.430	1.259	-.035	.733
More than 90 days	5.951	2.428	.224	.016*

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

The multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant model for the values orientation change score, $F(8, 114) = 2.180, p < .05, \text{adj. } R^2 = .072$. As compared to Black residents, Hispanic residents scored 3.065 points higher on the values orientation change score and White residents scored 1.356 points lower than Black residents. The effect size for this model only shows that 7.2% of the variability can be explained by race or ethnicity for the relationships change score. Length of time did not indicate to be a significant predictor of variance for this domain. Table 12 shows the summary of findings for the values orientation change score.

Table 12

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: Values Orientation

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	-1.356	.640	-.199	.036*
Hispanic	3.065	1.406	.196	.031*
Asian	-2.163	3.299	-.058	.513
Other/Biracial	3.264	2.365	.123	.170
Less than 30 days	.957	1.308	.070	.466
31-60 days	-.488	.975	-.049	.618
61-75 days	.683	.699	.101	.331
More than 90 days	1.714	1.349	.118	.206

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

The multiple regression analysis showed a statistically significant model for the overall RASP change score, $F(8, 114) = 2.578, p < .05, \text{adj. } R^2 = .094$. Hispanic residents scored 31.446 higher on the RASP change score than African-American residents. While length of time was not a significant predictor for change ($p=.056$) in the RASP, the regression analysis did show that residents who were in the program more than 90 days scored 21.064 points higher than residents who were in the program for 76-90 days. The effect size for this model shows that only 9.4% of the variability can be explained by length of time and race or ethnicity for the overall RASP change score. Table 13 shows the summary of findings for the RASP change score.

Table 13

Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis: RASP

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
White	-1.431	5.188	-.026	.783
Hispanic	31.446	11.395	.246	.007*
Asian	-27.868	26.730	-.091	.299
Other/Biracial	32.503	19.161	.149	.093
Less than 30 days	3.325	10.596	.030	.754
31-60 days	-13.859	7.902	-.169	.082
61-75 days	-.559	5.667	-.010	.922
More than 90 days	21.064	10.929	.177	.056

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE_{β} = Standard error of the coefficient; β = standardized coefficient, Comparison variables: 76-90 days and Blacks.

For research question two, (*Does the resident's initial RASP score predict whether there will be a positive significant change in the post RASP score?*) a logistic regression was conducted. The logistic analysis showed low RASP scores indicated a positive change score. However, residents with higher RASP pretest scores, showed a decrease in change score, $F(2, 120) = 189.143, p < .0005, \text{adj. } R^2 = .607$. In other words, if the resident came in with a relatively high RASP score, they did not show much of an increase in the amount of change on leaving the program. Moreover, in some cases they did worse and did not stay the same. The effect size for this model shows that 60.7% of

the variability can be explained by the pretest score on the RASP. Table 14 shows the findings for the logistic regression for RASP pretest score as a predictor of the RASP change score.

Table 14

Summary of Regression Analysis

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_β</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
RASP Pretest	-.711	.052	-.781	.000

Note. * $p < .05$; *B* = unstandardized regression coefficient; *SE_β* = Standard error of the coefficient; *β* = standardized coefficient,

Summary

The statistical analyses conducted here were intended to determine whether or not length of time and race or ethnicity were significant predictors of change on the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile as well as the seven individual domains. The statistical analyses showed that the longer residents are in the program, they do exhibit a higher change in their resiliency attitudes and skills. For the domains humor and creativity, residents who were in the program for only 31-60 days showed a lower change in score than residents who were in the program for 76-90 days. Residents who were in the program for more than 90 days showed a significantly higher change in score on the relationships and insight change score compared to residents who were in the program for 76-90 days. The analysis also showed that Hispanic residents scored significantly higher than Blacks on the overall RASP. They also scored higher than Blacks in the area of creativity, insight, and values orientation.

A logistic regression was also conducted to determine if a resident's pretest score predicted a positive change on the RASP. It was found that residents who did have low pretest scores had a significantly higher change score. However, residents who came in with a relatively high RASP did not show a significant change in score. It should also be noted that the effect size for each of the domains run under a multiple regression analysis was small. This means that only a small percentage of variability in the change scores could be explained by length of time and/or race or ethnicity. Thus, other variables have a larger impact on the change score as opposed to length of time and race or ethnicity. The logistic regression model showed a medium effect size for pretest scores being a predictor for an increase in the overall RASP change score. Chapter 5 will provide a detailed discussion of the statistical analysis findings. In Chapter 5 recommendations will be made for further research. Chapter 5 will also outline take-a-ways from this research and the impact it can have on the DJJ facility.

Chapter 5: Interpretation, Implications, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Introduction

This study sought to determine if the program and services of a DJJ youth development center predicted an increase in youth's resiliency attitudes and skills. While many components and factors could be considered, length of time in the program and race or ethnicity were analyzed as predictors of change in the RASP. I chose to study resiliency with this population because many adjudicated youths have had several traumatic experiences in their lives that they must overcome. Resiliency is the process of overcoming traumatic experiences and developing an ability to cope (Fergus & Zimmerman, 2005). Thus, studying resiliency with this population can provide important feedback for those who seek to change the circumstances for youth.

This preexperimental, quantitative study used archived survey results from the RASP, which has proven to be a valid and reliable instrument for studying changes in the seven domains of resiliency: humor, creativity, insight, initiative, independence, relationships, and values orientation. The following research questions were analyzed using multiple regression analyses:

1. Does the amount of time spent in the PYD program predict a change or higher score on the RASP?
2. Does the resident's initial RASP score predict whether there will be a positive significant change in the post RASP score?
3. What role does youth's race or ethnicity have on predicting higher levels of resiliency attitudes and skills?

The purpose of this chapter is to interpret the study findings, which have implications for social change, action, and further research. The chapter ends with general conclusions.

Interpretation of Findings

The PYD perspective suggests that youth who are not exposed to supportive interventions will have an increased chance of succumbing to situations such as incarceration. This is especially true for youth who have more risk factors, such as being from a low-income household and lacking supportive adult allies (Scales et al., 2000). As described in the literature review, youth who have more developmental assets typically are able to avoid behavioral troubles, and they do better in school. The goal of PYD interventions for youth in adverse situations is to expose them to opportunities that will ultimately increase their resiliency. The goal is to put youth back on a path, one in which they feel they can become successful, contributing members of society.

This study found that youth who did spend more time in the PYD facility showed an increase in some of the resiliency domains. While the findings were not wildly significant, it does show that with the right type of interventions, youth are able to improve in the areas of relationships, insight, humor, and creativity. Although length of time in the program was not a statistically significant predictor for a positive change on the overall RASP, it was very close to being significant. It does seem that based on the services residents receive while in the program, they would likely experience increased resiliency. However, the low effect sizes for the models suggests that other factors aside from length of time and race or ethnicity responsible for the variability in change scores.

Further review of the RASP indicators for the relationship and creativity domains provides a more in depth understanding of why residents may have showed a significant increase in their change score. The indicators for the relationship domain asks residents to respond to the following statements:

- My friends know they can count on me.
- My family is there for me when I need them.
- I avoid people who could get me into trouble.
- I choose my friends carefully.
- I'm good at keeping friendships going.
- I have friends who will back me up.
- I can be myself around my friends.
- I make friends easily.

The indicators for the creativity domain asks residents to respond to the following:

- I can imagine the consequences of my actions.
- When I'm faced with a tough situation, I come up with new ways to handle it.
- I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings.
- I can entertain myself.

The services provided while in the program are closely related to these particular developmental needs. One of the first interventions when the residents arrive into the program is based on getting to know that resident. As with any new situation, residents at this age are often afraid and nervous about being away from home. The staff (called field

instructors) focus on making sure the residents feel comfortable. It is also common for fellow residents to befriend someone new. Despite the changes residents go through when it comes to getting to know each other, many of the residents leave the program feeling like they have made new friends. This is also likely due to the fact that the girls have now found others that have something in common with them by way of their present situation.

The DJJ facility also provides opportunities for youth to speak with a mental health counselor, one-on-one opportunities to engage in conversations with positive adults, and outdoor experiences geared toward problem solving and cognitive skill building. Often times, while in the program youth are challenged to think about the reasons why they have been sentenced and explore other choices they could have made. In addition, the girls participate in a program called Girl's Circle. Girl's Circle is a structured support group for girls between 9-18 years old. This support group integrates relational theory, resiliency practices, and skills training in a group therapy style format. It is designed to increase positive connections, personal and collective strengths and competence in girls (One Circle Foundation, 2012).

Throughout their stay, the residents are also counseled to set personal growth goals. Aside from successfully completing their time, residents are encouraged to identify specific things they would like to work on while in the program. Typically, these goals are related to some of the problem behaviors that likely caused their incarceration to begin with. The process to achieving their personal goals likely contributes to an increase in insight. The insight domain indicators ask participants to respond to the following:

- I learn from my mistakes.
- I notice small changes in facial expressions.
- I know when I'm good at something.
- I can change my behavior to match the situation.
- When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was my fault.
- I can deal with whatever comes in the future.
- I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.

In addition to working with a mental health counselor, one of the techniques used to help residents realize their goals is high and low ropes courses. Ropes courses are challenging outdoor personal development and team building activities that help people gain a deeper understanding of themselves and the broader challenges they face in life. After many of the ropes course exercises, residents engage in discussions that are closely related to the indicators found under the insight domain.

Another major goal of the youth development facility is to help residents tap into talents they may not be aware of. Aside from being required to participate in traditional academic courses, participants engage in art therapy. The residents are fortunate to have an opportunity to participate in dance classes, African drumming, ceramics, painting, and culinary arts. While participating in these activities, residents are guided through projects that are designed to help them work through personal reflection in a more creative way. Regular participation in these activities may also contribute to the increase in their humor change score. The indicators for the humor domain asks residents to respond to the following:

- My sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.
- I look for the "lighter side" of tough situations.
- Laughter helps me deal with stress.
- When I'm in a bad mood, I can cheer myself up.

It is plausible to draw a connection between the related arts activities and the humor domain. Participation in these low pressure activities helps residents relieve the stress of being away from their families and recognize how to put their energy into more productive activities.

Limitations of the Study

Since the program changed to only one that serves females, I am unable to get a clear picture of the changes males may experience on the resiliency attitudes and skills profile. The change in program service population also contributes to the smaller data set. Since the facility changed its programming, they also moved their data files, and they were only able to provide data for the last two years of service. Second, the DJJ facility, while open to residents of any race or ethnicity, tends to serve primarily Black and White residents. While the regression analysis did find that Hispanic residents had a significantly higher change score than Blacks and Whites on the overall RASP, values orientation, insight, initiative, and creativity, there were only six Hispanic residents included in this data set. Thus, a true difference as it relates to race or ethnicity cannot be clearly seen due to the disproportionate amount of residents for each race or ethnicity group.

Despite the small number of Hispanics included in this study, some discussion of possible reasons for a difference in their scores as compared to the other races/ethnicities is warranted. According to Blanco-Vega, Castro-Olivo, and Merrell (2008), Latino or Hispanic youth have considerably different experiences in America compared to Black and White youth do to the more recent immigration status of many of their family members. This is particularly true if these youths are first generation Americans. It is argued that many Latino or Hispanic immigrants believe American culture undermines the family values within Latino or Hispanic culture and there is a belief that their children are becoming too Americanized (Blanco-Vega et al., 2008). Thus, there is a greater push on the part of their families to maintain connection to their native culture. However, these youths in turn often have to deal with added discrimination issues related to language, immigration status, education, and socioeconomic status (Blanco-Vega et al., 2008). Blanco-Vega et al. (2008) further posit that the most important protective factors that promote resiliency in Latino or Hispanic youth are parental/familial involvement, community support and a positive self-concept.

Anecdotally one might be able to posit that the Hispanic youth you were a part of this study experienced positive increases in their resiliency attitudes and skills because the services they received at the DJJ center reached them in ways that resonated more with their cultural needs. It is possible that these youths were able to build a connection with specific employees that aided in their development of a positive self-concept or a feeling of community support. This particular study was not designed to determine the

effect the specific services has on youth's resiliency attitudes and skills. Additional research is recommended to determine the effectiveness of the specific program services.

Finally, a major limitation to this study is the way in which the survey responses are gathered. When residents enter the program they are often brought into custody in handcuffs and shackles. Many of the residents may have been arrested and abruptly removed from their normal surroundings. For most of the residents, this experience is rather traumatic. Within the first two or three hours of being at the residential facility they are asked to complete the RASP survey. It is likely that the residents lack the focus to fully process the statements on the survey. In addition, the survey is administered in front of the intake coordinator from the facility. Often times this person reads the survey to the residents. While it is reported that no further instruction or explanation is given during the survey, having someone oversee in this way could influence the resident's responses.

Furthermore, the residents are asked to take the survey again when they are being released from the program. It is administered in the same way. However, it is plausible to conclude that the residents may not always take the time to fully comprehend the statements because they are anxious to leave the program. In addition, the residents know that they must complete the program successfully in order to avoid additional incarceration time. To that end, there could be a number of residents who may try to embellish their responses so that they appear to be most successful. The statistical analysis showed that residents who came into the program with a high RASP score tended to score lower on the post test score. It would be expected that their scores stayed the same. However, this may be attributed to how seriously the residents took the RASP

both times. It may have been useful to administer the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (1960) to further assess whether the girls were responding truthfully or misrepresenting themselves in a more favorable fashion. The results of this scale could have been used as another independent variable.

Recommendations

Despite the limitations of this study, this research does provide some useful insights for further research and interventions with at-risk youth. Based on prominent youth development research, one of the most important interventions for all youth is supportive adult allies. These allies are important to a child's ability to navigate various situations in life. Supportive adult allies assist youth in being able to access resources and navigate troublesome situations. It has been found in this study that when youth are surrounded by supportive adults and when they are provided opportunities to engage in activities designed to help them realize their own potential related to problem solving, supportive peer relationships, and other developmental needs outlined in the research, youth do have the potential to thrive. Based on this study, it is recommended that the DJJ facility hone in on the indicators of the RASP and focus on furthering services to be more intentionally related to resiliency attitudes and skills.

Currently the DJJ facility studied here operates on a model in which 16 girls are assigned to no more than two field instructors at a time. Because this study found that while youth are in the program they are able to show improvements in their relationships, it is recommended that the facility invest in more opportunities for youth to have one-on-one time with adults.

Furthermore, youth development research indicates at-risk youth would greatly benefit from strong supportive family environments. It is recommended that the facility develop program services that would facilitate strengthening the resident's family structure. Often times, youth who return to the same at-risk environment will repeat negative behaviors. To prevent recidivism, families will need to be equipped with strategies and tools that will ensure youth are able to make better decisions.

To better determine if this residential facility is effective in improving youth's resiliency, it is recommended that they change the way in which the RASP is administered. It may make more sense to give the residents at least a week to get settled into the program before asking them to complete the pretest. This will allow time for the residents to become more comfortable with their current situation. This may increase the likelihood of residents providing an honest response on the survey. Furthermore, it is recommended that residents take the exit survey at least a week before they know they are being released. If residents do not think they are completing the survey as a condition of release, they may be more inclined to take their time and answer honestly.

Another recommendation for further research is to obtain data from similar DJJ facilities. To better understand the validity and reliability of these findings, it will be important to analyze a larger sample size. Moreover, it will be useful to determine if similar survey results would be repeated in different locations. If multiple studies determine that the services and length of time at residential youth development facilities can improve resiliency attitudes and skills, this would provide important insight for youth development professionals.

There is also a lack of longitudinal research concerning the at-risk youth population. The DJJ facility studied here has had some residents return to the program after being released. However, they currently do not have measures in place to track the residents after they have been released. It is important to understand how youth are implementing the things they have learned after being incarcerated. It is also important to gain an understanding how their environments after incarceration contribute or stifle their growth.

Another limitation of this study is the limited amount of independent variables studied. It is quite possible that a resident's socioeconomic status, nature of offense, and mental health diagnosis could also be predictors for a change in resiliency attitudes and skills. It is recommended that a follow-up study would include these variables.

Implications

Dedicated youth development professionals are busy at work trying to identify the best interventions for at-risk youth. Common findings in prominent youth development research indicate the importance for youth to feel safe, a sense of belonging, a sense of purpose and comfort in knowing there are adults they can count on. While multiple theories that have shaped different approaches for organizations such as the Search Institute, America's Promise Alliance, The Forum for Youth Investment, and the National Research Council, the one common approach is consistent exposure to, youth centered activities, and caring adults. The findings presented in this study suggest that when youth are away from their typical environments and surrounded by structure and positive relationships, they have the potential to become more resilient. Based on this

study's findings, youth development professionals may find it important to design interventions that hinge on positive adult interactions and relationship building with peers. This finding does coincide with current youth development research.

The findings in this study also have implications for preventative youth development services. If youth who have found themselves in adverse situations have the potential to develop resiliency skills, at-risk youth who have yet to display negative behaviors may be able to avoid adverse situations with the right preventive supports. Youth development agencies and family support structures should focus on supporting youth in the areas of humor, creativity, insight, initiative, independence, relationships, and values orientation. Building youth's resiliency attitudes and skills.

Moreover, based on the low effect sizes found in this study, further research is needed to better determine if other independent variables would significantly explain a change in resiliency attitudes and skills. Youth development research suggests that a wide range of assets that youth must have to develop into self-actualizing adults. While this study did not include variables related to the specific education program the residents are in or the specific extracurricular activities, further research could be conducted to determine if these variables are significant predictors of RASP change.

Conclusions

Overall youth who have opportunities to learn about themselves in a safe supportive environment will likely be more successful in life. It is not uncommon for most youth to make multiple mistakes. The most important thing is to ensure structures are in place that help youth learn from their mistakes. Thus, one of the most important

developmental assets may be resiliency. Clearly no one is perfect, and mistakes will be made. How a child learns and grows from those mistakes will make the difference between a young person on a path toward academic success and productivity and a young person on a path toward negative behaviors, school dropout and, possible imprisonment.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- America's Promise Alliance. (2013). About the alliance. Retrieved from <http://www.americaspromise.org/About-the-Alliance.aspx>
- Arnett, J. (2006). G. Stanley Hall's Adolescence: Brilliance and nonsense. *History of Psychology, 9*(3), 186-197. doi:10.1037/1093-4510.9.3.186
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A., Jr. (with Hong, K. L., & Roehlkepartain, E. C.). (2006). Positive youth development so far: Core hypotheses and their implications for policy and practice. *Search Institute Insights & Evidence, 3*(1), 1–13. Retrieved from <http://www.search-institute.org/system/files/InsightsEvidence-11-06.pdf>
- Blanco-Vega, C. O., Castro-Olivo, S. M., & Merrell, K. W. (2008). Social-emotional needs of Latino immigrant adolescents: A sociocultural model for development and implementation of culturally specific interventions. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 7*(1), 43-61. doi:10.1080/15348430701693390
- Bruyere, E.B. (2010). Child participation and positive youth development. *Child Welfare, 89*(5), 205-220. Retrieved from <http://www.cwla.org/child-welfare-journal/>
- Caldwell, L. L. (2000). Beyond fun and games? Challenges to adopting a prevention and youth development approach to youth recreation. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 18*(3), 1-18. Retrieved from <http://js.sagamorepub.com/jpra>
- Center on Education, Disabilities, and Juvenile Justice. (2010). *Summary of class-action*

- litigation involving special education claims in juvenile and adult correctional facilities.* [Unpublished data.] National Center on Education, Disability, and Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.edjj.org/Litlगतion/index.html>
- Chen, X & Kaufman, P. (1997). Risk and resilience: The effects on dropping out of high school. American Education Research Association. Retrieved from http://www.mprinc.com/products/pdf/Risk_and_Protective_Factors.pdf
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.
- Conley, D. T. (2007). *Toward a more comprehensive conception of college readiness*. Eugene, OR: Educational Policy Improvement Center.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24(4) 349-354. doi: 10.1037/h0047358.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Soaring Systems. *Education Review*, 24(1), 24-33. Retrieved from http://educationpublishing.com/education_review24.shtml
- Deke, J. & Haimson, J. (2006). Valuing student competencies: Which ones predict postsecondary educational attainment and earnings, and for whom? Washington, DC: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Doll, B. & Lyon, M.A. (1998). Risk and resilience: implications for the delivery of educational and mental health services in schools. *School Psychology Review*, 27, 348-363.

- Dworkin, J.B., Larson, R., & Hansen, D. (2003). Adolescents' accounts of growth experiences in youth activities. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32, 17-26. doi: 10.1023/A:1021076222321
- Eisman, A. B., Stoddard, S. A., Heinze, J., Caldwell, C. H., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2015). Depressive symptoms, social support, and violence exposure among urban youth: A longitudinal study of resilience. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(9), 1307-1316. doi:10.1037/a0039501
- Faas, S., & Cauthen, N. K. (2008). Who are America's poor children? The official story. *National Center for Children in Poverty*. Retrieved from www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_787.pdf
- Fergus, S., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2005). Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 26, 399 – 419. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.26.021304.144357>
- Gomez, B. J., & Ang, P. (2007). Promoting positive youth development in schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 46(2), 97-104. doi:10.1080/00405840701232752
- Gravetter, F. J. & Wallnau, L. B. (2009). *Statistics for behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Griller Clark, H., Mathur, S. R., Sloane, F. C., & Helling, B. (2007, November). *The results are in: The Arizona Detention Transition Project*. Paper presented at the Robert B. Rutherford Memorial TECBD Conference on Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth, Tempe, AZ.

- Grisso, T. (2007). Progress and perils in the juvenile justice and mental health movement. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 35, 158-167.
Retrieved from <http://www.jaapl.org/content/35/2/158.full.pdf+html>
- Guilamo-Ramos, V., Litardo, H. A., & Jaccard, J. (2005). Prevention programs for reducing adolescent problem behaviors: Implications of the co-occurrence of problem behaviors in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 36, 82-86.
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2003.12.013
- Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education* (Vols. I & II). New York: D.Appleton & Co.
- Horn, L.J., & Carroll, C.D. (1997). Confronting the odds: Students at risk and the pipeline to higher education (U.S. Department of Education NELs: 88/94).
Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/98094.pdf>
- Hurtes, K.P. & Allen, L.R. (2001). Measuring resiliency in youth: The Resiliency attitudes and skills profile. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 35(4), 333-347.
- Jung, C. G., & von Franz, M. L. (Eds.). (1968). *Man and his symbols*. (Vol. 5183). Random House Digital, Inc.
- Keeley, J. H. (2006). Will adjudicated youth return to school after residential placement? The results of a predictive variable study. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 57(1), 65-85. Retrieved from <http://www.ceanational.org/Journal/index.php>
- King, M. (2006). *Guide to the state juvenile justice profiles*. Technical Assistance to the Juvenile Court Bulletin. Pittsburg, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Retrieved from

http://www.ncjj.org/Libraries/Technical_Assistance_to_the_Juvenile_Court/Guide_to_the_State_Juvenile_Justice_Profiles.sflb.ashx

Koltko-Rivera, M. E. (2006). Rediscovering the later version of Maslow's hierarchy of needs: Self-transcendence and opportunities for theory, research, and unification. *Review of General Psychology, 10*(4), 302-317. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.10.4.302

Kumpfer, K. L. (1999). *Factors and processes contributing to resilience: The resilience framework*. Retrieved from http://psychomotorischetherapie.info/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/literature_ip_2011_switzerland.pdf

Larson, R. W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 170-183. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.170

Lerner et al. (2005). Youth development contributions of fifth-grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 25*(1), 17-71. doi:10.1177/0272431604272461

Lerner, R. M. (2002). *Concepts and theories of human development* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lerner, R.M. (2005). *Promoting positive youth development: Theoretical and empirical bases*. White paper prepared for the Workshop on the Science of Adolescent Health and Development, National Research Council/Institute of Medicine. Washington, DC: National Academies of Science. Retrieved from <ftp://arnatural.org/Uploads/4->

H%20Afterschool%20Provider%20Training%202013/Positive%20Youth%20Development/Positive%20youth%20development/pubPromotingPositive.pdf

Leve, L. D., Fisher, P. A., & Chamberlain, P. (2009). Multidimensional treatment foster care as a preventive intervention to promote resiliency among youth in the child welfare system. *Journal of Personality*, 77(6), 1869-1902. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00603.x

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396. doi:10.1037/h0054346

Masten, A. S. (1994). Resilience in individual development: Successful adaptation despite risk and adversity. In M. C. Wang & E. W. Gorden (Eds.), *Educational resilience in inner-city America* (pp. 3-25). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Masten, A. S. (2014). Invited commentary: Resilience and positive youth development frameworks in developmental science. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43(6), 1018-1024. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0118-7

McLeod, S. A. (2007). *Carl Rogers - simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/carl-rogers.html>

McKay, C., Sanders, M., & Wroblewski, S. (2011). Positive youth development and school capacity building. *Journal of School Social Work*, 36(1), 16-25. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED454454> .

Mishel, L., & Roy, J. (2006). Accurately assessing high school graduation rates. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(4), 287-292. Retrieved from <http://pdk.sagepub.com/>

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2002). *Community programs to*

promote youth development. Committee on Community-Level Programs for Youth. Jacquelynne Eccles and Jennifer A. Gootman, eds. Board on Children, Youth, and Families, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty. (2007). *2007 annual report*.

Retrieved from www.nlchp.org/view_report.cfm?id_285

Nellis, A., & Hooks Wayman, R. (2009). *Back on track: Theory, research, and promising approaches for youth reentry*. Washington, DC: Youth Reentry Task Force of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Coalition. Retrieved from http://www.sentencingproject.org/doc/publications/CC_youth_reentryfall09report.pdf

Nelson, C., Jolivette, K., Leone, P. E., & Mathur, S. R. (2010). Meeting the needs of at-risk and adjudicated youth with behavioral challenges: The promise of juvenile justice. *Behavioral Disorders, 36*(1), 70-80.

One Circle Foundation. (2012). *Girls circle*. Retrieved from

<https://onecirclefoundation.org/GC.aspx>

Piaget, J. (1972). Intellectual evolution from adolescence to adulthood. *Human Development, 15*, 1-12.

Pierce, L. H., & Shields, N. (1998). The “be a star” community-based after-school program: Developing resiliency factors in high-risk preadolescent youth. *Journal of Community Psychology, 26*(2), 175-183. Retrieved from [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/\(ISSN\)1520-6629](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/(ISSN)1520-6629)

- Pittman, K.J., & Fleming, W. E. (1991). *A new vision: Promoting youth development*. Washington, DC: Center for Youth Development and Policy Research.
- Preckel, F., Holling, H., & Vock, M. (2006). Academic underachievement: Relationship with cognitive motivation, achievement motivation, and conscientiousness. *Psychology In The Schools, 43*(3), 401-411. doi:10.1002/pits.20154
- Roehlkepartain, E. C., Benson, P. L., & Sesma, A. (2003). *Signs of progress in putting children first: Developmental assets among youth in St. Louis Park, 1997-2001*. Search Institute: Minneapolis. Retrieved from <http://www.searchinstitute.org/system/files/SignsofProgress-5-03.pdf>
- Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). What Exactly Is a Youth Development Program? Answers From Research and Practice. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*(2), 94-111. doi: 10.1207/S1532480XADS0702_6
- Roth, J., Brooks-Gunn, J., Murray, L., & Foster, W. (1998). Promoting healthy adolescents: Synthesis of youth development program evaluations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8*, 423-459. Retrieved from [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1532-7795](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1532-7795)
- Ryff, C. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(6), 1069-1081. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069
- Scales, P.B., Leffert, N. & Blyth, D.A. (2000). Contribution of developmental assets to the prediction of thriving among adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science, 4* (1), 27-46. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10/1207/S1532480XADS0401_3

- Scales, P. C., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (2003). Boosting student achievement: New research on the power of developmental assets. *Search Institute Insights & Evidence, 1* (1), 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.search-institute.org/research/Insights/IE-10-03-Achievement.pdf>
- Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement goal theory at the crossroads: Old controversies, current challenges, and new directions. *Educational Psychologist, 46*(1), 26-47. doi:10.1080/00461520.2011.538646
- Stanard, R. (2003). High school graduation rates in the United States: Implications for the counseling profession. *Journal Of Counseling & Development, 81*(2), 217. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database (Accession No. 725240)
- The Forum for Youth Investment. (2013). About us. Retrieved from <http://forumfyi.org/about>
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2008). Disconnected youth: Federal action could address some of the challenges faced by local programs that reconnect youth to education and employment. (GAO-08-313) Washington, DC.
- Weissman, M., Cregor, M., Gainsborough, J., Kief, N., Leone, P.E., & Sullivan, E. (2008). The right to education in the juvenile and criminal justice systems in the United States: Submission to Vernor Munoz Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education Human Right Council, United Nations. Washington, DC: Dignity in Schools Campaign.
- Wolin, S. J., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The resilient self: How survivors of troubled families rise above adversity*. New York: Villard Books.

- Youngblade, L.M, & Theokas, C. (2006) The multiple contexts of youth development: implications for theory, research, and practice. *Applied Developmental Science*, 10(2). 58-60. doi: 10.1207/s1532480xads1002_1
- Youth Learning Institute. (2013). Youth development center. Retrieved from <http://www.clemson.edu/yli/pages/ydc.php>
- Zeldin, S. (1995). *An introduction to youth development concepts: Questions for community collaborations*. Washington, DC: Center for Youth Development & Policy Research, Academy for Educational Development.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Stoddard, S. A., Eisman, A. B., Caldwell, C. H., Aiyer, S. M., & Miller, A. (2013). Adolescent resilience: Promotive factors that inform prevention. *Child Development Perspectives*, 7, 215–220. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12042>

Appendix A: Email Permission from Authors of RASP

Karen Paisley

Apr 14

To Me

Hi there!

You're welcome to use the instrument. We also have a parent version (that we didn't work with too much) if that's of any interest.

If you're interested, can send it along from the office tomorrow.

Thanks for asking (it's a professional courtesy that many overlook). :)

Best of luck to you, and take good care, Karen

Karen Paisley, PhD
Associate Dean, College of Health
Associate Professor, Department of Parks,
Recreation, and Tourism
University of Utah
Office: (801)587-9617

On Apr 14, 2013, at 1:48 PM, Shaunette Parker wrote:

Hello, Dr. Paisley.

My name is Shaunette Parker. I am currently an employee of Clemson University's Youth Learning Institute. I work at the Camp Long Youth Development Center. I am also in the process of working on my dissertation toward a PhD in Educational Psychology. The YDC currently utilizes your assessment scale as a part of intake and release of its residents. I am seeking your permission to utilize data from this scale for my dissertation. My goal is to study achievement motivation in at-risk youth who complete their court ordered sentences at a juvenile justice program. I have been instructed that it is important for me to seek written approval to utilize any assessment scale that I have not created.

I would be happy to further discuss my dissertation goals if you have any questions. I am also interested in any information you may have to share with me that will help me complete this process.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration.

Shaunette Parker
803-522-6159
shaunetteparker@yahoo.com
shaunette.parker@waldenu.edu

Appendix B: Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile

The following items relate to your opinions of yourself and your personal characteristics.

Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with

each one. **There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as honest as possible!**

	STRONGLY DISAGREE					STRONGLY AGREE
1. When my work is criticized, I try harder the next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I can deal with whatever comes in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Once I set a goal for myself, I don't let anything stop me from reaching it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I learn from my mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I notice small changes in facial expressions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I can imagine the consequences of my actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I know when I'm good at something.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I'm prepared to deal with the consequences of my actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I say "no" to things that I don't want to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I can change my behavior to match the situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. My sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. My friends know they can count on me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I can change my surroundings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. My family is there for me when I need them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was	1	2	3	4	5	6

my fault.						
16. It's OK if I don't see things the way other people do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Lying is unacceptable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I avoid people who could get me into trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. It's OK if some people do not like me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I am comfortable making my own decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I can sense when someone is not telling the truth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. When I'm faced with a tough situation, I come up with new ways to handle it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. I choose my friends carefully.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I look for the "lighter side" of tough situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I control my own life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I try to help others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I stand up for what I believe is right.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I try to figure out things that I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I'm good at keeping friendships going.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I have friends who will back me up.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Laughter helps me deal with stress.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. I avoid situations where I could get into trouble.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. I can be myself around my friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. When I'm in a bad mood, I can cheer myself up.	1	2	3	4	5	6

37. When something bad happens to me, I don't give up.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I share my ideas and opinions even if they are different from other people's.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I can entertain myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. I make friends easily.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Copyright © 1999 by K.P. Hurtes

Appendix C: Survey Key for Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile

SURVEY KEY:

Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP)

Copyright © 1999 by K.P. Hurtes

CREATIVITY: 6, 22, 23, and 39

HUMOR: 11, 25, 33, and 36

INDEPENDENCE: 2, 9, 16, 19, 20, 26, 34, and 38

INITIATIVE: 1, 3, 13, 30, and 37

INSIGHT: 4, 5, 7, 10, 15, 21, and 27

RELATIONSHIPS: 12, 14, 18, 24, 31, 32, 35, and 40

VALUES ORIENTATION: 8, 17, 28, and 29

There are no reverse coded items.