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Objectives

- What is the history of Positive Youth Development (PYD) in the United States?
- What concepts have been used to define PYD?
- What has been the impact of PYD?
- Provide an example of a PYD program and outcomes across development
History of Positive Youth Development Programs: United States Experience

- Early 1900’s Adolescence emerges as a distinct stage of development
- Service programs, YM(W)CA, Scouting, 4H, Boys and Girls Clubs develop; education extended to be more universal
- 1950’s Juvenile crime intervention and treatment programs first supported by government
- 1950-1970 Treatment programs for adolescents expand to substance use, conduct disorder, academic failure, pregnancy
- Mid 1960’s-mid 1970’s Prevention programs focused on a single problem begin to be developed; most ineffective
- Mid 1970’s-1980’s Prevention programs focus on precursors of a single problem, some successes occur
- Late 1980’s-early 1990’s Critiques begin of single problem approach to prevention
**Positive Youth Development (PYD)**

*Critiques of Single Problem Behavior Focus of Early Prevention Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioners and Policy Makers</th>
<th>Prevention Scientists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on single problems ignores the whole child.</td>
<td>Overlapping risk and protective factors predict diverse problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the individual and downplays the role of the environment.</td>
<td>Risk and protective factors located in both individual and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental needs and competencies ignored.</td>
<td>Developmental needs, processes and tasks often ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-free does not mean fully prepared or healthy.</td>
<td>Protective factors often not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separates promotion from prevention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations for a Broader Conception of Youth Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioners/ Policy Makers</th>
<th>Prevention Scientists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>■ Focus on whole child</td>
<td>■ Address risk and protective factors for multiple problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Focus on developmental needs and challenges.</td>
<td>■ Address risk and protective factors during critical developmental periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Focus on the individual as well as the environment.</td>
<td>■ Engage multiple socialization units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Address cultural competence in program delivery</td>
<td>■ Understand the developmental epidemiology of the target population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Include promotion and prevention.</td>
<td>■ Include those at greatest risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convergence in critiques and recommendations led the Department of Health and Human Services to commission the first review of youth development program efficacy (Catalano et al., 1998)
Positive Youth Development Concepts

- Reviewed literature that described youth development approach (1996)
- Identified concepts being discussed to define the purview of this developing field
- Augmented through subsequent national and international reviews eg., Annenberg-Sunnylands Task Force on PYD (Seligman, Berkowitz, Catalano et al., 2005)
Positive Youth Development

**Concepts**

- Social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive and moral competence
- Self-efficacy
- Self-determination
- Clear and positive identity
- Belief in the future
- Opportunities for positive social involvement
- Recognition for positive behavior
- Bonding
- Positive norms
- Spirituality
- Resiliency
- Positive emotions
- Life satisfaction

Catalano et al., 1998; 2002;
Seligman, Berkowitz, Catalano et al., 2005;
Shek et al., 2007; Catalano, Hawkins & Toumbourou, 2008; 2014

Gavin, Catalano, David-Ferdon, Gloppen, Markham, 2010. A review of positive youth development programs that promote adolescent sexual and reproductive health. Journal of Adolescent Health, 46 (3 Suppl. 1)*

*Sponsored by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
PYD Program Review
Inclusion Criteria

- Promotive approach directed at youth aged 0-20
- Address positive youth development constructs
- Comprehensive (multiple concepts or socialization domains targeted)
- Strong evaluation
- Demonstrate *behavioral* outcomes on either (or both) positive or problem behavior
Review Methods

- Electronic search of online databases plus review of grey literature (1985-2007)

- Identified studies were summarized using a standard review form

- Each summary prepared independently by two reviewers who then met to reach consensus

- Program summaries were confirmed by original program developers (~70%)
Inclusion Criteria for this Presentation

- Found to be effective in the two reviews (38 total programs)
- Impact on substance Use or delinquent behavior (20 efficacious programs from the two reviews)
## Effective Programs Pre-School

**PYD Program**
- **Abecedarian Project**  
  (Campbell, Ramey et al., 2002)
- **High/Scope Perry Preschool**  
  (Schweinhart et al., 1992, 2005)

**Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes**
- Substance use
- Crime, substance use

**Other outcomes**
- Academic achievement, employment, teen birth
- Academic achievement, family relationships, teen pregnancy, employment
## Effective Programs
### Elementary School Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PYD Program</th>
<th>Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes</th>
<th>Other outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Social Development Project (Hawkins et al., 1999; Lonczak, Hawkins et al., 2005; 2008)</td>
<td>Crime/delinquency, heavy alcohol use, violence</td>
<td>Academic achievement, High school grad, ever sex, # of partners, delayed initiation, STI, pregnancy or birth, mental health diagnoses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know Your Body (Walter, Vaughan and Wynder, 1989)</td>
<td>Smoking initiation</td>
<td>Healthy diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) (Greenberg, 1996; Greenberg &amp; Kusche, 1997)</td>
<td>Aggression (Externalizing), conduct problems</td>
<td>Mental health symptoms (Internalizing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Example PYD Program
Seattle Social Development Project
Intervention Components

- **Teacher Training in Classroom Instruction and Management**
  (opportunities, recognition, bonding, positive norms)

- **Parent Training in Behavior Management and Academic Support**
  (opportunities, recognition, bonding, positive norms)

- **Child Social, Emotional and Cognitive Skill Development**
  (skills, self-efficacy, self determination, belief in the future)
Intervention has specific benefits for children from poverty through age 18.

- More attachment to school
- Fewer held back in school
- Better achievement
- Less school misbehavior
- Less drinking and driving

**By age 18**

Youths in the Full Intervention had

- Less heavy alcohol use
- Less initiation of delinquency
- Better family management
- Better family communication
- Better family involvement
- Higher attachment to family
- Higher school rewards
- Higher school bonding

By age 18 youths in the Full Intervention had:

- Less heavy alcohol use
- Less lifetime violence
- Less lifetime sexual activity
- Fewer lifetime sex partners
- Improved school bonding
- Improved school achievement
- Reduced school misbehavior

**By age 27**, significant effects were found on educational and occupational outcomes, mental health and risky sexual activity:

- More above median on SES attainment index
- Fewer mental health disorders and symptoms
- Fewer lifetime sexually transmitted diseases
- Less co-morbid diagnosis of substance abuse and mental health disorder

SSDP Reduced Disparities in Sexually Transmitted Infections

Sig. Tx X Ethnicity Interaction on STI onset, p < 0.0401
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PYD Program</th>
<th>Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes</th>
<th>Other outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aban Aya – SCI (Flay et al., 2004)</td>
<td>Violence, school delinquency, substance use</td>
<td>Recent sex, condom use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatehouse Project (Patton et al., 2006)</td>
<td>Substance use, antisocial behavior</td>
<td>Ever sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach for Health (O’Donnell et al., 1998, 2002)</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Recent sex, ever sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effective Programs: Middle School Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PYD Program</th>
<th>Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes</th>
<th>Other outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Brothers/Big Sisters&lt;br&gt;(Tierney, Grossman &amp; Resch, 1995)</td>
<td>Drug use, hitting, skipped class</td>
<td>Academic competence in subpopulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural Competence Skills&lt;br&gt;(Schinke, Botvin et al, 1988)</td>
<td>Alcohol, marijuana, inhalants</td>
<td>Self control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Social Competence Program for Young Adolescents&lt;br&gt;(Weissberg &amp; Caplan, 1998; and Caplan et al., 1992)</td>
<td>Minor delinquency</td>
<td>Positive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Midwestern Prevention Project - Project STAR - Kansas (MPP)&lt;br&gt;(Pentz et al., 1994; Pentz et al., 1989; Pentz, et al., 1990)</td>
<td>Smoking, marijuana, and alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PYD Program**: Programs designed to promote positive youth development.
- **Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes**: Outcomes related to drug use, alcohol use, and delinquency.
- **Other outcomes**: Additional positive outcomes beyond substance use and delinquency.
# Effective Programs
## Middle School Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PYD Program</th>
<th>Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes</th>
<th>Other outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Youth Against Violence Project</td>
<td>Violent behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Farrell &amp; Meyer, 1998, 1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying Connected with Your Teen</td>
<td>Substance use, violence</td>
<td>Ever sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Haggerty et al., 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Beginnings</td>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td>Mental health, # of partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wolchik, Sandler et al., 2002, 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Effective Programs

### Middle - High School Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Substance Use, Delinquency outcomes</th>
<th>Other outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PYD Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Sibling Pregnancy Prevention (East et al., 2003)</td>
<td>Substance use, gang activity</td>
<td>Ever sex, pregnancy, condom use, school truancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familias Unidas (Prado et al., 2007)</td>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td>STI, unprotected sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrock Youth Development Project (LoSciuto et al., 1997)</td>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Northland (Perry et al., 1996)</td>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics of Youth Served by Effective Programs

Most programs:

- targeted youth exposed to multiple risk factors
- were delivered to mixed gender groups of youth
- Were delivered to a mixed race/ethnic groups
  - a third delivered to a single race/ethnic group including African American, Latino, Native American and White
## PYD Concepts Addressed by Effective Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># programs</th>
<th>PYD Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Half or more</td>
<td>Bonding, opportunities, recognition, cognitive competence, social competence, emotional competence, belief in the future, self determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-third-half</td>
<td>Behavioral competence, moral competence, self-efficacy, prosocial norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-quarter</td>
<td>Clear and positive identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

There is evidence that PYD programs:

- Promote positive development and prevent many problems
- Have robust and sustained impact
- Demonstrate effects among diverse groups of youth and can reduce disparities
- Those programs with impact most frequently focused on skills, agency, and enabling environment
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