

**Positive Youth Development
Programs Targeting Students with
Greater Psychosocial Needs:
Findings Based on **Three** Subjective
Outcome Evaluation Studies**

TY Lee &
Vera MY Tang

4th International Conference on Holistic Health and Medicine

The preparation for this presentation and the Project P.A.T.H.S.
were financially supported by The Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust.
(Website: <http://www.paths.hk>)

Aims

- **Aims:** to assess participants' views
(**Subjective outcome evaluation**) of the
 - program**,
 - instructors**, and
 - perceived effectiveness** of the Tier 2
Program of the P.A.T.H.S. Project

- Initial findings supported the effectiveness of the Tier 2 Program (Secondary 1) in the **Experimental Implementation Phase (EIP-S1:2005-06)** using subjective outcome measures (Shek, Lee, Sun, Lung, 2008).
- This paper will present findings of two further studies on the Tier 2 Program.
- **EIP-S2:06-07**: might have joined in the Tier 2 Program in 05/06.
- **FIP-S1:06-07 Full Implementation Phase**
- **Cohort A**: 2005-06 - S1 (EIP) 52 schools, 3,072 participants
- **Cohort B**: 2006-07 - S2 (EIP) 49 schools, 2,542 participants
- **Cohort C**: 2006-07 - S1 (FIP) 207 schools, 13,194 participants

| No. of | 2005-06: S1 (EIP) Cohort A | 2006-07: S2 (EIP) Cohort B | 2006-07: S1 (FIP) Cohort C |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| schools | 52 | 49 | 207 |
| participants | 3,072 | 2,542 | 13,194 |
| p with greater pysoc needs | 2,718 | 2,439 | 12,092 |
| Other participants parents/teachers | 354 | 103 | 1,102 |
| average no. of p per school | 59.08 (Range: 21-274) | 51.88 (Range: 17-240) | 63.74 (Range: 14-308) |
| average no. of sessions(1.5-3hr) | 19.53 | 22.63 | 22.91 |
| p filled in Form C | 2,173 | 1,898 | 10,255 |
| Response rate | 70.74% | 74.6% | 77.72% |

Subjective Outcome Evaluation: Methods -

- **Participants:** were identified by teachers, parents and/or via self-administered questionnaires as having greater psychosocial needs and they were invited to join the **Tier 2 Program**
- **Data Analysis:**
 - Quantitative

Subjective Outcome Evaluation: Methods - Instrument

- The **Subjective Outcome Evaluation Form** (Form C) was designed by Shek et al. (2006) which aims to measure the **perceptions** of Tier 2 Program. There are **seven** parts in this evaluation form:
 1. Participants' perceptions of the **program**, such as program design, quality of service, appropriateness of the program, and interaction among the participants (**8 items**).
 2. Participants' perceptions of the **workers**, such as the preparation of the workers, professional attitude and knowledge, and interaction with the participants (**8 items**).
 3. Participants' perception of the **effectiveness** of the program, such as resilience and overall personal development (**8 items**).
 4. Things that the participants **appreciated most** (**open-ended**).
 5. Opinions about the **workers** (**open-ended**).
 6. Things that the participants **learnt** from the program (**open-ended**).
 7. Areas that **require improvement** (**open-ended**).

Reliability analysis (Schools as the unit of analyses)

| Items related to the | Alpha | | Mean inter-item correlation | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|
| | Cohort B | Cohort C | Cohort B | Cohort C |
| Program (8 items) | .99 | .98 | .92 | .88 |
| Worker (8 items) | .99 | .99 | .90 | .90 |
| Effectiveness (8 items) | .99 | .99 | .94 | .90 |
| All items (Form C) (24 items) | .99 | .99 | .88 | .84 |

Findings: views towards Tier 2 **Program**

- over 80% of the respondents perceived the Tier 2 Program in a positive manner
- 1/3 ratings on items over 85% (positive) in 3 cohorts

Comparison of the positive views (%) towards Tier 2 **Program** among different cohorts

| Positive views | Cohorts | 2005-06: S1 (EIP) Cohort A | 2006-07: S2 (EIP) Cohort B | 2006-07: S1 (FIP) Cohort C |
|--|---------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| The activities were carefully planned . | | 83.96 | 84.29 | 83.17 |
| The quality of the service was high . | | 83.19 | 84.87 | 81.57 |
| The service provided could meet the participants' needs . | | 82.56 | 86.03 | 82.47 |
| The service delivered could achieve the planned objectives . | | 85.28 | 86.90 | 84.18 |
| Participants could get the service they wanted . | | 81.63 | 83.62 | 80.44 |
| Participants had much interaction with other participants. | | 84.21 | 87.53 | 85.42 |
| Participants would recommend others who have similar needs to participate in the program. | | 82.01 | 83.30 | 78.94 |
| On the whole, participants were satisfied with the service . | | 86.82 | 87.65 | 85.34 |

Findings: views towards Tier 2 **Workers**

- A **very high** proportion of the participants had positive evaluation of the workers implementing the program.
- All ratings on items were **over 85%** except one item on “The worker(s) had much **interaction** with participants” in **two cohorts**.

Comparison of the positive views (%) towards Tier 2 **Workers** among different cohorts

| | Cohorts | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Positive views | 2005-06: S1 (EIP) Cohort A | 2006-07: S2 (EIP) Cohort B | 2006-07: S1 (FIP) Cohort C |
| The worker(s) had professional knowledge . | 87.29 | 89.77 | 87.98 |
| The worker(s) demonstrated good working skills . | 86.06 | 89.49 | 86.17 |
| The worker(s) were well prepared for the program. | 88.81 | 90.34 | 89.35 |
| The worker(s) understood the needs of the participants. | 85.79 | 87.94 | 85.83 |
| The worker(s) cared about the participants. | 86.96 | 89.60 | 87.33 |
| The worker(s)' attitudes were very good . | 86.78 | 90.11 | 87.86 |
| The worker(s) had much interaction with participants. | 84.84 | 86.91 | 83.04 |
| On the whole, participants were satisfied with the worker(s) . | 88.98 | 90.38 | 88.53 |

Findings: views towards Tier 2 **Program effectiveness**

- about **four-fifths** of the respondents perceived that the program had induced **positive changes** in them.
- 1/3 items were rated over 85% including the following item in all 3 cohorts: Participants **have learnt** how to **help themselves** thru' participating in the program.

**Comparison of the positive views (%) towards Tier 2
Program effectiveness among different cohorts**

| Cohorts | 2005-06: S1 (EIP) Cohort A | 2006-07: S2 (EIP) Cohort B | 2006-07: S1 (FIP) Cohort C |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Positive views | | | |
| The service has helped participants a lot . | 82.81 | 84.33 | 82.42 |
| The service has enhanced participants' growth . | 86.00 | 86.15 | 84.14 |
| In the future, participants would receive similar service(s) if needed. | 82.68 | 83.35 | 80.22 |
| Participants have learnt how to help themselves thru' participating in the program. | 86.11 | 88.14 | 85.57 |
| Participants have had positive change(s) after joining the program. | 84.94 | 85.61 | 83.96 |
| Participants have learnt how to solve their problems through participating in the program. | 85.67 | 87.34 | 85.40 |
| Participants' behaviour has become better after joining this program. | 82.21 | 82.98 | 79.36 |
| Those who knew the participants agree that this program has induced positive changes in them. | 80.76 | 81.92 | 78.36 |

Discussion

- Participants' perceptions of the **program** were **positively correlated** with perceived **benefits** of the program.
- Participants' perceptions of the program **workers** were **positively correlated** with perceived **benefits** of the program.
- They suggest that the **quality** of the program and program workers are intimately related to perceived **benefits** of the program.

Intercorrelations among domains in Subjective Outcome Evaluation

**p<0.003

A Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level (17 pairs of correlations) was used.

| | Cohort B | Cohort B | Cohort C | Cohort C |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | vap | vai | vap | vai |
| Views about program (vap) | 1 | .94** | 1 | .92** |
| Views about instructors (vai) | .94** | 1 | .92** | 1 |
| Perceived Effectiveness of the Program | | | | |
| The service has helped participants a lot . | .94** | .87** | .92** | .87** |
| The service has enhanced participants' growth . | .96** | .89** | .89** | .84** |
| In the future, participants would receive similar service(s) if needed. | .93** | .87** | .90** | .85** |
| Participants have learnt how to help themselves thru' participating in the program. | .96** | .89** | .89** | .85** |
| Participants have had positive change(s) after joining the program. | .93** | .89** | .90** | .86** |
| Participants have learnt how to solve their problems through participating in the program. | .91** | .87** | .88** | .84** |
| Participants' behaviour has become better after joining this program. | .91** | .87** | .85** | .80** |
| Those who knew the participants agree that this program has induced positive changes in them. | .87** | .80** | .81** | .76** |

Program Theories

- Main types of program elements used:

Type A

(ABC) **plus** volunteer training and services (VTS)

Type B

Adventure-based counseling (ABC) **only**

Type C

Volunteer training and services (VTS) **only**

Type D

other approaches

Main types of program elements used comparisons across cohorts

| | 2005-06: S1 (EIP) | 2006-07: S2 (EIP) | 2006-07: S1 (FIP) |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Type A (ABC) plus volunteer training and services | 57.7% | 40.82% | 53.14% |
| Type B Adventure-based counseling (ABC) only | 15.4% | 22.45% | 27.54% |
| Type C Volunteer training and services (VTS) only | 13.5% | 24.49% | 11.59% |
| Type D other approaches | 13.5% | 12.24% | 7.73% |

Type A program (ABC+VTS) Characteristics & Effectiveness by Clientele by Cohort

| | Clien tele | N | Aver no of partic | Aver progr attend | Aver progr aims | Aver no of constru | Mean of overall effectiveness 6-point scale | | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | a | b | c | d |
| Cohort A 2005-06: S1 (EIP) N=18 | a | 13 | 65 | 81 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 4.52 | | | |
| | b | 3 | 107 | 87 | 1.3 | 10.0 | | 4.86 | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 2 | 137 | 85 | 2.0 | 3.5 | | | | 4.63 |
| Cohort B 2006-07: S2 (EIP) N=20 | a | 17 | 40 | 85 | 2.4 | 6.1 | 4.87 | | | |
| | b | 2 | 29 | 85 | 3.5 | 6.0 | | 4.58 | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 1 | 168 | 79 | 2.0 | 5.0 | | | | 4.45 |
| Cohort C 2006-07: S1 (FIP) N=110 | a | 79 | 50 | 83 | 2.0 | 5.7 | 4.54 | | | |
| | b | 23 | 77 | 82 | 1.8 | 8.0 | | 4.35 | | |
| | c | 1 | 47 | 92 | 2.0 | 5.0 | | | 5.13 | |
| | d | 7 | 111 | 86 | 2.0 | 6.6 | | | | 4.76 |

clientele: a= students; b= s + parents; c= s + teachers; d= s + p + t

Type B program (ABC only) Characteristics & Effectiveness by Clientele by Cohort

| | Clientele | N | Aver no of partic | Aver progr attend | Aver progr aims | Aver no of constru | Mean of overall effectiveness 6-point scale | | | |
|--|-----------|----|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | a | b | c | d |
| Cohort A 2005-06: S1 (EIP) N=11 | a | 9 | 64 | 81 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 4.41 | | | |
| | b | 1 | 77 | 53 | 2 | 4 | | 4.59 | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 1 | 31 | 100 | 1 | 4 | | | | 4.5 |
| Cohort B 2006-07: S2 (EIP) N=11 | a | 11 | 47 | 74 | 1.9 | 5.0 | 4.54 | | | |
| | b | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort C 2006-07: S1 (FIP) N=57 | a | 41 | 53 | 81 | 2.1 | 6.2 | 4.45 | | | |
| | b | 7 | 53 | 76 | 2.0 | 5.4 | | 4.6 | | |
| | c | 1 | 80 | 88 | 1.0 | 5.0 | | | 4.36 | |
| | d | 8 | 138 | 81 | 2.5 | 6.4 | | | | 4.04 |

clientele: a= students; b= s + parents; c= s + teachers; d= s + p + t

Type C program (VTS only) Characteristics & Effectiveness by Clientele by Cohort

| | Clientele | N | Aver no of partic | Aver progr attend | Aver progr aims | Aver no of constru | Mean of overall effectiveness 6-point scale | | | |
|--|-----------|----|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | | | | a | b | c | d |
| Cohort A 2005-06: S1 (EIP) N=16 | a | 16 | 63 | 84 | 3.3 | 5.4 | 4.54 | | | |
| | b | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort B 2006-07: S2 (EIP) N=12 | a | 8 | 69 | 85 | 2.0 | 6.5 | 4.41 | | | |
| | b | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | c | 1 | 63 | 90 | 2.0 | 2.0 | | | 4.82 | |
| | d | 3 | 67 | 90 | 3.3 | 7.0 | | | | 4.3 |
| Cohort C 2006-07: S1 (FIP) N=24 | a | 21 | 49 | 83 | 2.0 | 6.1 | 4.41 | | | |
| | b | 1 | 290 | 78 | 1.0 | 8.0 | | 4.84 | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 2 | 70 | 85 | 3.5 | 9.0 | | | | 4.15 |

clientele: a= students; b= s + parents; c= s + teachers; d= s + p + t

Type D program (other approaches) Characteristics & Effectiveness by Clientele by Cohort

| | Clientele | N | Aver no of partic | Aver progr attend | Aver progr aims | Aver no of constru | Mean of overall effectiveness 6-point scale | | | |
|--|-----------|----|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|-------------|---|-------------|
| | | | | | | | a | b | c | d |
| Cohort A 2005-06: S1 (EIP) N=7 | a | 7 | 37 | 84 | 1.9 | 4.14 | 4.76 | | | |
| | b | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort B 2006-07: S2 (EIP) N=6 | a | 5 | 48 | 85 | 1.4 | 4.8 | 4.59 | | | |
| | b | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 1 | 70 | 92 | 2.0 | 10.0 | | | | 4.32 |
| Cohort C 2006-07: S1 (FIP) N=16 | a | 11 | 58 | 88 | 2.2 | 5.0 | 4.42 | | | |
| | b | 3 | 129 | 90 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | 4.26 | | |
| | c | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | d | 2 | 70 | 85 | 3.5 | 9.0 | | | | 4.16 |

clientele: a= students; b= s + parents; c= s + teachers; d= s + p + t

Different Program Approaches

- **Cohort C: No differences** between utilizing and NOT utilizing the **ABC** approach
- Participants who joined programs with **VTS** had **higher global subjective outcome scores** than did participants who joined programs without VTS.
- So, engagement in **VTS** is conducive to the positive development of adolescents.

Limitations

- Subjective outcome evaluation
- Unit of analysis: school, not individual
- Program contents designed according to the various needs and contextual situations if different schools: hard to compare the results directly.

Reference

- Shek, DTL, Lee, TY, Sun, RCF, Lung, DWM (2008). Positive youth development programs targeting students with greater psychological needs: Subjective outcome evaluation. *TheScientificWorldJOURNAL: TSW Holistic Health \$ Medicine* 8, 73-82.

six functions of volunteering

- According to Clary et al. (1998), there are 6 functions of volunteering
- enhanced understanding of the world through volunteering (**knowledge** function);
- expression of values via volunteering (**value expressive** function);
- avoidance of personal issues or undesirable truths about the self via volunteering (**ego defensive** function);
- enhancement of self-esteem, competence, and mood (**self-enhancement** function);
- facilitation of career and development of a better resume (**utilitarian** function); and
- social companionship and socializing with other volunteers (**interpersonal** function).

benefits of volunteering

- There are research findings that also show that volunteers believed in several benefits of volunteering, including
 - **knowledge** and **skill** acquisition,
 - enhancement in **occupational** and **educational** opportunities, and
 - **social belongingness** among peers.
- In addition, there are research findings that show that volunteerism is associated with a
 - **lower level of anticipated distress** and **negative emotion**.
- Based on these findings, it would be expected that volunteer training and services would promote positive youth development.