Connectedness, Positive Values and Contributions to Society: three building blocks of adolescent well-being

Robert Blum MD MPH PhD
Professor, Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

David Henry
President, Global Youth Parliament Saint Lucia
UNICEF Youth Leader
St. Lucia

Cassandra Jessee MA
International Center for Research on Women
Washington, DC

Michelle Martinez MSPH
Research Assistant and Doctoral Student,
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland, USA

Audrey-Marie Schuh Moore, Ph.D.
Senior Researcher, Mathematica
Washington, D.C.

Anjali Singla
Consultant, Youth Leader Program, UNICEF
Researcher and Adjunct Faculty
The Banyan Academy of Leadership in Mental Health
Chennai, India

Sarah Thomsen MPH, PhD
Division of Health
UNICEF, New York, USA

28 February 2021

Corresponding author: Robert Blum MD MPH, PhD
                      rblum@jhu.edu

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Connectedness, positive values and contributions are essential building blocks for adolescent well-being. For a long time, the focus on adolescent health programming had been on reducing problem behavior, but over the past generation programming has shifted focus to adolescent well-being and the dimensions that comprise that construct. In the present paper we explore the evidence that supports the focus on three dimensions: connectedness, positive values and contributions. The evidence is compelling that where young people feel connected with parents, peers and communities and schools they benefit in numerous ways including improved mental health, self-esteem, less violence involvement and less substance use. The evidence is equally compelling as to the elements of programs that potentiate these building blocks for achieving well-being: 1) *Community* including prosocial adults, non-parental mentors and role-models, opportunities for youth engagement and school engagement and supports. 2) *Positive neighborhoods* provide safety and structure; belonging and group membership; personal empowerment; voice; competence; closeness with peers and nurturing adults. 3) *Positive parenting* includes connectedness with at least one parent or caregiver, emotional availability and responsiveness, high behavioral and educational expectations, behavioral monitoring. 4) *School connectedness* which is the belief by students that adults care about their learning as well as about them as individuals. The essential ingredients include a) high academic expectations coupled with support; b) positive adult-student relationships; c) both physical and emotional safety. 5) *Contributions* involve age-appropriate skills, opportunities to engage at every level from family to global engagement, and the recognition from adults for the contributions made. 6) *Positive values* are those values that each community sees as having pro-social benefits that include caring, equality, and social justice, integrity, honesty, responsibility , empathy and restraint. In this paper we provide examples of programming that represent many of these critical elements as well as tools by which to assess impact of such programs.

I.   Introduction

When we ask adolescents the world over what they aspire to, they rarely say that their highest goal is to be drug-free. Neither do they say that they aspire to avoid unplanned pregnancy nor to avoid incarceration or school failure. Instead, being problem-free is the baseline upon which they build their aspirations. Their hopes lie in obtaining an education, having the skills to be employed, forming stable relationships and contributing to the societies in which they live. They also say when the timing is right (usually after they obtain an education), many wish to marry and raise the next generation of competent young people. [1] This framing is the difference between a problem reduction and an adolescent well-being approach or as Karen Pittman sums it up: "Problem-free is not fully prepared." [2]

For a long time, "problem free" programmatically translated to "problem reduction." However, over the past generation, there has been an increasing shift to programs based on adolescent thriving [3] and well-being, as is reflected in the UN H6+ Technical Working Group on Adolescent Health and Well-being conceptualization [4]. The present paper is one of a series that explores the various dimensions of the Adolescent Well-being model. This paper focuses on three interrelated building blocks that form one of the five domains of adolescent well-being: Connectedness, Positive Values and Contributions.

II.   The Evidence for the Building Blocks

a.   Connectedness

In this section, we explore three facets of connectedness: family, peers, and community. Youth development occurs in context and involves meaningful interactions between youth and their social environment [4,5]. Bernat and Resnick define connectedness as the: "…protective relationships that exist between youth and their environment… [including] with individuals (inside and outside of the family), as well as within their broader social context, including schools and other institutions." [6] Most immediately, this translates to personal and social relationships, and high on that list are relationships with family, peers, and neighbors. Researchers from diverse disciplines recognize personal and social relationships as critical elements of well-being [8-10]. Within this relational construct, self-identity emerges through interactions between individuals and their networks (both peers and adults). It is as if they are enacting their life in a hall of mirrors [12]. They step onto that stage playing a particular role and then watch for the reactions of those most important to them-- parents, peers, community. Through these actions and reactions, we all come to define ourselves.

Family Connectedness: Family connectedness is defined as the degree to which adolescents feel understood, loved, wanted, and paid attention to by other family members [13]. The popular image we have of adolescents is that their family becomes diminishingly important as they go through the teenage years and that peers begin to replace family as central in their lives. However, there is little data to support this belief. Instead, the family remains the major

influence in adolescents' lives even as the importance of peers increases [14]. Study upon study reflect this centrality which finds that when we ask adolescents who is the most important person in their lives, they overwhelmingly respond-- parents [15]. Ample research shows that adolescents who are connected to their parents experience fewer emotional problems [16], fewer suicide attempts [16-18], less conduct disorder, better school performance [19], and higher self-esteem, less violence involvement [20] and less substance use [12]. Conversely, Resnick, Harris, and Blum [15] showed that family stress (as measured by parental unemployment, poverty, domestic violence, and substance abuse) undercut parent-adolescent connectedness.

But what are the components of family connectedness? When researchers study this question, they find at least some of the following characteristics: a) parents are aware of where their adolescent children are most of the time; b) parents know their child's friends and their parents; c) they know who their child's teachers are and how their adolescent is doing in school; d) adolescents feel that they can talk with their parents about concerns and also turn to them for advice; e) adolescents report feeling close with at least one parent and f) that their parents care about and understand them [13,21,22]

Peer Connectedness: While peers generally do not supersede parent influence, peers become increasingly important throughout adolescence. Here we discuss how peers influence brain development and debunk the myth that peers substantively influence negative behavior.

Peer Influence and the Developing Brain: Peers influence adolescent behavior; there is good evidence that the influence peers have on behavior is more significant among younger adolescents and that resistance to peer influences steadily increases between the ages of 14 and 18 years [23]. There are several reasons for this, some of which relate to brain changes that occur around puberty, where the areas of the brain that regulate rewards and emotional responses mature before the more rational control center of the pre-frontal cortex [24]. Thus, younger adolescents have a greater tendency to do things to get the adulation of peers (and thus the brain stimulation that goes with it) [25]. But there are numerous other factors as well that contribute to the increasing importance of peers during adolescence. In many societies, young people spend more time with peers outside of their parents' presence than younger children. They may be more involved with school activities, sports clubs, or community activities with their friends than when they were younger. This engagement outside the home helps us understand why peers have an increased influence on adolescents.

Debunking a myth: That said, there is little to substantiate the myth that peers are primary sources of pressure for antisocial behavior. Instead, the opposite is often the case; peers are often major influencers for pro-social behaviors [13,26.27].

Peers contribute to well-being: Young people who have strong peer relationships have better social and emotional functioning than their more isolated age-mates [26]. So too, high levels of connectedness to the family have been shown to increase academic achievement [28] and self-esteem among adolescents [29-31]. McGraw and colleagues [32] have also shown that

positive peer connections are strongly associated with adolescent well-being. Positive peer relationships are also linked to school connectedness [33,34].

But what about peer pressure? Don't peers *force* adolescents to do things that they otherwise would not do? The answer is complex; and pressure is often indirect. Research has shown, for example, that in simulated driving tests, those who are under age 16 are more likely to take risks as the number of friends in the car increases. The same is not true for older adolescents. Whether that is a function of distraction or "showing off" to seek peers' approval is not clear [35,36]. Allen and colleagues [37] have shown that the "pressure" that peers have on an adolescent's behavior is influenced both by external (e.g., social status of friends) and internal factors (e.g., autonomy, quality of family relations). Those adolescents with weak connections to family, school, and other institutions (e.g., faith community) may be more attracted to socially deviant peers. The problem with a lot of this research, as Jaccard and colleagues [38] have noted, is that it is constrained by self-report.

Community Connectedness: Community connectedness focuses on adolescents' perceptions of adult caring and belonging in the communities where they live [39. 40]. Other authors focus on community self-efficacy or the community's perceived capability to effect change [41]. They measure adolescent perceptions of connectedness in the following ways: a) neighborhood safety, b) adult willingness to act if they saw vandalism or criminal activity in the neighborhood; c) the extent to which people in the neighborhood look out for each other; d) a personal sense of belonging in the community and e) having a voice in the community. Coleman refers to these dimensions of connectedness as social cohesion [7]. Research consistently has shown that where social cohesion exists, young people are less likely to engage in high-risk behaviors, emotional distress [42], have more positive health behaviors, and greater personal efficacy [43,44].

Conversely, where young people do not feel that they have a voice in community affairs, it is associated with depression and a sense of disenfranchisement [45]. The concept of community connectedness is closely akin to social capital [46] or "...the set of norms, institutions, and organizations that promote trust and cooperation among persons in communities. [47]" In high-income countries, youth acquire social capital primarily through education and those they meet in school. Still, where higher education is less of an option, youth acquire social capital over a more extended period of time through family [48] neighborhood, apprenticeships and community engagement. The factors noted above for community connectedness are central to social capital as well. The World Bank has repeatedly shown that empowerment of youth and women requires both financial and social capital (as in micro-financing schemes) for social capital potentiates financial resources by creating human networks that maximize financial support [49].

Relational well-being: Building on the concepts of connectedness and social capital, White and colleagues have emphasized that an individual's well-being is heavily influenced by their relationships, with well-being seen as emerging "...through the dynamic interplay of personal, societal, and environmental structures and processes." and places the "generative quality of relationality" at the center of what drives well-being [10].

School Connectedness: For adolescents in much of the world school is their primary social context beyond home and family; and the evidence is strong that young people who report feeling connectedness to school are not only more likely to graduate but also to thrive in many aspects of their lives [76]. For example, students who feel connected to school exhibit less disruptive behavior, less school violence, less substance use and less emotional distress when compared with disconnected peers [77,78]. School connection is the belief by students that adults care about their learning as well as about them as individuals [13]. The three critical elements for school connectedness are: 1) academic rigor and high expectations coupled with support for learning; 2) positive adult-student relationships; 3) both physical and emotional safety [79]. When any of these three elements is not present not only does academic performance suffer but so too does fighting and bullying and absenteeism increase while school completion rates decline (see Beadle, S. et al. *Investing in adolescent well-being through education, learning, competence, skills and employability* in the present volume).

b) Contributions

There are numerous ways that adolescents make contributions to family, neighbors, community, and faith organizations. Today we see adolescents taking the lead on global issues such as global warming and in the United States on gun regulation. Not only does society benefit from their contributions, so too does the adolescent. As such, youth engagement with community and social issues is bidirectional reflecting the emergence of agency (see Vidyarthi et al. *Agency and resilience: foundational elements of adolescent well-being* in this volume) and the capacity for social impact. Developmentally, such processes create a sense of purpose and meaning that when present persists across the lifespan.

There is substantial evidence, for example, that recognition for work done for the benefit of others builds self-esteem for both adolescents and adults. Cambron and colleagues [50] note that there are three essential components of this process for adolescents: age-appropriate tasks, the skills needed, and the rewards (both financial and verbal recognition) for a job well done.

Volunteering and community service are some of the more powerful vehicles for young people to contribute. And there is ample evidence that it returns numerous health benefits to the volunteer. For example, Moreno and colleagues [51] have shown that there are physical health benefits to youth volunteers that include lower cholesterol and body mass when compared with non-volunteering peers. So too, using the Australian International Youth Development Study, Moorfoot and colleagues [52] have shown that youth volunteering was associated with high school completion. Other research [53, 54] has shown additional benefits across adolescence and adulthood, including better academic performance, less involvement in problem behaviors, and greater life satisfaction. The benefits also include fostering community connections and associations with pro-social adults [54]. In a review of the literature on adolescent volunteering, Moore and Allen [55] note other benefits: reduced school failure

rates, less school suspension and early school leaving, better reading achievement, less unintended pregnancy, and improved self-concept. Hart's ladder of participation [56] examines different levels of youth engagement in society and considers how elements such as tokenism and manipulation negatively affect how connected youth feel to their environment. The reduced connectedness affects their ability to reach their life goals.

c) Positive Values

We define positive values as those values and beliefs that each community sees as having pro-social benefits. As Ross and colleagues note in their adolescent well-being framework, an element of connectedness relates to "… having positive, meaningful relationships with others, including family, peers, and, where relevant, teachers and employers." But what does it mean to have "positive relationships" and to feel valued and respected? Embedded in the Adolescent Well-being Framework (Ross 2020) are a set of values: a) perceived respect from others, b) a sense of voice that what you think and say matters to others, c) perspective that requires skills to put oneself in another's shoes, d) interpersonal skills to sensitively interact with others and e) opportunities to use these newly acquired skills. But how does a young person develop these positive values?

There has been extensive research and programming on strategies that foster connectedness, contributions, and positive values. USAID has identified four dimensions that include [57]: (1) Assets, (2) Agency, (3) Contribution, and (4) Enabling Environment. As conceptualized, *assets* are the skills youth acquire. *Agency* refers to how youth use their assets to influence the decisions that they make about their lives. *Contribution* refers to how youth engage in their communities as a source of change. *Enabling environment* refers to how youth environments surround them to maximize their assets, agency, access to services and opportunities, the ability to avoid risks, and stay safe, secure, and protected while promoting positive norms, social and emotional competence, and connections with others to thrive. Reduced connectedness compromises youth's ability to reach life goals. Rose-Krasnor and colleagues [58] highlight the importance of factors at the individual, social, and systems levels that affect youth connectedness and their engagement in society.

Years of research, including that of the Search Institute [59], identify the following as adolescents' positive values: caring, equality, and social justice, integrity, honesty, responsibility and restraint. A cross-sectoral review further verified these critical skills and added: *empathy* and *communicatio*n as essential skills of connectedness [60]. We highlight some of these values through the voices of youth leaders in figures I and II.

The evidence is strong that programs that foster positive values among adolescents concurrently reduce a host of risk behaviors [61] and promote physical, and particularly mental, health. After a detailed review of the research literature, Guerra and Bradshaw [62] noted five critical skills and competencies for adolescents for positive social engagement: (1) a positive sense of self, (2) self-control, (3) decision-making skills, (4) a moral system of belief, and (5) pro-

David Henry (President, Global Youth Parliament Saint Lucia UNICEF Youth Leader, St. Lucia): From the perspective of youth in St. Lucia, disconnection is what keeps young people from realizing their potential. Over the past generation or two there has been a deterioration among youth of their sense of agency to the extent that many no longer realize the power and influence they have. Conversely, too often adults brand young people as immature, lazy and irresponsible. Historically, in many of my country's communities the town hall forum was the setting for all community members including adolescents and youth to debate issues and make decisions. That social compact between youth, community elders and government is fractured; and now too often each group looks on the other as a threat.

Today, rather than having partnerships, adults develop youth programs without the engagement of the people for whom they are designed. Often these are what the adults call "obvious impact areas"; however, equally often these programs are not seen as relevant by youth. In fact, young people may never have asked for these programs.

How can we realistically engage young people in programs that foster engagement when they cannot even meet their basic needs of food and shelter? How can programs foster pro-social values when theft becomes a survival tool. We can no longer afford to build programs and services based on "the best interests of young people" without their full engagement. And we can no longer afford to engage only the educational and social elites. Rather, we must engage all young people— and especially the most disengaged—to support them to have a voice and the skills to shape their futures in a positive way. What capacities are we talking about: Curiosity and imagination, Initiative, Agility and Adaptability, Critical Thinking and Problem Solving, Curiosity and Imagination, Self-Awareness, Emotional Intelligence, Social Intelligence, Teamwork and Team Building, Leadership, Time Management, Improved Mindfulness, Interpersonal Skills, Discipline, Respect, Self -Leadership, Assertiveness and Confidence. We must reclaim the town hall forum so that young people can shape their futures

social connectedness. We discuss strategies and programs that advance engagement, contributions, and connectedness in the next section.

What complexities underlie the normative framing of connectedness, contributions, and positive values?

Many factors affect the normative framing of adolescent connectedness, their values, and contribution to society: culture, gender, sexual orientation, youth experiences, socio-economic status, how society defines and measures adolescent well-being, and organizational perspectives. This myriad of complexities varies depending on age segmentation, country, culture, and level of marginalization. For example, social and cultural norms affect how youth view gender distinctions, how they understand stereotypes, how they come to understand prejudice in society, and sexism [63]. These social and cultural norms differ even within countries. Social acceptance and perspectives on sexual orientation also affect how youth frame and experience connectedness. For example, low social acceptance levels around sexual orientation drive higher suicide rates among the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) communities. In contrast, family acceptance and connectedness with LGBTQ youth offers the most protection leading to lower suicide levels [64]. Social connection also positively impacts self-esteem in both transgender and gender non-conforming populations.

Online tools and platforms can both facilitate and hamper adolescent connectedness and contributions. These tools provide a range of ways to create and connect with online groups and communities. The tools and platforms can help get underrepresented voices into public spaces and help different groups reach marginalized populations. However, digital technology can also be a source of alienation and ostracism, leading to even more complex problems in how youth frame and connect to their environment [37]. These tools can both drive and hamper youth

connectedness and contributions. UNICEF's U-Report platform [72] serves as an example of how Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), youth, and faith-based organizations in 20 countries partner with UNICEF to create a positive way for youth to connect; to identify problems in their communities and use their voices to drive policy change.

III.　　Programs that Foster Connectedness

Over the past 15 years, an increasing number of interventions have been implemented and evaluated that foster connections, contributions, and positive values. A number have been developed and implemented under the banner of Positive Youth Development [65,66]. These programs aim to enhance at least one of 6 Cs: Confidence, Competence, Character, Caring, Connection, Contribution. Many programs aim to address two or more of these components concurrently; and some programs have a goal of reducing problem behaviors. For example, Communities that Care is a program of work addressing a number of the Cs at a community level with a primary focus on substance abuse and violence reduction (https://www.communitiesthatcare.net/).

Over the past generation, we have moved away from problem reduction programs to programs that focus on promoting adolescent thriving [67]. These programs often focus on enhancing connectedness, opportunities for young people to contribute to the communities in which they live, and often embedded in them are opportunities to engage with pro-social adults and, in doing so, acquire positive values [66]. Some, such as *Familias Fuertes* or *Big Brothers/ Big Sisters,* aim to enhance connectedness without a specific problem reduction focus. Others, such as *Stepping Stones* [74] use these strategies to reduce problem behaviors such as violence and substance use. But why has there been a movement away from problem reduction strategies toward programming that focus on positive strategies? [75].

First, researchers find that most problem reduction strategies are ineffective. Evaluations of programs such as *Scared Straight* for violence prevention [68], fear-based and abstinence-only pregnancy prevention programs [69] information-based programs for drug abuse prevention

[70] demonstrate these limitations. The reasons why these programs do not work are many: 1) fear is at best a temporary response to a situation—no one can function in a chronic state of fear; eventually denial kicks in; 2) information may not align with the lived experiences of young people and even when it does young people like all people select the information that best conforms to their beliefs; 3) the young people who are most likely to benefit from programs and services are those least receptive to fear or knowledge-based programs. Assets-based approaches see "youth as resources to be developed, not problems to be solved" [71]. So, what matters for youth programs?

- *Community matters:* pro-social adults in the neighborhood; non-parental mentors and role-models, repairing deteriorating neighborhoods. Positive neighborhoods provide safety and structure, belonging and group membership, personal empowerment; control over one's life; competence; closeness with peers, and nurturing adults.
- *Positive parenting matters:* Elements of positive parenting include connectedness, emotional availability, responsiveness, high behavioral and educational expectations, behavioral monitoring.
- *School matters:* Feeling part of the school; experiencing school as emotionally, physically safe; perceiving teachers as supportive and caring; experiencing high academic expectations; believing rules and discipline are fair.

Table 1: Select programs that foster Connectedness, Positive Values, and Contributions

Program Name	Description/Objectives	Country/ Audience	Reference
Family/Peer/Community Connectedness			
Let Us Protect Our Future	*Program:* Six 2-h mixed-sex sessions led by trained facilitators, focused on youth 15-24 year with modules addressing gender norms. Parent engagement through collaborative assignments. Goal: H.I.V. reduction *Evaluation:* Reduced risky sexual behavior increased self-efficacy and parental engagement	South Africa	P.Y.D. Programs in LMICs: A Conceptual Framework and Systematic Review of Efficacy
Big Brothers Big Sisters	Program*:* Community-Based Mentoring, matching youth with adults who spend weekly time together. The goal is social connection with pro-social adults, which builds the characteristics needed for academic, social, and economic success. Evaluation: There have been two random assignment studies that have shown that participating youth are significantly less likely to have started using illegal drugs or alcohol, hit someone or skipped school (1998). Mentored youth are also shown to perform better academically, have better perceptions of their own academic abilities, and report having a "special adult" in their lives (2011).	USA, International	2019 Annual Impact Report Does Mentoring Work?: An Impact Study of the Big Brothers Big Sisters Program (1998) Mentoring in Schools: An Impact Study of Big BrothersBig Sisters School-Based Mentoring (2011)
Teen Triple P Program	*Program:* A multi-level intervention with varying intensity where parents are provided with several strategies to assist them in managing their children's behavior, preventing future problems and building strong and health relationships. Interventions range from general media coverage and education to structured series of intensive parenting training sessions. *Evaluation:* A systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrated substantial impact. In the short term, significant effects included: children's social, emotional and behavioral outcomes, parenting practices, parenting	Australia and worldwide	https://www.triplep.net /glo-en/home/ The Triple P-Positive Parenting Program: A systematic review and meta-analysis of a multi-level system of

	satisfaction and efficacy, parental adjustment, parental relationship and child observational data. In the long-term significant effects were found for all outcomes considered, including parent observational data.		parenting support (2014)
Familia Fuentes	.*Program:* Seven group sessions for parents/caregivers and their 10-14-year-old child that aim to prevent the initiation and reduce the prevalence of health-compromising behaviors among adolescents by strengthening family relationships and enhancing parenting skills. *Evaluation:* The program has demonstrated several effects across countries: improvements on positive parenting and parental hostility (Colombia, Ecuador and Bolivia), differences between intervention and control groups in attachment and hostile parenting practices (Chile), differences between groups in attitudes towards school and aggressiveness (Colombia), effects on family closeness, positive parenting and self-esteem (Honduras), and perceptions of changes around communication, limits, obedience, relationship roles, emotional regulation and social development (Panama). An ongoing evaluation is being conducted in Brazil.	Panama, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic, United States, Afghanistan	https://www.unodc.org/ropan/en/DrugDemandReduction/strong-families.html Evaluation of Family Skills Training Programs to Prevent Alcohol and Drug Use: A Critical Review of the Field in Latin America (2020)

Positive Values			
Promundo Program H Program M	*Program:* Focuses on young men to provide group education sessions combined with youth-led campaigns/activism to transform stereotypical gender norms. Partners typically implement between 10-16 activities weekly over several months. *Evaluation:* Young men have reported a range of positive changes after participation: more gender equitable attitudes and behaviors generally, improved couple communication, reduced gender-based violence, and improved attitudes around caregiving/domestic duties. *Program:* Focuses on young women to combine educational workshops with youth-led community campaigns to promote gender-equitable attitudes and improve their agency in interpersonal relationships. *Evaluation:* Evaluations using items from the Gender Equitable Men Scale have found that participants experienced increased with partners about sexual health, increased self-efficacy in interpersonal relationships, increased partner condom use, and decreased drug use.	International	Program H Program H and Program M: Engaging young men and empowering young women to promote gender equality and health Program M Program H and Program M: Engaging young men and empowering young

			women to promote gender equality and health
Parenting for Lifelong Health (PLH)	*Program:* An initiative designed to strengthen family relationships and with a goal to reduce child abuse.[1] The program consists of 14 group sessions (complemented by home visits). *Evaluation:* Tested in a large-scale cluster randomized controlled trial in South Africa's Eastern Cape. Findings show reductions in child abuse, increases in involved parenting, improvements in mental health, reductions in substance use and improvements in family budgeting and economic outcomes.	South Africa	https://www.who.int/teams/social-determinants-of-health/parenting-for-lifelong-health
Parivartan	*Program:* Structured training of coaches to engage boys 10-16 years on challenging traditional gender roles, discourage disrespectful behavior toward women and reduce GBV. *Evaluation:* Improved self-reported gender norms and attitudes; No effects on bystander behavior or perpetration of violence. No effects on positive bystander intervention behavior or perpetration of sexual abuse.	India	PYD Programs in LMICs: A Conceptual Framework and Systematic Review of Efficacy Evaluation of a GBV Prevention Program (2014)boys-into-men/
Responsible, Engaged, and Loving Fathers (REAL)	*Program:* Mentoring of 16-25 year old fathers and young children focused on developing nonviolent parenting skills and norms poster campaign *Evaluation:* Reduced partner violence and use of physical punishment. Increased ability to use nonviolent discipline; improved communication skills, more time with the child, and positive parenting.	Uganda	https://irh.org/projects/real-fathers-initiative/
Stepping Stones	*Program:* Stepping Stones program targets older adolescents and young adults using eleven 3-hour sessions helping participants find work, build businesses, strengthen self-esteem and improve relationships *Evaluation:* Increased earnings, improved gender attitudes.	South Africa, International	https://steppingstonesfeedback.org/

	Decreased depression, suicidal thoughts, reduced women's physical/sexual abuse		
Positive Adolescent Training Through Holistic Social Programs (PATHS)	*Program:* The program, intended for 12-14-year-olds, is a positive youth development program that has progressed through an initial phase followed by school-based and then community-based extension phases that can be implemented in two tiers. The tier 1 program is designed around 15 PYD constructs and the tier 2 program builds upon tier 1 activities to collaborate with the school social work agency. *Evaluation:* Significant improvements in competence (e.g. social, emotional, behavioral functioning) self-efficacy and optimism for the future. So too, psychosocial competence significantly improved resulting in measurable improvement in family functioning.	Hong Kong, Macau	Systematic Review of PYD Programs in LMICs Effectiveness of a Chinese positive youth development program: the Project P.A.T.H.S in Hong Kong (2014)
Contributions to Society			
Roots and Shoots	*Program:* Focused on environmental protection and youth political engagement for 15-24 year olds. Activities include caring for the natural environment and community members. *Evaluation:* Survey results showed improvements in participants' perceptions of civic and social responsibility.	China	Systematic Review of PYD Programs in LMICs Youth Civic Engagement in China: Results From a Program Promoting Environmental Activism (2007)
Balika	*Program:* Weekly meeting with mentors and peers in safe, girl-only locations to develop friendships, build technology skills and develop transition skills to young adulthood. Included a community engagement component. *Evaluation:* Participating girls were 25% less likely to marry over a 15-month period. Each of the three components Education, life skills and livelihood skills training were found to have independent beneficial impacts.	Bangladesh	https://www.popcouncil.org/research/balika-bangladeshi-association-for-life-skills-income-and-knowledge-for-adol
Yes, Youth Can	*Program:* Creates forums for 18-35 year old youth to form youth led groups and work toward commonly agreed upon goals *Evaluation:* Increased asset ownership, political empowerment, self-efficacy, and positive attitudes about community supportiveness	Kenya	https://www.norc.org/Research/Projects/Pages/impact-evaluation-of-usaid-yes-youth-can-kenya-project.aspx

Engaging Youth to Rebuild the Social Fabric in Baghdad	*Program:* Supports local NGOs to conduct soft skills training, provide psychosocial support, and support youth to design and implement community development initiatives that help build social cohesion. It also provides financing to youth entrepreneurs. *Evaluation:* In process	Iraq	https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2020/12/02/iraq-engaging-youth-to-rebuild-the-social-fabric-in-baghdad
Proponte Mas	Program: To reduce empirically derived risk factors for youth at risk of joining gangs and their families and the behaviors associated with those risk factors. Focal point is the family system. It utilizes horizontal strategies designed to build the problem-solving capacity of family members that live together; and vertical strategies designed to build cohesion between family members across multiple generations through the use of a mapping process referred to as a genogram. Evaluation: Results show a 77 percent drop in the crime and substance abuse factor; a 78 percent drop in anti-social tendencies.	Honduras	https://www.creativeassociatesinternational.com/past-projects/honduras-proponte-mas-secondary-violence-prevention-activity/

IV. How Connectedness, Positive Values and Contributions Relate to Other Domains of Adolescent Well-being

This paper series shows how connectedness, contributions, and positive values are related to the other four Adolescent Well-being domains in the UN H6+ Technical Working Group on Adolescent Health and Well-being model [4]. model. Each domain in the series supports and reinforces the other. For example, health services, optimal nutrition, learning, skills, and safe and supportive environments enhance connectedness and youth contribution. This paper shows how family connectedness links to school engagement and achievement. We see how strategies that enhance peer and community connectedness link to safe and supportive environments, competency, and agency. We have heard from two youth leaders from different parts of the world who highlighted that to foster positive values we must first meet all young people's basic human needs and do it with respect, dignity, and honesty. All of the papers in this series reflect these themes.

A mountain of evidence tells us that problem reduction approaches without strategies that foster connectedness and positive values are doomed to failure. So too, the evidence is overwhelming that the way young people and all people develop self-esteem and agency is through contributing to others—having the skills to contribute meaningfully, the opportunities to do so, and the recognition for a job well done.

Given what we know makes a difference for youth, the question now is - do we have the political will to make a difference? Or will we continue to invest in programs that repeatedly have been shown not to work? Fundamentally, it is not the program that makes a difference for young people; it is the people who deliver the program-- the connections they foster and the values they transmit.

References

1   Blum RW, Li M, Pasha O, et al. Coming of age in the shadow of the Taliban: Education, child marriage, and the future of Afghanistan from the perspectives of adolescents and their parents. *J Adolesc Health* 2019;64(3):370-375.

2   Pittman K. Youth Today: The Power of Engagement. Forum for Youth Investment 1999.

3   Scales PC, Benson PL, Roehlkepartain EC. Adolescent thriving: The role of sparks, relationships, and empowerment. *J Youth Adolesc* 2011;40(3):263-77.

4   Ross DA, Hinton R, Melles-Brewer M, et al. Adolescent wellbeing: A definition and conceptual framework. *J Adolesc Health* 2020;67:472e476.

5   Bronfenbrenner U. *The Ecology of Human Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1979/2009.

6   Damon W, Gregory A. Bringing in a new era in the field of youth development. In: Lerner R, Jacobs F, Wertlieb D, eds. *Handbook of Applied Developmental Science, vol. 1*. New York: Wiley 2002:407-420.

7   Bernat DH, Resnick MD. Connectedness in the lives of adolescents. In: DiClemente RJ, Santelli JS, Crosby RA, eds, *Adolescent Health: Understanding and Preventing Risk Behaviors.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass 2009:375-399.

8   Abeyasekera A. A Social justice approach to wellbeing: the PADHI psychosocial framework. In: White SC, Abeyasekera A, eds. W*ell-Being and Quality of Life Assessment. A Practical Guide*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing 2014:37-54.

9   Seligman M. *Flourish: A New Understanding of Happiness and Well-Being – and How to Achieve Them.* London: Nicholas Brealey 2011

10   White SC. Relational wellbeing: Re-centering the politics of happiness, policy and the self. *Policy and Politics* 2017;45(2):121-136.

11   Erikson E. *Childhood and Society*. New York: WW Norton 1963.

12   Blum RW, Rinehart PM. Reducing the Risk: Connections That Make a Difference in the Lives of Youth. Division of General Pediatrics & Adolescent Health, University of Minnesota Adolescent Health Program 1997.

13   Resnick MD, Bearman PS, Blum RW, et al. Protecting adolescents from harm: Findings from the national longitudinal study on adolescent health. *JAMA* 1997;278(10):823-832.

14   Unger M. The importance of parents and other caregivers to the resilience of high-risk adolescents. *Family Process* 2004;43(1)23-41.

15   Resnick MD, Harris LJ, Blum RW. The impact of caring and connectedness on adolescent health and wellbeing. *J Pediatr Child Health* 1993;29(1):S3-S9. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1440-1754.1993.tb02257.x

16   Day, R. D., & Padilla-Walker, L. M. Mother and father connectedness and involvement during early adolescence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 2009, 23*(6), 900–904. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016438

17   Kuramoto-Crawford SJ, Ali MM, Wilcox HC. Parent–child connectedness and long-term risk for suicidal ideation in a nationally representative sample of US adolescents. *Crisis 2017;38*(5),309-318. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000439

18   DesJardins T. and Leadbetter B. Changes in Parental Emotional Support and Psychological Control in Early Adulthood: direct and indirect associations with educational and occupational adjustment. *Emerging Adulthood,* 2016

19   Gonzalez-DeHass AR, Willems PP, Doan Holbein,MF. Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educ Psychol Rev* 2005;(17):96–123.

20 Farrell AD, Mays S, Bettencourt A, Erwin EH, Vulin-Reynolds M, & Allison KW (2010). Environmental influences on fighting versus nonviolent behavior in peer situations: A qualitative study with urban African American adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(1–2), 19–35

21 Eisenberg M, Resnick MR. Suicidality among gay, Lesbian and bisexual youth: The role of protective factor. *J Adoles. Health* 2006;39(5):662-999.

22 Sieving RE, Beuhring T, Resnick M, et al. Development of adolescent self-report measures from the national longitudinal study of adolescent health. *J Adolesc Health* 2001;28(1):73-81.

23 Steinberg L, Monahan KC. Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Dev Psychol* 2007;43(6):1531-1543.

24 Albert D, Chein J, Steinberg L. Peer influences on adolescent decision making. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2013;22(2):114–120.

25 Spear LP. The adolescent brain and age-related behavioral manifestations. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev.* 200024(4):417-, 63. doi: 10.1016/s0149-7634(00)00014-2. PMID: 10817843.

26 Oldfield J, Humphrey N, Hebron J. The role of parental and peer attachment relationships and school connectedness in predicting adolescent mental health outcomes. *Child Adolesc Ment Health* 2015;21(1):22-19. https://doi.org/10.1111/camh.12108

27 Bayraktar, F., Sayil, M., & Kumru, A. Self-esteem among high-school adolescents and college students: The role of parental and peer attachment, empathy and psychological adjustment variables, *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi,*2009, 24: 48-63.

28 Foster CE, Horwitz A, Thomas A, et al. Connectedness to family, school, peers, and community in socially vulnerable adolescents. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 2017;81:321-331. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.08.011

29 Miller, B. C., Benson, B., & Galbraith, K. A. Family relationships and adolescent pregnancy risk: A research synthesis. *Developmental Review,* 2001, 21(1): 1–38.

30 Goodenow C. Classroom Belonging among Early Adolescent Students: Relationships to Motivation and Achievement J. Early Adolescence, 1993, 13 (1): 21-43

31 Skinner, E. A., & Snyder, T. Parenting, motivation, and children's coping: Empirical analyses. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM (1999, April).

32 McGraaw K, Moore S, Fuler A, et al. Family, peer and school connectedness in final year secondary school students. *Aust Psychol* 2008, 43(1):27-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060701668637

33 Furrer, C. Skinner, E Sense of Relatedness as a Factor in Children's Academic Engagement and Performance*, J. Educational Psychology,* 2003, 95 (1): 148-162.

34 Waters, S. Cross, D. Shaw, T. Does the nature of schools matter? An exploration of selected school ecology factors on adolescent perceptions of school connectedness, *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2003, 80(Pt 3):381-401

35 Steinberg L. A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Dev Rev* 2008;28(1)78-106.

36 Vaca FE, Li K, Tewahade S, et al. Factors contributing to delay in driving licensure among U.S. high school students and young adults. *J Adolesc Health* 2021;68(1):191-198.

37 Allen JP, Chango J, Szwedo D, et al. Predictors of susceptibility to peer influence regarding substance use in adolescence. *Child Dev* 2012;83(1):337-350.

38 Jaccard J, Blanton H, Dodge T. Peer influences on risk behavior: An analysis of the effects of a close friend. *Dev Psychol* 2005;41(1):135-47.

39 Rauner J. The Role of Caring in Youth Development and Community Life. New York: Columbia University Press 2000.

40 Beckman PJ, Barnwell D, Horn E, et al. Communities, families, and inclusion. *Early Child Res Q* 1998;13(1):125-150.

41 Tadaka E, Kono A, Ito E, et al. Development of a community's self-efficacy scale for preventing social isolation among community-dwelling older people (Mimamori Scale). *BMC Public Health* 2016;16(1):1198.

42 Rutter, M., & Rutter, M. (1993). *Developing minds: Challenge and continuity across the life span.* Basic Books.

43 DeLuca, Stefanie, Susan Clampet-Lundquist and Kathryn Edin. 2016. *Coming of Age in the Other America.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

44 Youngblade LM, Curry LA, Novak M, et al. The impact of community risks and resources on adolescent risky behavior and health care expenditures. *J Adolesc Health* 2006;38(5):486-494.

45 Jones N, Baird S, Hicks J, et al. Adolescent Psychosocial Well-Being and Voice and Agency in Ethiopia, 2019. https://www.odi.org/publications/11377-adolescent-psychosocial-well-being-and-voice-and-agency-ethiopia

46 Coleman J. Social capital in the creation of human capital. *Am J Sociol* 1998;94:95–120.

47 Durston J. Building community social capital. *CEPAL Rev* 1999;69:103-118. https://doi.org/10.18356/9773e1e2-en

48 Addae EA. The mediating role of social capital in the relationship between socioeconomic status and adolescent wellbeing: Evidence from Ghana. *BMC Public Health* 2020;20(20). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8142-x

49 Grootaert C. Social Capital: The Missing Link? 1998.
http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/902971468764409654/pdf/multi0page.pdf

50 Cambron C, Catalano R, Hawkins JD. The social development model. In: Oxford Handbook of Developmental and Life Course Criminology. USA: Oxford University Press, Inc. 2017.

51 Moreno MA, Furtner F, Rivara FP. Adolescent volunteering. *JAMA Pediatr* 2013;167(4):400.

52 Moorfoot, N. Leung, R, Toumbourou, J. Catalano, R. The Longitudinal Effects of Adolescent Volunteering on Secondary School Completion and Adult Volunteering, Int J Dev Sci. 2015; 9(3-4): 115–123.

53 Fredricks JA, Eccles JS. Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Dev Psycho* 2006;42(4):698-713.

54 Zaff JF, Kawashima-Ginsberg K, Lin ES, et al. Developmental trajectories of civic engagement across adolescence: Disaggregation of an integrated construct. *J Adolesc* 2011;34:1207-1220.

55 Moore CW, Allen JP. The effects of volunteering on the young volunteer. *J Prim Prev* 1996;17(2):231-258.

56 Hart R. Children's Participation: From Tokenism to Citizenship. UNICEF, Florence, Italy, 1992. https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/pdf/childrens_participation.pdf

57 Alvarado G, Skinner M, Plaut D, et al. A Systematic Review of Positive Youth Development Programs in Low-and Middle-Income Countries. Washington, DC: YouthPower Learning, Making Cents International, 2017. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00MR58.pdf

58 Rose-Krasnor R. Future directions in youth involvement research. *Soc Dev* 2009;18(20)497-509.

59 Benson P. *All Our Kids. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 2006. ISBN 978-0-7879-8518-9.*https://www.search-institute.org/our-research/development-assets/developmental-assets-framework/

60 Gates S, Lippman L, Shadowen N, et al. Key Soft Skills for Youth Outcomes. USAID's YouthPower: Implementation, YouthPower Action 2016.

61 Catalano, Richard F., M. Lisa Berglund, Jean A. M. Ryan, Heather S. Lonczak, and J. David Hawkins. 2002. Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. Prevention and Treatment 5(15). http://journals.apa.org/prevention/volume5/pre0050015a.html

62 Guerra NG, Bradshaw CP. Linking the prevention of problem behaviors and positive youth development: core competencies for positive youth development and risk prevention. In: Guerra NG, Bradshaw CP eds. Core Competencies to Prevent Problem Behaviors and Promote Positive Youth Development. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2008;122:1-17.

63 Martin, A. Academic buoyancy and academic resilience: Exploring' everyday' and 'classic' resilience in the face of academic adversity, School Psychology International, 2013, 34(5):488-500

64 Katz-Wise SL, Rosario M, Tsappis M. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Youth and Family Acceptance. *Pediatr Clin North Am*. 2016;63(6):1011-1025. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2016.07.005

65 Lerner RM, Lerner JV, Lewin-Bizan S, et al. Positive youth development: processes, programs, and problematics. *J Youth Dev* 2011;6(3):38-62.

66 Catalano RF, Skinner, ML, Alvarado G, et al. Positive youth development programs in low- and middle-income countries: a conceptual framework and systematic review of efficacy. *J Adolesc Health* 2019;65(1):15-31.

67 Hamilton SF, Hamilton MA, Pittman K. Principles for youth development. In: Hamilton SF, Hamilton MA, eds. The Youth Development Handbook: Coming of Age in American Communities. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc. 2004;3-22.

68 Petrosino A, Turpin-Petrosino C, Hollis-Peel ME, Lavenberg JG. 'Scared Straight' and other juvenile awareness programs for preventing juvenile delinquency. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013 Apr 30;(4):CD002796. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD002796.pub2. PMID: 23862186.

69 Stanger Hall, K. Hall, D. Abstinence-Only Education and Teen Pregnancy Rates: Why We Need Comprehensive Sex Education in the U.S, PLoS One. 2011; 6(10): e24658

70 Griffin KW, Botvin GJ. Evidence-based interventions for preventing substance use disorders in adolescents. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am*. 2010;19(3):505-526. doi:10.1016/j.chc.2010.03.005

71 Benard B. Youth Service: From Youth as Problems to Youth as Resources. 1900.School K-12.Paper 12. https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=slcek12

72. UNICEF, *U Report: Empowering and connecting young people around the world to engage with and speak out on issues that matter to them,* https://www.unicef.org/innovation/U-Report.

73. Kim, B. Gloppin, K. Rhew, I, Oesterie, S. Hawkins, J.D. Effects of the Communities That Care Prevention System on Youth Reports of Protective Factors, Prev. Sci. 2015, 16(5): 652-662.

74. Gibbs, A. Washington, L. Abdelatif, N. et al. Stepping Stones and Creating Future Intervention to Prevent Intimate Partner Violence Among Young People: Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial, J. Adol. Health, 2020 ,66: 323-335.

75. UN Major Group for Children and Youth. Adolescent well-being framework: A virtual youth consultation report. November, 2020, https://www.unmgcy.org/main-news-updates/2020/6/25/consultation-series-on-adolescent-wellbeing

76. Blum, R. and Libbey, H. (Editors). School Connectedness – Strengthening Health and Education Outcomes for Teenagers: Executive Summary. *J Sch Health* (2004) 74(7):229-299.

77. Lonczak, H. S., Abbott, R. D., Hawkins, J. D., Kosterman, R., & Catalano, R. (2002). The effects of the Seattle Social Development Project: Behavior, pregnancy, birth, and sexually transmitted disease outcomes by age 21. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Health, 156*, 438–447

78. Samdal, O., Nutbeam, D., Wold, B., & Kannas, L. (1998). Achieving health and educational goals through schools. *Health Education Research, 13*(3), 383–39

79. McNeely, C. Nonnemaker, J. Blum, R. Promoting School Connectedness: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *J Sch Health* (2002) 72(4):138-146.

Annex A: Measuring Connectedness, Contributions and Positive Values

Measure Name	Description	Application	Source
Multi-Domain Measures (Include Aspects of Connectedness, Positive Values, and Contributions)			
Youth Development Index (YDI)	The YDI is a comprehensive measure across 5 domains that are critical to youth development: education, health, employment, civic participation, and political participation. These domains create a composite index of 18 indicators that is used to measure youth development progress across 183 countries. The YDI was initiated by The Commonwealth under a definition of youth as ranging from the age of 15-29 years of age. Reportedly, the methodology and components of the YDI have been reviewed, refined and validated by the YDI Technical Advisory Committee.	National-level; Compilation of Outside Sources	Global Youth Development Index and Report 2016
Global Millennial Viewpoints Survey	This tool measures youth involvement in economic, education and civic activities. It helps users understand how their engagement is affected by environmental factors that reduce connectedness. Across approximately 25 questions its scales cover several important domains: education, health, economics, work, governance, safety and security, and values. The 2016 survey was administered in 30 countries with approximately 250 youth surveyed per country. The age range includes those aged 16 through 24 years.	National-level; Individual-based	The 2016 Global Millennial Viewpoints Survey
Global Youth Wellbeing Index	The index survey was created in 2014 and re-conducted in 2017 to assess the strengths and gaps that youth are experiencing worldwide. Implemented through external data gathering and individual survey administration it measures 35 indicators across 7 domains: gender equality, economic opportunity, education, health, citizen participation, safety and security, and information and communication technology. Primarily, the index focuses on youth aged 15-24 years, but includes some information on those ranging from 10 to 29 years old.	National-level; Individual-based	2017 Global Youth Wellbeing Index
Measures Related to Connectedness, Positive Values, and Contributions			
The Developmental Assets Profile (DAP)	The DAP is a social-emotional assessment measuring the internal strengths and external supports of young people, and their growth over time. It is built upon the Developmental Assets® Framework – a set of 40 positive external assets young people need across their lives internal assets they need to make good choices, take responsibility for their actions, and be independent.	School, Institution or Individual-based	Search Institute

	Incepted in 2005 it has been taken by nearly a million young people between 8 to 18 years of age to measure the strengths and supports that influence a youth's success across school and life. Studies have demonstrated the validity and reliability of the DAP measures of social-emotional learning skills through the internal assets measures. The DAP is also listed in the [CASEL* compendium](#) as a valid social-emotional assessment tool.		
Chinese Positive Youth Development Scale (CPYDS)	The CPYDS, based on PYD and positive psychology theory, has been used to evaluate programming in Hong Kong and Macau among youth ages 12-18. It is administered through a 90-item self-report survey that has been shown to be positively related to thriving, wellness and life satisfaction; and negatively related to delinquency, problem behavioral intent and substance use.	Program evaluation	[The Chinese Positive Youth Development Scale: A Validation Study](#) [Measuring Skills in International Programs](#)
Child and Adolescent Wellness Scale (CAWS)	The CAWS was developed in 2011 to assess the social and emotional competencies of school-aged youth, particularly the strengths and adaptive qualities that indicate psychological health. It includes 150 items across 10 sub-scores: adaptability, conscientiousness, connectedness, emotional self-regulation, empathy, initiative, mindfulness, optimism, self-efficacy, and social competence. It has reportedly been validated for use among youth aged 12-18 years from samples in the United States, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand.	Individual assessments	[Wellness Dimensions Relate to Happiness in Youth](#) [Measuring Skills in International Programs](#)
Youth-Adult Partnership Rubric	This rubric measures perceptions among adults working with youth in various settings (i.e., school reforms, afterschool programs, camps, parks and recreation, youth participatory action research, etc.). The development of the rubric is based on the Youth-Adult Partnership approach that would see youth and adults work together as partners toward a common goal through increasing youth voice and leadership. The rubric measures 4 dimensions: authentic decision-making, natural mentors, reciprocity, and community	Adult-based	[Youth-Adult Partnership Rubric Tool](#)

	connectedness. It is designed for adults interacting with older middle-school and high school aged youth (approximately 14-19 years old).		
Jamaica Youth Survey	This survey was designed in order to evaluate the level of impact that youth development programs were having in urban Jamaica. Its measurement emphasizes five core competencies across 107 items: positive sense of self, self-control, decision-making skills, moral system of belief, and pro-social connectedness in addition to aggressive behavior and propensity for aggression. Reportedly, the reliability and validity of the scale are good and it has been used now to measure violence and aggressive behaviors among youth ages 12-18.	Program evaluation	The Jamaica Youth Survey Measuring Skills in International Programs
Positive Youth Development Measurement Toolkit: A Practical Guide for Implementers of Youth Programs	This toolkit is designed to provide references, resources and tools on using a positive youth development (PYD) approach to evaluate youth-focused programming for the implementers. The toolkit discusses constructs of PYD and illustrative indicators useful to implementers. It also walks through the phases of utilizing the PYD framework to optimally design youth programs, and how programmers can measure outcomes of their program to assess impact.	Program Monitoring and Evaluation	Positive Youth Development Measurement Toolkit
Measures of Connectedness			
Hemingway Measure of Adolescent Connectedness	The Hemingway was designed to measure the impact of a high school mentoring program in terms of an adolescent's level of connectedness. The subscales measure positive connections to four important 'worlds' of connectedness to school, family, friends and romantic partners, and self. Included in the adolescent version are other connectedness subscales including peers, reading, "culturally different others", religion, and neighborhood. The manual, amongst other resources, discusses the theoretical basis and empirical validation for the scales.	School-Based Survey	Hemingway Measure of Adolescent Connectedness
The Child and Adolescent Scale of Participation (CASP)	The CASP is designed to measure participation in youth ages 6-12 and 13-17. It includes 20 items across 4 domains: home participation, school participation, community participation, and home and community living activities. It is meant to be completed by caregivers as it is primarily used with children with chronic health conditions/disabilities. The scale has demonstrated relatively good validity and reliability, although there are notably different scores related to type of disability.	Individual-based	The Child and Adolescent Scale of Participation (CASP)

Measures of Positive Values			
California Healthy Kids Survey: Social and Emotional Health Module	The California Healthy Kids Survey is used by school districts and schools to measure school climate, healthy behaviors, and youth resiliency among those ages 10-19 through self-report. The Social and Emotional Health Module provides a strengths-based assessment of skills and competencies needed to thrive later on. It measures constructs such as positive self-concept, self-control, higher-order thinking skills, social skills, communication, goal orientation, empathy, responsibility, and positive attitude. The wider survey also includes modules on Resilience and Youth Development and School Climate.	Group performance monitoring – School-based	California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) Measuring Skills in International Programs
Responses to Stress Questionnaire (RSQ)	The RSQ is designed to measure coping and involuntary stress responses across a range of specific stressful situations. The 57 items are designed to measure three types of coping and two types of involuntary responses to stress. The survey can be completed by parents, children over the age of 9, and parents on their perceptions of their children. It has been used among youth in international contexts and has been translated into several languages.	Individual assessments	Responses to Stress Questionnaire (RSQ) Measuring Skills in International Programs
SENNA 1.0 and SENNA 2.0	The original SENNA scale was developed to assess social and emotional skills among school-aged youth in Brazil for education system-wide monitoring and evaluation. It has been tested with over 24,000 youth across 5th, 10th and 12th grade (approximately 10-19 years old). The measures combine the Big Five Personality Factors – conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability and openness to new experiences – in addition to a measure of locus of control. The scale includes 76 items. SENNA 2.0 provides a short version for youth ages 12-14 and a longer version for youth ages 15-19. It reorganized and recategorized the original scale based on testing among Brazilian students and so measures 17 facets of social and emotional skills through 5 domains (based on the Big Five Personality Factors): openness to the new, amity, self-management, emotional resilience, and engaging with others. Measures include daily behaviors as well as self-efficacy in each domain.	Group performance monitoring – School-based	Measuring Skills in International Programs

The Big Five Inventory (BFI)	The BFI is a 44-item assessment that has been administered to those over the age of 10 in many countries and has been translated into 28 languages. It is one of the most-used instruments in the world for identifying theory-based individual personality factors. They are 1) openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism.	Individual assessments	Measuring Skills in International Programs
The Anchored BFI Tool	The Anchored BFI uses the same instrument noted above, and adds anchoring vignettes and situational judgement tests to address differences in underlying response patterns of participants and in cultural dispositions or standards.	Individual assessments	Measuring Skills in International Programs
Measures of Contributions			
Tiffany-Eckenrode Program Participation Scale (TEPPS)	TEPPS was first developed in 2006 to measure youth participation at the community, civic, and government levels across 20 items. These items are separated into four subscales: personal development, voice/influence, safety/support and community engagement). It was initially created to measure the level of participation of urban youth enrolled in community-based after school programs. Pilot study results indicate that the scale measures are indeed reliable and valid.	School- and Program-based	A New Measure for Assessing Youth Program Participation