Measurement and Evaluation Manual

William M. Kurtines

Youth Development Project (YDP)

Florida International University

WORKING DRAFT

(DO NOT QUOTE)

Revised: 2/21/04

Printed: 9/15/04

The Core Measurement and Evaluation Battery and Manual was developed for use in the Youth Development Project of the Adolescent and Adult Development Program, Child and Family Psychosocial Research Center, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, 33199. Any comments or suggestions regarding the material should be directed to William M. Kurtines at the above address. Because the core battery is still undergoing development and refinement, the contributors would appreciate receiving information with respect to any data or findings related to the use of the battery.

Contributors:[1]

Richard Albrecht, Donette Archer, Ondina Arrufat, Marlene Arzola, Alan M. Berman, Steven L. Berman, Ervin Briones, Janene Bussell, Arlen Garcia, Laura Ferrer-Wreder, Lisa Lewis Arango, Gabrielle Kortsch, William M. Kurtines, Carolyn Cass Lorente, Clary Milnitsky, Marilyn Montgomery, Rachel Richie, Seth Schwartz, Silvia Sullivan, Sara K. Swenson

---

[1] Alphabetical order

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Measurement and Evaluation Manual

Youth Development Project (YDP)

Florida International University

Purpose

Measurement and evaluation plays an essential role in the Youth Development Project. This manual describes the core measures and procedures used as part of this project. These measures and evaluation procedures provide us with information about what <u>is</u> working and what <u>is</u> <u>not</u> working in our interventions. This is essential if we are to make the program as effective as possible. In addition, the measures and evaluation procedures also provide a means for contributing to our general knowledge of interventions that work in promoting positive youth development. This manual provides an overview of the framework that we use in our evaluation and a summary of the evaluation procedures that are used as part of the Miami Youth Development Project in public alternative high schools throughout Miami Dade Country and Miami, Florida.

Part I:
Purpose

This *Handbook* provides a summary of the policies and procedures of the Youth Development Project and the duties, responsibilities, and conduct expected of members of the Project. Project members participate in the operational of the project at many levels (as faculty, students, volunteers, etc.) and function in many roles (intervention, research, training, etc.). Refer to the Handbook for information and to answer questions about the Project and your role in it.

Objectives of the Youth Development Project

The objective of the Youth Development Project is to foster positive youth development. The intervention program currently under development, the Changing Lives Program (CLP) is a school-based intervention for promoting positive development in troubled (multi-problem) youth. The program uses a participatory and transformative intervention approach and targets adolescence in transition to adulthood. The aim is to engage these young people and to get them invested in themselves and their community, to create an intervention context in which troubled young people can change their lives for the better. The program is a community-based response to the need for youth programs that are broad-based, culturally responsive, and can be readily adapted to local and particular contexts.

The Youth Development Project has its home base in the Child and Family Psychosocial Research Center, Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199, USA. The Youth Development Project has evolved by establishing partnerships between:

- Florida International University (FIU), the public university in Miami,
- Communities in Schools (CIS), the leading community-based organization for delivering community resources to schools, and
- Local community based alternative public high schools throughout Miami and Miami Dade County.

These partners have responded to a perceived community need - the need for community-based youth programs that work.

FIU is an urban, multicampus, research university located in Miami, Florida's largest population center. Its mission includes serving the people of Southeast Florida. CIS partners with families, schools and community leaders to create a support system for students. The schools where we offer the program are mainly public high school of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools, the fourth largest school system in the country. The high schools serve a multiethnic population of youth drawn from all over the greater Miami metropolitan area and Miami Dade County. These youth come to the alternative schools with a history of attendance, behavior, or motivational problems in their neighborhood school, with many coming from inner city, low-income families that exist within a community context of disempowerment, limited access to resources, and pervasive violence, crime, and substance abuse.

Miami Youth Development Project

Objectives

The objective of the Youth Development Project is to foster positive youth development. This includes conducting research projects developing, refining, and implementing the interventions for working with the adolescents in the schools such as the Changing Lives Program (CLP) and longitudinal life course studies of the lives of individuals in the school such as the Longitudinal Life Course Change Project (LCP).

The Youth Development Project Training Program is open to graduate students and undergraduate students and provides opportunities for intern placement and research training with project members participating at many levels of involvement. At the graduate level, students in the Psychology Department's Life Span Developmental Science Doctoral Program may obtain research training in the process of fulfilling academic requirements (e.g., Masters Thesis, Doctoral Dissertations) as well as obtain supervision that can be accrued toward fulfilling the licensure requirements for licensure as a mental health counselor in the State of Florida. Students in the Psychology Department's Mental Health Research and Services Masters Degree Program and other license eligible programs also obtain supervision that can be accrued toward fulfilling the licensure requirements for the State of Florida. At the undergraduate level, students may obtain both research and intern experience by participating in research projects and in working in counseling groups, conducting assessments and interviews, and other forms of direct experience in working with the adolescents at the high schools. Course credit is available for work done as part of the project as briefly described next.

The Population and the Problem

Although adolescent stress and storm is not a universal phenomena (Arnett, 1999), for an increasing number of youth the transition to adulthood poses a formidable challenge. This is particularly so for disadvantaged youth. Such youth <u>begin</u> life outside the mainstream social institutions (e.g., economic, political, educational, etc.) that have traditionally provided young people value references and normative support (Côté & Allathar, 1994; Tait, 1993). For such socially marginalized youth, the development of a personal and moral sense of identity (i.e., who they are and the values they believe in) has become increasingly problematic.

The cost to society is high. Because of the experience of increasing marginalization, these young people put little (if any) investment in most normative social institutions. The cost to the youth themselves is also high. These marginalized youth have withdrawn from proactive participation in their personal lives, tending not to take control and responsibility for the direction of their lives, instead searching for daily adventure that too frequently includes antisocial activities and problem behaviors. As a result, the number of youth at risk for problem behaviors is extraordinary high (Dahlberg, 1998; Rutter, Giller, & Hagell, 1998), particularly among disadvantaged youth.

A large proportion of marginalized young people in the United States come from inner city, low-income minority families that exist within a community context of disempowerment, limited access to resources, and pervasive violence, crime, and substance abuse (Berman, Kurtines, Silverman, & Serafini, 1996; National Center for Children in Poverty, 1993; Wilson, Rodriguez, & Taylor, 1997). Such youth tend to be disadvantaged by socioeconomic status, ethnicity, minority status, or in other ways socially marginalized (National Center for Children in Poverty, 1993). They are, for example, often subject to diverse forms of oppression, the deleterious effects of poverty, and various forms of institutional and individual racism. The psychological consequences are profound. Many young people respond to the experience of marginalization in ways (e.g., impulsiveness/ immediatism, pretending not to care, keeping their pain inside themselves, acting out against others, or escaping through drug use) that result in <u>further</u> marginalization and disengagement (Allison, et al., 1999; Keys, Bemak, & Lockhart, 1998).

Working with Disadvantaged Adolescents

Adolescence represents an opportune time for intervening to prevent risky behaviors that compromise healthy development and assisting with the normative course of development into adulthood. Adolescence is a time of experimentation, increased risks, and heightened vulnerability as well as openness to change (Lerner, 1995). Thus, for some developmental domains, adolescence provides a maximally effective point of focus for programs that promote youth development (Sherrod & Brim, 1986).

However, the challenge of developing interventions for promoting positive development in disadvantaged youth in the context of limited resources is formidable. The development of effective interventions requires approaches that are readily adaptable to local and particular contexts, culturally responsive, and practical. Our experience in using this approach with the young people drawn from a diverse array of cultural contexts and traditions has shown it to be useful for providing them the opportunity to increase their proactive participation in defining who they are and what they believe in. Our experience in this area is consistent with the growing awareness of the importance of creating positive development programs designed to encourage and empower young people (McWhirter, 1994, 1997). The idea of empowerment is one that may be, and is increasingly, utilized within counseling to encourage people to actively engage in meaningful, self-directed, life course change and social action.

Overview of Intervention Components

Theoretical Framework

In seeking to promote positive development by creating contexts in which these troubled young people can change their lives, the CLP draws its developmental framework from both psychosocial developmental theory (Erikson, 1968) and life course theory (Elder, 1998) which we refer to as a psychosocial developmental life course approach. From psychosocial developmental theory, this approach adopts the view of adolescence as the developmental stage at which the individual is first confronted with, systematically and seriously, addressing the complex and difficult challenge (and responsibility) of choosing the goals, roles, and beliefs about the world that give the individual's life direction and purpose as well as coherence and integration. From life course theory, it adopts an emphasis on how individuals construct their own life course through the choices and actions they make within the constraints and opportunities of history and social circumstances. In line with Eriksonian theory, the CLP not only targets (and seeks to resolve) identity issues of the developmental moment but also is aimed at fostering domains of functioning that are foundational to successfully meeting other developmental challenges across the life span (Waterman, 1994). The psychosocial developmental life course approach of CLP, however, draws on life course theory to extend Eriksonian theory to include the view that intraindividual change after childhood is less developmentally predictable than has usually been described in Erikson's approach. Rather, in adapting the view of identity as a "steering mechanism" for life course change, a psychosocial developmental life course approach emphasizes the self-directed nature of change in adolescence and adulthood consistent with life course theory (Elder, 1998) and the emerging view of individuals as producers of their development (Brandtstaedter & Lerner, 1999; Lerner & Busch-Rossnagel, 1981).

Intervention Goals: Promoting Positive Development

There has been a growing interest in developing intervention programs designed to affect the lives of young people, with the goal of moving their life trajectories in more adaptive directions (Rutter, 1990). More recently, there has also been a growing recognition that interventions need to do more than "treat" problem behaviors (i.e., symptoms) or "prevent" negative developmental outcomes (Lerner, Fisher, & Weinberg, 2000). As a result, a growing literature focusing on interventions that seek to *promote positive development* has emerged that are usually termed positive development programs/interventions or youth development programs (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, & Hawkins, 1999). CLP is a positive development program.

Positive development programs differ from both intervention and prevention programs. Treatment intervention programs, for example, specifically target identified problem behaviors. Prevention

intervention programs similarly specifically target risk and protective factors identified as probable antecedents of negative developmental outcomes. Positive youth development programs, in contrast, lack the specificity of treatment and prevention programs. They often emerge in response to issues and concerns that are local and particular, culturally bound, and historically situated. In these cases, the aim of youth development programs is to promote "positive" development where the meaning and significance of the concept of "positive" is determined by a complex interaction of locally, culturally, historically, and developmentally relevant factors.

When employed as universal interventions (e.g., 4-H, Girl/Boy Scouts, etc.) the most general aim of youth development programs is to enrich and enhance the normative course of development in a multitude of ways (specified and not specified) that are locally, culturally, contextually, and developmentally meaningful and significant (Mulkeen & Markstrom, 2001). The goal of universal positive development interventions (i.e., interventions that do not specifically target identified behavior problems or "at risk" youth) is thus to intervene across a broad and diverse array of specific and non-specific positive development constructs to promote, enrich, and enhance ongoing progress along an already positive life course. That is, the goal is not to change lives; on the contrary, the goal is to "hold the course" and, if possible, enrich and enhance progress along the way.

Positive development programs may also target troubled youth. We use the term "troubled" youth to describe the population we work with (and develop interventions for) as an alternative to the terms "behavior problem" youth or "at-risk' youth. In developing CLP for the "troubled" youth, the youth we work with are drawn from the same general population as the behavior problem and at risk youth targeted by treatment and prevention programs and, like those youth, as a population they exhibit a full spectrum of the behavior problems and risk factors. In contrast to treatment and prevention programs that target specific types of behavior problems or risk factors, however, CLP does *not* target specific behavior problems or risk factors; rather, the focus of CLP is on promoting positive development. CLP provides (as needed and available) selected interventions that target specific behavior problems and risk factors, but reducing behavior problems and risk factors is not our main goal.

Like universal youth development programs, CLP focuses on promoting positive development, but in contrast to programs that aim at facilitating development along a trajectory or life course that is already proceeding in a positive direction, CLP aims at altering or changing the course of lives that are proceeding in a negative direction. When employed as selective interventions (i.e., with troubled youth), the aim of CLP is thus to alter or change the direction of the "negative" life trajectories of the youth in our programs. That is, the aim is to change the lives of troubled young people for the better where "change" means a qualitative change in direction (i.e., from negative to positive) and where "for the better" (negative to positive) is to be understood in ways that are particularly local (i.e., in ways that are relative to relative to each individual's specific life course trajectory at the time of entry into the program) as well as culturally, historically, and developmentally appropriate. Our goal is thus to *promote qualitative change in the direction of participants lives in ways that are individually, culturally, historically, and developmentally meaningful and significant*. We consequently consider our programs to be open-ended responses that target the intersection of the developmental and historical moment – changing lives and changing times (Lerner, et al. 2000).

Intervention Strategies

For its intervention strategies, CLP draws on Freire's (1983/1970) approach to empowering marginalized people by enhancing their critical consciousness about their exclusion from the mainstream. Freire developed this approach in his work with impoverished Brazilian peasants. He found that individuals marginalized by extreme poverty had difficulty progressing when provided traditional classroom instruction format. According to Freire, didactic approaches only served to emphasize in the peasants' minds their sense of "incompetence" in contrast to the "competence" of the knowledgeable expert who dictates the lesson. Freire offered an alternative: a "problem posing" and co-constructive learning model. Freire referred to such a transformative pedagogy as a pedagogy of dialogue rather than instruction. Transformative pedagogy is participatory; it identifies and seeks to solve problems. While intentionally identifying problems and following through by engaging in transformative activities to solve these problems, students become the "experts" and, in the process, develop a greater sense of control and responsibility over their lives. They become empowered as they experience the possibility of creating

(rather than enduring) the circumstances of their lives. Because of such mastery experiences, youth learn "to see a closer correspondence between their goals and a sense of how to achieve them, gain greater access to and control over resources and ... gain mastery over their lives" (Zimmerman, 1995, p. 583). It is in this sense that the personal identity that is initially formed during adolescence serves as a "steering mechanism" that guides the remainder of the individual's life course trajectory. Adolescence is thus a developmental period that provides a significant opportunity to intervene in ways that have the potential for significantly altering (in a positive direction) the adolescent's life course trajectory

In our work with young people, as noted, the learning process is co-participatory. In the process of intentionally engaging in critically posing problems and in following through by engaging in transformative activities to solve these problems, participants acquire a greater critical understanding, transform their sense of control and responsibility, and increase their proactive participation in defining who they are and what they believe in. Within the context of the program these young people become empowered to transform themselves and, as a result, the context of their communities.

Intervention Domains

CLP seeks to promote positive development by empowering young people in ways that enable them to change their lives in positive directions. In doing so, CLP targets three developmental domains:

- Skills and Knowledge (the focus is on Critical Understanding)
- Attitudes and Orientations (the focus is on Control and Responsibility)
- Self Understanding and Insight (the focus is on Knowledge of Self)

that enable young people to:

1 think critically about making the choices that shape their life course
2 take personal responsibility for these decisions, and
3 live up to their fullest potentials

Table 1 provides an overview of the developmental domains targeted by CLP and the objectives of the intervention.

Skills and Knowledge: Critical Decision Making and Problem Solving.

The skills and knowledge domain targeted by the program include critical problem solving and decision making as a type of cognitive competence. Cognitive problem solving is a protective factor that has been empirically shown to be negatively related to adolescent substance abuse, acting-out behaviors, and school-related stressors in the type of population the program targets (Botvin & Botvin, 1992; Elias et al., 1986; Spivack & Shure, 1982; Tolan, 1994). There is also a growing recognition among many researchers that various types cognitive problem solving are basic to the process of development of a sense of identity in young people (Berman et al., 1999; Berzonsky, 1989; 1990; Enright et al., 1983; 1984; Grotevant, 1987; Grotevant & Adams, 1984; Markstrom-Adams et al., 1993). The "critical" competence targeted by the program is performance-based and not only includes creative processes such as generating alternatives for solving problems but also emphasizes a critical stance towards life problems and decisions.

Attitudes and Orientations: Personal Control/Responsibility and Identity Style.

The attitudes targeted for intervention, personal control and responsibility, build on recent advances that have been made in conceptualizing and operationalizing responsibility-related concepts and constructs (Schlenker et al., 1994; Tetlock, 1992; Williams, 1992). In addition, they are also targeted because they are basic to the process of identity development in general and the development of a moral identity in particular. More specifically, the concept of "a sense of" control and responsibility is defined in terms of what Erikson (1980) called one's attitude or orientation toward life tasks, including accepting responsibility for solving problems and making choices that affect the quality of one's life and the lives of others.

The orientations targeted for intervention include a range of behavioral and dispositional tendencies. More specifically, the three problem-solving dispositional orientations or "identity styles" described by

Berzonsky (1989) targeted for intervention include: a problem-focused informational style, a rule-focused normative style, and an evasion-focused diffuse/ avoidant style.

Self Understanding and Insight: and Knowledge of Self.

Self-development and life goals were targeted because of their potential for promoting long-term positive change in developmental trajectory. The development of one's sense of self and of life goals that provide the self with a sense of direction and purpose were central to Erikson's (1968) original conceptualization of identity formation as a life span process and to Marcia's (1966) empirical extension of that conceptualization. In the process of forming an identity, the process of exploration is a critical developmental precursor to making a commitment to a personal sense of identity. It has been characterized as an index of proactive participation in the task of defining for oneself a direction and purpose worthy of personal commitment as well as the acceptance of control and responsibility for whatever choices one makes as part of this process. Moreover, an emerging literature indicates that engagement in exploratory identity processes is positively related to several indices of psychological health (Archer, 1989; Josselson, 1994), and that a lack of engagement in these processes is positively related to involvement in various problem behaviors (Hernandez & DiClemente, 1992; Jones, 1994).

In targeting knowledge of the self and self-realization, we seek to extend the concept of exploration by focusing on both its inward as well as it external features. In doing so, we build on the work of Waterman (1999) as extended by Schwartz (1999). The focus of this work has been on developing an approach to identity development rooted in discovery-based concepts. This approach integrates the concept of exploration for insight as articulated by the psychodynamic tradition in general (Freud, 1914/1963; 1969; Erikson, 1964) and three discovery processes (self-actualization, personal expressiveness, and flow). This approach also extends the concept of exploration. According to this discovery approach to exploration, exploration is primarily a search for insight within, a search for one's best potentials and for one's 'ideal self.' Outward exploration is undertaken is mainly a search for goals, values, and beliefs that match these inner discoveries. Exploration for insight is thus characterized as facilitating the identification and fulfillment of participants' unique talents, competencies, abilities, and potentials as well as identifying the means for living up to or fulfilling those potentials.

Part II:
Measures

Measurement Selection Goals.

Our core battery includes quantitative measures that we have used in our pervious work (Ferrer-Wreder, et al., 2002). These measures are used in the quantitative evaluation of the effects of the intervention in terms of both producing and maintaining intervention gains in the primary developmental domains of interest (i.e., skills/knowledge, attitudes/orientation, and self understanding and insight).

We have included qualitative measures in our core battery to address the need for evaluating the impact of our program on the life course or developmental trajectory of the participants that is often not captured well by traditional self-report questionnaires and structured interviews. Our experience with these measures further highlighted for us the importance of the need for the use of both "open-ended" less structured qualitative markers of change as well as "closed ended" and more structured quantitative indices. This appears to be particularly so with respect to assessing the impact of the intervention in promoting long term positive change in developmental trajectory that is often not captured well by traditional self-report questionnaires and structured interviews, as they tend to focus on incremental changes in specific domains. In our work, for example, we have consistently been able to document reliable incremental positive changes in the critical thinking and discussion skills domain, with effects sizes consistent with those obtained by similar types of interventions. Because one of our goals in working with marginalized youth is to foster in them a greater critical understanding of themselves and the world they live in, we consider this an important contribution. In developing our intervention, however, we seek to do more than increase the average number of alternatives that participants can generate to life challenges or the number of positive or negative consequences they can identity. This is indeed an important skill in a marginalized population that can be characterized, in part, by their perception (rooted in the reality their experience) of the lack of options and alternatives.

In our efforts to realize the emancipatory potential of a transformative and co-constructivist approach, however, we also consider it important to document the intervention's potential for promoting positive change that is qualitative and long term, i.e., we seek to foster qualitative change in their developmental trajectory. In this respect, our goal is not only to build on and extend available intervention approaches; it is also to enlarge and expand available methods for assessing the long term impact of such approaches on the life course of the individuals who participate in our interventions. Our strategy, then, has been to complement the use of quantitative methods with qualitative methods in order to increase the likelihood that we will be successful in capturing and reporting accurately the experiences of the participants, particularly those involving qualitative and long term developmental change.

In our previous experiences in implementing the program we have found that the use of free response qualitative formats also had an additional benefit. The administration of open-ended measures revealed these youth to be not only marginalized with respect to mainstream institutions such as school, but also with respect to most mainstream markers of performance, including the type of structured verbal and written tasks used in academic and research evaluation. Their positive response to the administration of the qualitative measures, consequently, provided some insight with respect to ways we might address the challenge of engaging and maintaining them in the evaluation process across multiple evaluations, particularly with respect to the use of a standardized evaluation battery. Based on this experience, we made a decision to individually monitor the administer all the measures (i.e., "self-report" questionnaires as well as structured interview type measures). Although labor intensive, we considered this to have been the most effective alternative for engaging and maintaining them in the evaluation process. The results of individually administering all of the measures (including "self-reports") provided us with direct feedback for monitoring the extent to which we were successful in engaging and maintaining these youth in the evaluation process. This procedure, combined with the use of multiple strategies to ensure acceptable levels of reliability of the process, contributed significantly to our efforts to substantiate the trustworthiness of the evaluation data.

The core assessment battery that we have been developing for use in evaluating our programs also includes three measures that elicit open ended response data that can be coded using qualitative methods: [the Life Course Interview (Clausen, 1998) and Possible Selves Questionnaire (PSQ; Oyserman, 1987), and the Personally Expressive Activities Questionnaire (PEAQ: Waterman, 1995) as adapted for use in our research program]. The quantitative core measures are used to evaluate the impact of the intervention on three developmental domains: 1) skills and knowledge (the focus in this domain is on critical understanding), 2) attitudes and orientations (the focus here is on control and responsibility), and, 3) self understanding and insight (the focus here is on knowledge of self) using both individually administered performance measures and group administered self-report measures. Within each domain, the quantitative measures that we use to evaluate variables in that domain that were either drawn from the appropriate literature or developed as part of our own program of research. The three qualitative measures included in our core battery, in contrast, are specifically *conceptualized* and *operationalized* as qualitative measures coded for categories that can be analyzed for qualitative change using person oriented qualitative methods.

Finally, as part of our effort to evaluate the implementation of the intervention, we have drawn on the growing interest in developing empirical methods for assessing and evaluating interpersonal processes in counseling in exploring the possibility of empirically evaluating the impact of both group and participant-facilitator process variables on a session-by-session basis. The Session Evaluation Form that we have developed for this purpose and the procedures for administering it will be described at the end of this manual.

Core Battery Quantitative Measures

This section provides a summary of the quantitative measures that are included in the core battery. These measures are used to evaluate the quantitative impact of the program on targeted developmental domains described below.

Skills and Knowledge

The <u>Critical Problem Solving Scale</u> (CPSS; Berman et al.,2000) is a performance measure that assesses three domains of critical problem solving and decision making (creativity, suspension of judgment, and critical evaluation). The CPSS Total Score (CPSSTOT) is the average of all of the scale scores and provides an overall index. Performance on the CPSS is scored by trained raters. Interrater reliability with this population has been reported as 89%. Cronbach's alphas for CPSSTOT have been reported as .70 for college students (Berman, et al.,2000; Bussell, Ferrer, Kurtines, & Cass Lorente, 1996) and .68 in previous research with this high school population (Ferrer-Wreder, et al., 2000/in press).

Attitudes and Orientations

The <u>Personal Responsibility Measure</u> (PRM; Ferrer-Wreder, et al., 2000/in press) assesses control and responsibility with respect to life challenges. The PRM asks participants to generate personal and interpersonal "real life" challenges that they are experiencing currently. Participants are asked to rate, on 5-point Likert scales, aspects of control and responsibility for their decisions and for the possible consequences of those decisions. The PRM yields a total score (PRMTOT) and four scale scores that assess control and responsibility for decisions and their consequences. Cronbach's alphas for PRMTOT have been reported as .78 for college students (Brown et al., 1997) and .73 with this high school population (Ferrer-Wreder, et al., 2000/in press).

The <u>Identity Style Inventory</u> (ISI-6G; White et al., 1998) The ISI (Berzonsky, 1997; White, Wampler & Winn, 1998) assesses three types of identity styles: Informational, Normative, and Diffuse avoidant styles as dimensions of positive psychosocial functioning. An identity style is an individual's orientation toward exploration, closure, and avoidance in situations (i.e., making life choices) that require identity exploration. The ISI-6G consists of 30 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale. It yields three continuous identity style scale scores: information-oriented (INFO), norm-oriented (NORM), diffuse-oriented (DIFF). Cronbach's alphas for the ISI-6G scores have been reported as INFO=.59, NORM=.64, DIFF=.78 COMMIT=.72 for college students (White, et al., 1998) and as INFO=.59, NORM=.56, DIFF=.71, COMMIT=.61 with this population (Ferrer-Wreder, et al., 2002).

The Transformative Goal Attainment Scale (TGA; Swenson, 2003) The TGAS assess both a quantitative and qualitative index of goal attainment. Specifically, it was designed to assess qualitatively the *type* of transformative goals intervention participants strive for as well as assess quantitatively the *degree* to which they report successful attainment of these goals (utilized as an index of mastery experience). The TGAS is comprised of two-part: the TGT and the TGA.

Part I: Transformative Goal Type (TGT): Participants are asked to describe three important life change goals and then to identify their most important change goal ("If you could change anything at all that you wanted to change about yourself or your life, what is the most important thing you would like to change?"). This question is following by a set of three standardized "meaning and significance" questions ("What would this change mean to you?" "Why would this change be significant or important to you?" "How significant or important would it be?"). In addition they are asked, "Is this something you might be able to work on within a counseling setting?" (Yes, No).

Part II: Transformative Goal Attainment (TGA): Part II asks participants who have participated in the CLP intervention condition if they have succeeded in making the changes they wanted to make over the course of the past semester (Yes, No) and, if No, how much progress they have made toward achieving their change goals, rated on a Likert scale of 1 (No Progress) to 5 (Very much). Participants in the control condition are asked if they have worked on their life change goals over the course of the past semester and if yes, are asked what have they did to try to achieve their change goals. They are also asked if they succeeded and if not, to rate how much progress they have made on the same 5-point Likert scale.

Part I (TGT) is scored to identify the number and type of qualitatively different transformative goals that participants report, while part II (TGA) yields a quantitative index of the degree to which participants report having attained their change goals. Because the focus of this study was on mediators of developmental change, participants' ratings of progress toward goal attainment (TGA) was used as the index of transformative goal attainment

The Ego Identity Process Questionnaire (EIPQ; Balistreri et al., 1995) assesses identity exploration and commitment. The EIPQ is a 32 item self-report survey rated on a 5-point Likert scale. The EIPQ contains scales for exploration and commitment, both of which are measured in ideological and interpersonal content areas. Exploration and commitment Cronbach's alphas have been reported as .76 and .75 for college students (Balistreri, et al., 1995) and as .69 and .60 for this high school population (Ferrer-Wreder, et al., 2002).

Zill Behavior Items, Behavior Problem Index (ZBI(BPI))

The original ZBI(BPI) is a 32-item questionnaire administered to parents. This measure was developed in order to examine behavior problems in children aged 4-17 years who were living with one biological parent and one step-parent. The ZBI(BPI) was derived, the Achenbach Behavior Problems Checklist (Achenbach & Edelbrook, 1981) a widely used measure of externalizing and internalizing behavior problems. Each of the items that comprise the ZBI(BPI) describe various behavior problems that may have occurred during the last 3 months. The revision of the ZBI(BPI) is used in the CLP. It was created for the purpose of obtaining self-reports of problem behavior.

The 32 items were reworded to fit the format of self-report, but the content of the items did not change. The following items load on the five subscales:

I. *Antisocial Behavior*: 4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 30

II. *Anxious/Depressed Behavior*: 1, 2, 5, 16, 22, 32

III. *Hyperactive Behavior*: 7, 8, 15, 18, 19

IV*. Peer Conflict/Social Withdrawal*: 13, 17, 23, 29

V. *Headstrong Behavior*: 3, 6, 10, 20, 21

Core Battery Qualitative Measures

The <u>Life Course Interview</u> (LCI; Lewis Arango, 2003) builds on Clausen's (1993; 1995; 1998) pioneering work on the use of Life Reviews and Life Stories in life course research for the methods and procedures that it uses to elicit participants' qualitative descriptions of their life course experiences. More specifically, the Life Course Interview uses Clausen's Life Chart procedure (1998) and a semi-structured interview (structured probes and follow-up questions) drawn from life course theory to elicit and structure free response data of participants regarding their life history and experiences. To this basic narrative structure, the LCI adds seven Themes with corresponding standardized questions and follow-up probes (drawn from psychosocial developmental theory and life course theory) that provides participant's the opportunity to respond to open-ended questions about issues related to their life course experiences in general and their personal identity in particular.

The unstructured responses to the seven Themes of the LCI are classified into qualitatively difference conceptual categories using the Integrated Qualitative/Quantitative Data Analytic Strategy (IQ-DAS) adaptation (Kurtines, Lewis Arango, Kortsch, 2003/in press) of Strauss and Corbin (1998) grounded theory approach to open coding techniques and the use of the method of constant comparison. The IQ-DAS adaptation of Strauss and Corbin's (1998) method of constant comparison for open coding is designed to identify the smallest set of qualitatively different categories in a particular data set

<u>The Possible Selves Questionnaire - Qualitative Extensions</u> (PSQ-QE; Kortsch, 2003) The PSQ-QE builds on the Possible Selves Questionnaire (PSQ; Oyserman, 1987). The PSQ is a self-report questionnaire used to assess variation in possible selves, including participants' goals and motivations as well as fears and anxieties (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Possible selves are the selves that individuals could become, or want to avoid becoming, and represent one aspect of the ability to conceptualize the self in the future. The PSQ asks participants to identify up to four expected selves and four to-be-avoided selves.

The Possible Selves Questionnaire – Qualitative Extension (PSQ-QE) is an extension of the PSQ, adapted and refined to provide a method for eliciting the subjective meaning and significance of participants' possible future selves. The PSQ-QE is used to document qualitative change in the subjective meaning and significance of participants' most important possible selves as a marker of developmental change. For the PSQ-QE, participants are asked to identify up to four expected selves and four to-be-avoided selves; Part II of the PSQ-QE, however, also asks participants to identify their most important possible self and to provide an open ended description of its meaning and significance. In the interview format, as administered as part of the Changing Lives Program, the meaning and significance questions are followed by up to three neutral probes that request secondary elaboration on the meaning and significance. The PSQ-QE thus provides a method for eliciting participants' open-ended descriptions of the subjective meaning and significance of their most important future possible selves.

The unstructured responses to the PSQ-QE are classified into qualitatively difference conceptual categories using the Integrated Qualitative/Quantitative Data Analytic Strategy (IQ-DAS) adaptation (Kurtines, Lewis Arango, Kortsch, 2003/in press) of Strauss and Corbin (1998) grounded theory approach to open coding techniques and the use of the method of constant comparison. The IQ-DAS adaptation of Strauss and Corbin's (1998) method of constant comparison for open coding is designed to identify the smallest set of qualitatively different categories in a particular data set

<u>The Personally Expressive Activities Questionnaire (PEAQ: Waterman, 1995)</u> is used to assess positive changes in both the personal and prosocial content of participants' life goals and change in the degree to which they experience the pursuit of these goals as personally satisfying and expressive of their unique potentials. The PEAQ asks participants to identity three short-range life goals (strivings) that are important to them, and then to rate each striving on fourteen 7-point Likert items. Six items rate the strivings for personal expressiveness, six for enjoyment, and two for flow (Csizkszentmihalyi, 1990).

The PEAQ yields quantitative results that focus on participants' current life goals. More specifically, the yields three quantitative scores with respect to current life goals: personal expressiveness (<u>PE</u>), hedonic enjoyment (<u>HE</u>), and flow (<u>FLOW</u>), the average of the ratings across all activities. Alphas for (<u>PE</u>) and (<u>HE</u>) have been reported as .77, .90, respectively. The (FLOW) scale contains only two items per striving.

The PEAQ also asks participants to identify their most important life goal and to provide an open ended description of its meaning and significance. In the interview format, as administered as part of the Changing Lives Program, the meaning and significance questions are followed by up to three neutral probes that request secondary elaboration on the meaning and significance. The PEAQ thus provides a method for eliciting participants' open-ended descriptions of the subjective meaning and significance of their most important life goal.

The unstructured responses to the PEAQ are classified into qualitatively difference conceptual categories using the Integrated Qualitative/Quantitative Data Analytic Strategy (IQ-DAS) adaptation (Kurtines, Lewis Arango, Kortsch, 2003/in press) of Strauss and Corbin (1998) grounded theory approach to open coding techniques and the use of the method of constant comparison. The IQ-DAS adaptation of Strauss and Corbin's (1998) method of constant comparison for open coding is designed to identify the smallest set of qualitatively different categories in a particular data set.

<div align="center">

Part III:
Evaluation and Measurement
Duties and Responsibilities

</div>

Background

The Evaluation Team is responsible for coordinating the overall activities that take place during the three scheduled evaluation periods (Fall, Winter, and Spring) and the weekly administration of the Session Evaluation Forms (SEFs). This responsibility includes arranging for copies of the measures to be available at the appropriate times, coordinating the flow of the process (e.g., making sure all participants have an ID number, ensuring confidentiality of data, ensuring completeness of data, etc.), and managing the computer processing of the data (e.g., making sure the GAs turn in the completed measures and forms, coding and filing the measures, inputting the data into the computer).

Each Intervention Team (Facilitator, Co-Facilitator, Group Assistant, and Intern Trainee(s)) conducts the evaluations. Within the intervention team, the Co-Facilitator and the GA (see Appendix III for a more detailed description of the GAs duties and responsibilities) have the primary responsibility for ensuring that all of the measures are administered following the administration procedures described in this manual and according to the schedule summarized in Appendix II, Ydp Measures/Forms Administration Schedule. Both individuals have to be knowledgeable about all phases of the evaluation process. This includes all of the measures that are administered for the scheduled evaluation periods (Fall, Winter, and Spring) **and** for the weekly evaluations that take place at the end of *each* individual or group session (see Appendix I for a summary of the measures). Co-Facilitator and the GA are also responsible for obtaining Parental Informed Consent and Student Informed Assent before students are administered any measures. The parent and student Informed Consent and Assent forms are turned in to the YDP Information Manager.

The procedure for conducting this administration is described in detail under the guidelines for the duties and responsibilities of the Group Assistants. The procedure for the intervention team administration of the core battery is described next.

<div align="center">

Overview of the Evaluation Procedure

</div>

The"full" Background Information Form (BIF) is only administered once, at the very first time the student participates in any type of YDP intervention activity. After the initial administration, each student is administered a Background Information Form – Update (BIF-U) at the beginning of each semester. The YDP Core Battery consists of three parts (I, II, and III). Core I is a group administered self-report questionnaire type measure. Core II is administered in a standardized interview format. Core III is an audio taped, open-ended interview. Core I and Core II are administered three times a year at each evaluation period (Fall, Winter, Spring). Core III is administered twice a year at the Fall and Spring evaluation period. General directions for administrating the battery are described next followed by direction for each part.

General Directions

The initial evaluation for each students takes (Background Information Form, Core I, II, and III) takes two session and it will be necessary to adjustment the timing of the administration depending upon whether you are using it for individual or group counseling. Subsequent evaluations (ongoing fall, winter, or spring) will take less depending upon which measures are being administered. In order to get the entire core evaluation battery administered in the shortest possible time it is very important to be organized, to start on time, and to stay on task. The Co-facilitator and Group Assistant for each intervention team for each of the sites should assign responsibilities before the session and everyone should be familiar with the battery and know what is their job for that evaluation session.

The best strategy that we have found for getting the evaluation done in a group setting (if you come up with something better, please share) is to administer the self-report and interview measures at the same time to different students. That is, in order to most effectively use the limited person power available, it has proved more efficient for one person in the team (e.g., the GA) to monitor the administration of the self report part of the battery (BIF, Core I, etc.) and for the remainder of the team (e.g., Facilitator, co-facilitator, and whatever additional help is available on evaluation day) to be individually administering the interview parts of the battery (Core II & III). For example, if you have 6 or 8 participants in your group, one team member can monitor the administration of the self-report measures (BIF, Core I. etc.) to half of the participants (4) while the other two members of the team (along with the other help that is available) are individually administering the interview measures (Core II & III) to the other half (4). As participants complete each part, they can switch to other parts until they have finished all the parts (Core I, II, & III).

Directions for Group Administered Measures:
BIF-U and Core I

The BIF-U and Core I are both group administered self-report questionnaire type measures that contain fill in the blanks and Likert type scale items (1 to 5, etc.). Have the participant write and/or circle their responses directly on the questionnaire.

The team member who is responsible for monitoring the administration of the BIF-U and Core I should spend some time with each participant to make sure that they **are not** having trouble reading the questions, that they **are** answering them in a way that appears to indicate they are reading them, and that they **are not** leaving any of the questions blank or missing. Encourage the participants to be thoughtful and complete when answering the fill in the blank questions, but do not let them spend too much time on any particularly question. When each participant has finished the all the self-report measures, check them carefully to make sure they are is complete. Check every page.

When they have completed all group administered self-report measures and they have been checked, administer them Core II (i.e., the interview parts of the battery) if they have not already done so or arrange for some other member of your team to administer it. Core II is part interview and part self-report, but it MUST be individually administered with the team member who is administering it responsible for writing down the parts that need to be recorded in writing.

Interview Measures:
Directions Administering BIF, Core Battery II and III

BIF, Core II and III are individually administered.

The BIF (the "full" Background Information Form) is only administered at once, as part of the initial assessment and at that time it is conducted as a individually administered interview. It is important that a participant's initial baseline background information be as complete as possible. Subsequent administrations of the BIF are done following the procedures for group-administered measures described in the previous section.

Core II contains the PRM, CPSS, PSQ, and the PEAQ. Core III contains the LCI. Core II and Core III both require that the interviewer read the stories or test stimuli to the participants and records their answers. For the sections of Core II that require responses to Likert type scales (1 to 5, etc.), the interviewer asks the questions and records (circles) the participant's response on the interview protocol. Core III, the LCI, is an open-ended clinical interview that is audiotape recorded.

For the sections of Core II that requires open-ended responses and all of core III, the interviewer administers the questions using what we call the Iterative Interviewing Procedure (IIP) and either writes down participants' responses on the appropriate place on the interview protocol or for the LCI audio tape-records participants' responses. Because we use the same basic IIP procedure for administering the open-ended responses to all the Core II and III measures (i.e., PRM, CPSS, PSQ, PEAQ, LCI), we will illustrate the basic procedure using the Meaning and Significance questions from the PSQ, PEAQ, and LCI. In addition to the basic IIP procedure, we also use a specialized version with the Generating Alternatives Questions from the CPSS, which will be described at the end of this section.

In learning how to use this interviewing method, it will be helpful to have some understanding of why we use open-ended responses on the measures and why it is important to use the interviewing procedure to elicit the fullest possible range of information from the participant you are interviewing. Therefore, the next section provides you with some background with respect to the development of the interview method and its measurement goals.

Administering the YDP qualitative measures: The Iterative Interviewing Procedure (IIP)

The qualitative measures included in our core battery (e.g., the PSQ, PEAQ, and LCI) are specifically *conceptualized* as measures for indexing the subjective meaning and significance of participants' life course experiences are intended to be coded for qualitative categories using person oriented qualitative methods. The Meaning and Significance questions for all the qualitative measures are intended to elicit participants' open-ended qualitative descriptions of a diversity of domains of life course experiences. More specifically, the LCI uses a semi-structured interview (structured probes and follow-up questions) to elicit and structure free response data of participants regarding their life history and experiences, and the PSQ and the PEAQ elicit the same type of content with respect to participants' future possible selves and life goals. All the part of each of these measures that elicit this type of material use a semi-structured free-response interview format that asks respondents to identify relevant material and then follow-up with probes that elicit more detail about the meaning and significance of the material in question.

The individual's responses are either written down (in a detailed summary) in the case of the PSQ and the PEAQ or audiotape recorded for transcription in the case of the LCI. These measures are included to provide direct access to the participants' own personal expressions of the subjective experience of what is meaningful and significant in their lives, including their experiences in the program. They are intended to complement the structured quantitative measures, which provide a useful method for documenting the impact of the intervention on the targeted developmental domains in terms of change that can be measured quantitatively and incrementally. It is thus the participants' personal expressions of their life experiences and the impact of the intervention on their lives that we seek to elicit and capture with the Meaning and Significance Questions (and probes) of the qualitative measures included in Core II and III.

The Iterative Interviewing Procedure (IIP) that we will describe in this section was developed to allow us to elicit and capture the fullest possible range of information from the participant in their <u>open-ended responses</u>. These open-ended responses provide the participants with the opportunity to describe the phenomenology of their lives and the impact of the program on their live in their own terms, using their own concepts and constructs. Our aim is to capture as best we can the changes that are taking place in their live in terms of personally relevant concepts and constructs that are meaningful and significant to them (e.g., the life challenges they face, their personal life goals, the future they see for themselves, etc.).

To do so, the qualitative measures each structured in such a way that enables to participant to identify the specific content of the most important construct in the target domain of the measure (e.g., most important life goal, most important future possible self, most important life change goal, etc.) and the Iterative Interviewing Procedure is then used to structure the use of the follow-up probes to facilitate the elaboration of the meaning and significance of the concept to that person. This process of eliciting the meaning of a concept and secondary elaboration on its meaning and significance is at the core of the Iterative Interviewing Procedure.

In using the IIP It is important to recognize that there are time constraints on the interview process and that every effort should be made to move through the interview quickly. However, it is also important to recognize that although the interview needs to be done as quickly as possible, it is essential that you allow the participant the opportunity to respond fully. Our guidelines are that you should stay on task throughout the interview, but do not attempt to hurry through it. If the interview does not get completed during one session, you can always reschedule with the participant and follow-up later. In other words, do not sacrifice the opportunity to obtain a full interview for the sake of saving a few minutes of time. It takes a great deal of time and resources to implement the intervention, and the information obtained from the measures is critical to finding out whether we are achieving our goals of having a positive impact on the lives of the young people we work with. We will not be able to do so if we have incomplete or fragmented information. To the extent that the interview procedure is conducted under optimal conditions (e.g., good rapport, sufficient time for the administration, etc.) the questions and probes used to elicit meaning and

significance and secondary elaboration of them tends to yield a richness of data with respect to the meaning and significance of the relevant constructs and concepts to the participant being interviewed.

An example of using IIP and neutral probes to elicit meaning and significance information from the PEAQ

In the case of the PEAQ the participant is asked to describe three life goals. They are then asked to tell which they consider their *most important life goal, that is, the goal that MOST comes to mind when you ask yourself the question," What do I want to do with my life?*

The interviewer then asks the Meaning and Significance Questions: These include*:*

<u>What</u> it means to you. <u>How</u> important it is to you. <u>Why</u> it is important to you.

The order in which they answer the questions is not important, but it is important that you try to answer all three questions*.*

The *Meaning and Significance Questions* are asked to elicit participants' subjective expressions of the personal meaning and significance of their life goals and then the IIP is used to with follow-up with probes that elicit more detail about the meaning and significance of the material in question. The *Meaning Question* asks the participant to provide a description of **what** the life goal **is** and what it **means** to her/him. In administering the questions and secondary elaboration probes, the participant should be allowed to completely respond to the question (and each probe) as they are administered. In administering the meaning question and probes.

The *Significance Question* asks the participant "**Why** is this significant or important to you?" and "**How** significant or important is this to you?" In probing for significance, the goal of IIP is to obtain a description of **why** it is important and **how** important it is.

We have found that some participant's respond with as little as a sentence or two. For example, in response to the Meaning Question, a participant might say, "I would like to quit drugs; but I might lose some of my good friends." Or "I want to be a rock star because then I would be rich and famous." etc.). Others provide a more detailed response. The use of the secondary elaboration probes are described next.

If the participant provides a detailed response and the meaning appears to be clear, the interviewer should still follow up with at least one of Probes for Secondary Elaboration ("Can you say more about what you mean by/about_____?" "Does that (_____) mean anything else?" "Can you think of anything else?")**.** For example, "Can you say more about what you mean by losing some of your good friends." Or, "Can you say more about what you mean by being rich and famous."

The purpose of this secondary elaboration probe is to elicit any additional information the participant wants to provide. For example, if in the interviewer's judgment the participant's first response consisted of a relatively unambiguous description of the meaning of the challenge, the probe should elicit essentially the same meaning ("Like I said, quitting drugs means that some of my friends will not think that I am cool anymore."). The same procedure is followed for identifying and clarifying the significance of the concept, i.e., asking the Significance Question ("**Why** is losing some of your friend significant or important to you?" **How** significant or important is losing some of your friend significant or important to you?") and following up with the secondary elaboration probes to elicit any additional information the participant wants to share (or you have administered three standard probes, see the text box on the Use of Probes). As discussed in the text box, the probes for secondary elaboration are administered at least once but no more than three times.

Because the open-ended responses are subjected to qualitative coding, the secondary elaboration the participant provides in defining both meaning and the significance should be recorded (written down) <u>in as much detail as possible</u> in the appropriate spaces on the interview protocol. Be sure to record enough information so that the response makes sense to the person who will be doing the coding.

For purposes of standardization, it is important that when using a standardized interview the interviewer **does not probe** for information beyond what the limits set by the interview protocol. That is, the interviewer should not ask more than other interviewers, thereby skewing the results obtained with that particular interview. If a participant's response to question is something like, "I don't know. I never thought about that." this is an appropriate response. It should be followed-up with a single neutral probe (e.g., "Can you say more about what you mean?).

If it is the first time they are being assessed, it is actually highly likely to be true. Even if they have been assessed multiple times, it still might be true. Even if you think (feel, sense, etc.) it is NOT true, however, do not try to get the participant to answer more. If they give you a complete and articulate response to a question, it is because that's what they want to do. If they give you an incomplete or partial answer (or no answer), it is because that what they want to do. And that is the answer we want to capture with the interview – the answer they want to give you, not the answer you can get out of them. The interviewer, for example, should not try to "be helpful" by saying things to encourage extra effort, e.g., "I know you can answer more than you have said."

In addition, the interviewer should not respond to questions by adding new information. If the participant asks a question, the interviewer may **repeat** the directions and the standard secondary elaboration probes, but add **nothing** to them. In other words, do not expand or elaborate the directions, the questions, or the probe for the participant being interviewed beyond the directions, questions, and probes that all of the other participants receive.

In addition, no interviewer should repeat the directions for any section of the interview more than three times or any of the probes to the questions more than three times. If the participant continues to ask for more directions or if the meaning or significance is unclear after three probes, offer a transitional sentence (e.g., "Okay, let's try the next one.") and move on to the next part of the interview.

The final section illustrates the use of IIP in the special case of identifying and clarifying number of alternative participant generate in response to their most important life challenge from the CPSS.

Using IIP as a method for identifying distinctive responses from the CPSS

In addition to identifying the meaning and significance of the participant's open-ended responses, the IIP is also used to determine the number of distinct or different alternatives (best choices, worse choices, etc.) participants can generate for the life challenge they report on the CPSS. This is accomplished using the modified interviewing procedure described in this section.

As part of the interview protocol, the participant is asked describe as many different alternative ways as s/he can for solving the problem (meeting this challenge, resolving this issues, making this decision, etc.) they report on the CPSS. In using IIP to determine the number of distinct alternatives the participant can generate, the interviewer first attempts to establish at least one distinct alternative and then proceeds to determine whether the participant can generate any additional distinct alternatives using a modification of the secondary elaboration probes determine whether the additional alternatives are different or distinct from the other alternatives.

Identifying the First Alternative. After the being asked to describe her/his first alternative, the participant should be allowed to completely respond to the question. When the participant has finished her/his response, the interviewer makes a judgment with respect to the distinctness and clarity of the response. If the participant's first alternative is clear, the interviewer records it (writes it down) as Alternative 1 and moves on to the second alternative. However, in the initial stages of generating alternatives, we recommend that the response be followed up by the secondary elaboration probe, "Can you say more about what you mean?" even if the response appears to be relatively unambiguous. Once again, the purpose of this probe is making certain that the participant has supplied at least one distinct alternative. For example, if in the interviewer's judgment, the participant's first response consisted of only one distinct alternative; the probe should elicit a description of essentially the same alternative.

We have also found that the participant's initial response will sometimes elicit more than one alternative. In cases where it is clear that the participant has provided more than one alternative, the interviewer

follows up with a secondary elaboration probe directed at one of the alternatives, usually the most elaborate one. "Can you say more about what you mean by the first (or second, etc) alternative?" In cases where the participant's response to the original question is ambiguous but appears to cover more than one alternatives, the secondary elaboration probe "Can you say more about what you mean?" is *always* be administered. The probe should elicit at least one alternative that matches an alternative that emerged in response to the original question. The same probe is then again used to clarify what appears to be the primary alternative. If in the interviewer's judgment the primary alternative is now clear, the interview moves on to additional alternatives. If the elaboration probe does not render explicit at least one primary alternative, the probe is used a third time. If the third use of the probe does not yield at least one distinct primary alternative, the interviewer moves on to the next part of the interview and records, No Alternatives, on the interview protocol.

Identifying the Second Alternative. After the participant has generated at least one clear alternative, ask the question, "Can you think of any more (or other) alternatives?" followed by the statement, "We are interested in finding out how many different or distinct alternatives you can think of." The purpose of the use of the questions and probes in the first alternative was to elicit at least one clear primary alternative. The purpose of the use of the questions and probes from this point on is to find out if the participant can provide of any additional alternatives that are, in the interviewer's judgment, different or distinct from the first. Hence the importance of attempting to elicit a single, relatively unambiguous alternative in the first set of questions and probes. If the participant responds with a second alternative, the interviewer *always* follow up with the probe, "How is that different from the first alternative?" unless in the interviewer's judgment the difference is obvious. We have found that in a number of cases it will be clear to the interviewer that it is a different alternative. If the response to the "How is that different?" probe is not clear, the interviewer uses the "Can you say more about that?" probe to attempt to get the participant to clarify the difference. The "How is that different probe?" as with the other probes, can be used *at least once, but not more than three times*. In some cases, the second alternative will not be clearly different from the first. In these cases, the purpose of the "How is that different?" probe is to determine if the participant really does understand a second alternative. Participants will frequently acknowledge following the use of the probe that the second alternative is not really different from the first. If the participant cannot make clear what the difference is and/or acknowledges that the alternative is not really different, ask the question, "Can you think of any more alternatives?" again and follow it up with the probe, "How is that different from the first alternative?" If the participant cannot provide an unambiguous second alternative at this point the interviewer moves on to the next part of the interview. If the participant does provide a different alternative, record it as Alternative 2 and move on to the *Third Alternative*. It is important to remember to record any secondary elaboration on each alternative as the interview progresses.

Identifying the Third and Fourth Alternatives. The interviewer uses the same sequence for the third and four alternatives as used for the second alternative. The interviewer asks the question "Can you think of any other alternatives?" and follows that up with the probe, "How is that different from the other alternatives usually *at least once but no more than three times*. Continue to record each additional alternative. If the participant provides more than four alternatives, continue to elicit additional responses and record the total number of alternatives the participant has generated.

Follow-Up And Data Checking.

The importance of follow-up and data checking cannot be overemphasized. It is essential that the team members make sure that all parts of the battery are completely filled out and that each part has a participant ID number recorded on it. There should be **no missing data** on the measures and **no measures without IDs**.

As each participant completes each part of the battery, the person administering that part must check **each page** of the measure before going on. If any responses are missing that need to be filled in, ask the participant for the information for those responses. Do not collect incomplete measures -- There is nothing we can do with them.

All of us put many hours of effort into working with these young people to promote positive development (and we hope that's what we are doing), but without some data and feedback we can never know if our

efforts have done any good or how to make our efforts better or more effective in the future. The data we collect as part of the measurement and evaluation process is an essential part of making the program work and getting it to work better but the data has to be collected in ways that can be used. Incomplete data cannot be used.

What is important about the measurement and evaluation process is that we use it to obtain important information that benefits them. It is good to remind them of this. That is, that we do not do this just to hassle them; instead, it is how we find out if our work is making a difference and, if not, what we can do to make it better.

A good time to remind participants of the importance of evaluation is in the group sessions that precede the start of the evaluation process. It is also good to remind them again when you find it necessary to discuss with individual participants missing data on their measures. If a participant has not completed all of the questions and gives you reasons why they can't (won't, shouldn't have to, etc.), remind them that the evaluations are our main way of finding out if we have been giving them what they need and/or want and also that it is they main way we have for making the program better. Remind them that the information they give us helps us to our job better, and that we NEED their information to do this.

Appendix I:
YDP MEASURES/FORMS ADMINISTRATION SCHEDULE

MEASURES/FORMS	Initial Evaluation	Weekly	Fall	Winter	Spring	Follow up
Initial Evaluation Measures/Forms						
YDP Background Information Form (BIF)	X					
YDP Parent Consent Form	X					
YDP Student Assent Form	X					
YDP Confidentiality (Handout)	X					
YDP Group Rules (Handout)	X					
Process Measures						
YDP Session Evaluation Form (SEF)		X				
YDP Participant Evaluation Rating Form (PERF)		X				
Scheduled Evaluations						
YDP Background Information Form Update (BIF-U)			X		X	X
YDP Core Battery I: EIPQ, EPSI, ISI, ZBI (PBI), PSID-CDS, IDS	X		X	X	X	X
YDP Core Battery II: CPSS, PRM, PSQ, PEAQ	X		X	X	X	X
YDP Core Battery III: LCI	X		X		X	X

Appendix II:
YDP PARTICIPANT TRACKING AND
MEASURES/FORMS PROCESSING CHECKLIST (PTMPC)
Facilitator's Guidelines

Duties and Responsibilities

This Appendix describes the procedures to be followed in tracking status of the participants in your counseling groups and/or their attrition, i.e., In Groups **or** No Longer In Group (NLIG) over the course of the year (Fall and Spring semesters at the high schools). Tracking of participants attrition is accomplished using the Participant Tracking and Measures/Forms Processing Checklist (PTMPC) and the processing of evaluation measures and forms at the appropriate times (Fall, Winter, Spring Evaluation Periods) is also accomplished using the PTMPC. The intervention team *facilitator* is responsible for overseeing participant tracking and measures/forms processing and all other intervention team members (Co-facilitators, GAs, ITs, etc.) are responsible for administrating the assessments *in their entirety* as well as assisting the facilitator in other necessary tracking and evaluation-management duties.

Conducting Assessments

All ITs are required to administer at least three assessments per semester (with highest priority going to following up on participants who have been previously assessed, preferably by them) each semester, and more if they are needed. Assessments beyond three should be shared equally among ITs, i.e., no single IT should assess more participants than all others. In their role as "evaluator" (i.e., the person who administers all the forms and measures to a participant) ITs are responsible for following through and completing all phases of the assessments they have been assigned. ITs that do not complete their assessment assignments will be given an unsatisfactory performance evaluation at the end of the semester.

Facilitators and GAs are responsible for assigning the ITs their assessments "cases." GAs, Co-Facilitators, and Facilitators also conduct assessments on an "as needed basis." Once a team member (at any level) of a specific intervention team (e.g., ACE Anger Management, 2nd Period; CAN Substance Use, 3rd Period, etc.) is assigned as the evaluator for a specific student participant in that counseling group, that team member is responsible for following through on all subsequent assessments for that student participant for the duration of the participants' and/or team members' assignment to that counseling group. Again, all ITs in a team should share the total assessment responsibility equally, and assignments of new evaluations should take into account the current equality of work distribution.

Ensuring Completion of the Assessments

It is essential that all assessments be fully completed; any incomplete portions will be returned to the Facilitator to return to the IT to complete. ITs have to do whatever is necessary to get the missing data including, contacting students at lunch time or free periods to complete the assessment if they cannot be pulled out of group. All assessments must be checked for completion by the evaluator and verified by the facilitator. Completion includes all questions being legibly answered (or at least "attempted") with all correct identification information on the assessment front page, to include the following:

> Assessment date
>
> School
>
> Student name
>
> Student ID number
>
> Student activity level: CLP (intervention condition), WLC (wait-list condition), LCP (longitudinal condition).

Using the PTMPC for Tracking Participant Attrition and Monitoring Measure Processing

The Facilitator and the GA are responsible for maintaining the PTMPC up-to-date across the entire high school year (Fall and Spring Semester) and throughout all evaluation periods (Fall, Winter, and Spring).

Directions for filling in the PTMPC

At the beginning of the fall semester, you will be provided with a tentative list of students in your group(s), a packet of blank PTMPCs, and evaluation folders with a new set of the appropriate core measures in each folder. Do not add in the student names from the tentative list to the PTMPC until you are sure they show up and a willing to participate in your group. More specifically, do not enter a name and number for a student until they are far enough along in the process to be assigned an evaluator and are administered a component of the evaluation. After a student has completed at least one component of the core battery and you have entered her/his name on the list, then they have "officially" started your group. After that, do not remove that student's name from checklist. The student name remains on your checklist for the entire year. The PTMPC is used to track attrition from the groups as described next.

Tracking Attrition. From that point on (i.e., after a student is "officially" in your group), if/when that student drops out of your group, i.e., are No Longer In Group (NLIG) track that student's attrition status as you best know it in the "notes" column using this format:

NLIG, Date ___Code # __

The NLIG Codes to be used are:

1=NLIG, Still at this school in other Group,

2=NLIG, Still at this school no longer in Groups,

3=NLIG, Still in school, not this School,

4= NLIG, No longer in school,

5= NLIG, Other___

 If a new student(s) joins the group, add their name to the bottom of the list. When the page fills, continue on additional pages recording the page number of each additional page. The Data Management Team will request update "copies" of the PTMPC throughout the year. For purposes of updating, turn in a Xerox copy of the original and not the original itself. All of the pages of the original PTMPC are kept by the Facilitator/GA until the end of the year and at that time the original PTMPC is to be turned into the Data Management Team.

Processing Assessment Components during each Evaluation Period

You will be provided with evaluation folders with a new set of the appropriate core measures in each folder at the beginning of each evaluation period (F, W, S). You should keep the evaluation folders on site so that assessments can continue if a particular team is absent, but Facilitators/GAs must return all completed components of the assessments (e.g., Core I, II, etc.) as they are completed to the YDP Lab EVERY WEEK for processing. Do not leave any completed evaluation material at the school. When all the components of the core battery have been completed and turned in, return the empty folder for recycling.

Again, as soon as each assessment component is completed and properly recorded on the PTMPC, it should be brought to the YDP lab and filed appropriately.

Assessment components should be filed in the YDP lab as follows:

Assent/Consent/Life Course Charts – in the individual high school student's folder (if the student does not have a folder, one should be made for them and *filed according to school and then student ID number*)

BIF/Core I/Core II/Core III – in the "data to be entered" drawer *according to school and assessment type* (these are the assessment components that must then be entered into the SPSS data files)

Appendix III:
Group Assistant and Intern Trainees
Duties and Responsibilities

Group Assistants play an essential role in the Youth Development Project's intervention teams. GAs contribute to achieving the intervention objectives (and they get first-hand exposure to intervention process in a counseling setting that is personally rewarding), but it is their role in maintaining the integrity of the research and evaluation protocol that makes them crucial to the success of the Youth Development Project. GAs are responsible for working with their facilitator to ensure that all evaluation data are properly collected.

In all of the activities described in this section, the GA is assisted by all of the ITs assigned to her/his group. The GA assumes responsibility for training the IT(s) to take over these responsibilities in the GA's absence (and for coordinating having the GA's responsibilities covered in such cases) as well as for eventually assuming the role of GA on an intervention team. RTs may be involved in administering assessments and in other ways in contact with students. In such cases, their conducted is governed by the same rules as the ITs

The primary duties and responsibility of Group Assistants involve a number of important tasks. The first is working with the facilitator to make sure that all members of their group complete their initial and semester evaluation each semester. The second is filling out the keeping attendance using the procedure designated by the school. Finally, GAs are responsible for administering the Session Evaluation Form at the end of each group session.

GA's Semester Tasks

Completion of Initial and Scheduled Evaluations

GAs work directly with the facilitator (and share responsibility for) making sure that all members of their group complete the regularly scheduled Fall, Winter, and Spring semester evaluations each semester and/or their Initial Evaluation[2] and that the completed evaluations are turned using the procedures described in the **Facilitator's Measures Processing Guidelines**. Although the facilitator is ultimately responsible making sure that all evaluations are completed (i.e., that students in their group have finished all components of the assessment), the GA provides the facilitator with direct support for this activity, using whatever means necessary. This means that the GA has to take whatever steps are necessary (e.g., make arrangements to have the evaluations administered before, after, during their sessions, or by means of appointments with individual students on days when they are not in counseling) to get the assessment completed. If any of the participants in the GA's group do not complete the assessment at the scheduled assessment time, it is the responsibility of the facilitator (with the help of the GA) to take whatever steps necessary to get them completed (this includes recruiting additional help if it is more than you can handle yourself). It is absolutely essential that you not fall behind on this task. If you (the GA) find yourself falling behind, bring the issue up with your facilitator or because this is an issue for the entire intervention team. The GA should first bring up any issues or obstacles to completing the assessments within the team in order to get done what is necessary to get the assessments completed. If further help is needed, the facilitator bring the issue up with the Evaluation Team Leader. Everyone in the project has a stake in maintaining the integrity of the protocol, so you can get as much help as you need.

---

[2]All students who receive counseling need to complete an initial evaluation. For the initial evaluation the participant receives the initial (Long Form) Background Information Form (YDP: BIF), Core I, II, and III. This is the first time the participant's ID number will appear in the computer data file and this evaluation will serve as the baseline evaluation for this participant. On all subsequent evaluation, the receives the (Up-date, Short Form) Background Information Form-Update (YDP: BIF-U). If the participant starts counseling after the regularly scheduled evaluations, the GA is responsible for making sure the new participant receives an Initial Evaluation (YDP: BIF) and that the evaluation is turned in to the Evaluation Team.

GA's and IT's Weekly Tasks: Escorting Students to Counseling Sessions and Back to Class

GAs are responsible for insuring that for each week the students are escorted to the location where their sessions are being held that week (e.g., office, cafeteria, park, etc.) and are escorted back to class at the end of the session. The student participants are to be accompanied by at least one member of the intervention team (i.e., IT, GA, Co-facilitator, Facilitator) at ALL times when they are not in counseling sessions or in class. The following procedures are to be used in getting the students to group and back to class. Because of the complex and evolving nature of the context in which the session are offered and the differing sites they are offered at, all intervention team members responsible for keeping up to date on in the procedure at their placement site.

Escorting Students to Counseling Sessions

The students in the counseling groups have been given a pass to be in counseling sessions during the scheduled times. Because the students have been released from class to attend the counseling groups, during this time they are under the supervision of the intervention team. During this time, the student participants are to be accompanied by at least one member of the intervention team (i.e., IT, GA, Co-facilitator, Facilitator) at ALL times.

Walking Students to Session

If you are working with your participants on school property, walk with them to the designated location (e.g., cafeterias during evaluation periods). The students must be escorted to session location and back to class. Students are not allowed to walk around the school building unescorted without a hall pass, a "yellow" slip, even to go to the bathroom. The only time they students are allowed in the halls without a pass is during break between periods. For this reason, you should not authorize them going to the bathroom during sessions. They know that they should use the bathroom during class breaks, and you should remind them of this. If you feel that it is really an emergency, you should either escort them or write them a hall pass. Teachers have to do this, and we do as well. If they are stopped in the hall without a pass and you are the one that released them, then you are responsible for the consequences that follow.

If you are working with your groups off school property, then it is essential that they be escorted at all times. Students are not allowed to walk to or from sessions off school property (e.g., at the park) without an escort. They may tell you otherwise, but that does not change anything. They are still released to you and you are responsible for them. If something happens to them and you are not with them, you are responsible for what happens. If there is some need for your session to end before the end of the class period, the students must be escorted back to class. If your group is being held off campus, this means that a team member has to walk them back to class. If you are escorting them back to the school after the end of a session and arrive at the school during (or just before the period break), you can release them on school property (after the bell for break rings) because they have only been released to you for the period of your session. Until the bell rings, however, they are your responsibility.

At the Session Location and Walking Students Back to Class

During sessions off school property, the intervention team is responsible for the conduct of the students. If the session is in the park, the facilitator is responsible for the students after they arrive. If the team breaks up (e.g., for evaluations), each team member is responsible for the student with them (and all the rules and procedures described in this document).

When the session is over, the students must be escorted back to class. Again, if there is some need for your session to end before the end of the class period, the students must be escorted back to class not just to school property. They are not allowed to be in the halls or around school (outside of class) without a pass (except during break and lunch). If they are caught at the school outside of class without a pass when they are released to you, then you are responsible for the consequences that follow.

Administering the Session Evaluation Form (SEF)

GAs are responsible for administering the Session Evaluation Form at the end of each group (or individual) session that s/he participants in. To complete this task the GA should have the SEF ready before the session ends. This means that the GA should the student fill in their ID number (not their name) on one of the SEF forms that they use to evaluate that session. The GAs also have to be responsible for monitoring the session time to ensures that the session process comes to an end **at least five minutes** before the end of the time allotted for the session so there is time to complete the session evaluation.

GA's Weekly Session Tasks

To successfully complete their weekly session tasks, it is important that GAs know *all* the members of their group by name *and* by ID number. All student participants are identified by their school ID numbers for purposes of data tracking and management. The IDs are essential for maintaining the confidentiality of the data and the anonymity of the participants. GAs should know the number as well as the names of all participants in their sessions.

GAs are also responsible for having all of the material that will be needed to complete their tasks on hand before the session starts. This means having the appropriate number of forms, pencils, etc. when you get to the school. In some schools it is possible to make a limited number of copies, but it is better to have everything ready when you get there.

Although missing sessions is strongly discouraged, if it becomes necessary to miss a session it is crucial that you arrange with the co-facilitator to take attendance and administer the Session Evaluation Form (as described below) for any session that you miss.

Evaluating Level of Participation

Immediately after the conclusion of each session, the GA is responsible for soliciting the input of the two other intervention team members for purposes of evaluating the level of participation of each participant in that session. The levels of participation are:

5=very active/constructive, 4=active/constructive, 3=active, 2=passive, 1=passive/unconstructive

The number assigned to the evaluation of each individual's participation should be the consensus of the intervention team as arrived at through discussion at the end of the session. If the team assigns a Rating of 1 or 2 or 4 of 5, the GA should write down the team's consensual justification (reason) for the rating and any other relevant comments

After session closure, remind the facilitator and co-facilitator that they should not be present when the participants complete the evaluation form. After the facilitator and co-facilitators leave, give each participant the SEF form with their ID number on it.

Remind the participants their evaluation is anonymous -- that there are no names on the form and that the members of the intervention team will not see the forms as the data manager collects the forms after the session. It is important that you (the GA) remind them that we need them to be honest in filling out the evaluation form. If we are going to make the programs better we have to know what is working and what is not working and the only way we can find out is if they share their true feelings with us. Explain this to the participants in words that you feel comfortable with and that are appropriate for your group. Remind students of this several times each semester, especially if you see indications that "response set" has developed, rather than thoughtful and honest completion of the form. When they are finished, collect the SEFs a turn them using the procedure provided by the Evaluation Team Leader.

It is important for research purposes that the facilitators and co-facilitators be "blind" with respect to the session evaluation so as to not compromise the results. It is therefore very important that you make every effort to maintain the integrity of the evaluation. The SEFs and the ratings for level of participation MUST be turned in to the Evaluation Team EVERY WEEK (consult the ETL for the current procedure).