1-1-2014

The Circle Of Courage: Childhood Socialization In The 21st Century

William Charles Jackson
Wayne State University,

THE CIRCLE OF COURAGE: CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATON IN THE 21ST CENTURY

by

WILLIAM C. JACKSON

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2014

MAJOR: SOCIOLOGY

Approved by:

_____

Advisor   Date

_____

_____

_____

_____

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my mothers. My grandmother Ella, though she is no longer leading us with her physical presence, remains the guiding light for her entire family, I love and miss her with all my heart. And to my mother Dolly, simply the greatest mother of all time. She has always given her best to her children and it is because of my mothers that I know what it is like to feel loved unconditionally. All that I have accomplished to this point in life is to make them both proud.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Modern socialization theory often focuses on the outcomes of socialization. This research will identify four developmental needs essential to the production of social acceptability or functionality in individuals. Known as the Circle of Courage, belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity, are hypothesized to be the desired outcome of childhood socialization (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 2002).

Studying socialization by its outcomes is useful; however, this approach has drawn sociological attention away from the interaction that constitutes the process (Wentworth, 1980). This requires understanding how children become group members, and the processes of value-norm internalizations and social learning which lead to developmental outcomes. This research seeks to convey the value of children in the socialization process, and focuses on specific outcomes necessary to create and sustain the society in which they live.

The establishment of a means to measure the four outcomes of childhood socialization will further inform our understanding of the relationship between the individual child and the group during the socialization process. The use of the Circle of Courage developmental model of socialization applied to the human service profession demonstrates the applicability of the approach to social institutions seeking to instill in children constructive beliefs, attitudes, values, norms or behaviors.

Children and youth receiving care and services have typically relied upon policy makers, program evaluators and service providers to determine what goals and outcomes are appropriate indicators of progress and well-being. As professionals participating in young people's

socialization process embrace the emerging paradigm of positive youth development (PYD), there is a need to establish consistent outcomes measures among practitioners, policy makers and community leaders (Small & Memmo, 2004).

PYD provides an alternative to the traditional assumption that youth are broken and need to be fixed. Instead, PYD views all youth as having many assets, capable of becoming positive and constructive contributors to society. Rather than viewing youth as problems or risk factors to be managed or reduced, PYD views young people as resources to be developed (Lerner, 2005; Damon, 2004). Although PYD is presented in a variety of configurations, the term typically refers to a focus on the developmental characteristics that lead to positive outcomes and behaviors among young people (Heck & Subramaniam, 2009). The successful socialization of our youth, in other words, positive development, is the paramount responsibility of all who work in education, after school programs, juvenile justice, treatment, and community programs (Brendtro & Larson, 2006; Eccles & Templeton, 2002). As social science has begun to focus on PYD, the field needs agreed upon principles and metrics to maintain its momentum (Walker, 2000). The establishment of a universally recognized theoretical framework applicable across the full range of PYD programming would provide consistent outcome measures to incorporate into program designs and help determine what programming is most effective in helping youth reach developmental goals. Currently, youth program designers and policy makers lack common constructs that will guide the development of stable outcome measures that are applicable regardless of whether the interest is reducing risk, developing resilience, or asset building (Smalls & Memmo, 2004).

Additional policy implications stem from the need to address the social forces that continually affect childhood socialization. Since the Civil Rights Act of 1964, America has

struggled to achieve the racial equality. Affirmative Action policies that do not focus on the real disadvantages that affect the successful socialization of children and youth living in lower socioeconomic environments may require revision. The problems of children and adolescents impacted by poverty, segregation, and other structural factors will require what Wilson (1987) refers to as non-racial solutions. Future policies should endeavor to provide families and individuals with resources that promote the Circle of Courage framework within the poorest neighborhoods, schools, and juvenile justice systems. Policies utilizing the Circle of Courage framework would be race neutral and insure that the variables described in the model are present and integrated into the social organization of communities, schools, and the social networks that flow through them.

This study seeks to use the PYD paradigm as a representation of childhood socialization to develop a psychometrically valid measurement instrument for the outcomes of the socialization process. Specifically, this study will investigate four PYD constructs belonging, mastery, independence and generosity as represented in the Circle of Courage developmental theory (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern 1990; 2002). In this dissertation, I argue that these four constructs can provide a framework for the establishment of universal outcome measures of childhood socialization regardless of the specific youth development programming utilized. Data will be collected from youth involved in Starr Commonwealth programming via survey questionnaires incorporating acceptable safeguards needed to establish reliability and validity. This research has two long-term goals. First, produce a reliable, valid measurement instrument to assess the outcomes for a variety of youth programming contexts that focus on PYD. Second, develop a tool capable of producing empirical support for the Circle of Courage model of

childhood socialization, which hypothesizes that when these four universal needs are effectively internalized, children develop into successful adults.

Background

As sociologists have grappled with the development of a conceivable relationship between the individual and society, they have been highly influenced by the psychological interpretation of socialization (Wentworth, 1980). The work of Sigmund Freud (1961) had a profound impact on later sociology including its emphasis on childhood as the core of socialization. Freud's focus on the impact of early experience on personality and the concept of internalization helped to change the conception of socialization (Wentworth, 1980). The concept of the "social self" drawn from the work of W.I. Thomas (1966), Cooley (1964), and Mead (1968) relegated the conflict between the individual and society to the realm of the psyche. Micro interactionist and interpretive sociology posed the question of how individuals become group members, and the unit of analysis shifted away from society to the individual (Wentworth, 1980). The specific focus on the child is reflected in Peter Bergers' definition of socialization as "the process by which a child learns to be a participant member of society" (Berger, 1963, p. 99). This transition fueled the emergence of a developmental approach to socialization. An important aspect of the developmental model of socialization is the thought that children could help to create the society in which they live (Bengston & Black, 1973). Developmental models of childhood socialization are useful in a variety of social institutions responsible for helping children and youth become productive members of society, notably education and juvenile justice. The new millennium has seen the emergence of the field of positive psychology as attention has turned from deficit-based to strength-based perspectives of childhood development.

At the turn of the 21st century, Martin Seligman, president of American Psychological Association, redirected the behavioral science field from a deficit to a strength orientation. Positive psychology focuses on the study of three related topics: positive subjective experiences, positive individual traits, and institutions that enable positive experiences and positive traits (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). For instance, Corsaro's (2011) theory of interpretive reproduction highlights the strengths in children and the positive contributions of their peer culture to society. The theory of interpretive reproduction presents a general sociological socialization theory that represents an opportunity for PYD researchers to develop outcome measures capable of unifying the youth development field. Both PYD and interpretive reproduction maintain that in order to understand successful socialization, researchers should focus on the degree to which youth develop positive traits rather than the degree to which they avoid negative characteristics.

Sociological research on children and youth has historically focused on socialization by examining the processes by which adaptation and internalization of society occurred (Clavering & McLaughlin, 2010; Corsaro, 2011). The perspective that structural or societal forces shape children framed many theories (Corsaro, 2011; Eder & Nenga, 2003; Corsaro, & Eder, 1990). Certain developmental psychologists recognized the impact of cognitive development as youth appropriate information from the environment to use in organizing and constructing their own interpretations of the world (Piaget, 1950, 1968; Vygotsky, 1978). These authors incorporated the impact of youth's cognition on their development, rather than seeing socialization as a one-way process in which only adults play an active role (Corsaro, 1992). Whether viewed as entirely passive agents taken over by adults and society or as agents capable of constructing their

own interpretations of the world, such approaches focus on youth being prepared for adulthood by adults and structural forces around them (Corsaro, 1992; Corsaro & Eder, 1990).

Traditional child welfare and juvenile justice policy makers, practitioners, and program evaluators have been influenced by the view that adults need to "civilize" youth, who, if left to their own devices, would succumb to the risks associated with social life (Sewell, 1963; Elder 1994; Holland, 1970; Marotz-Baden, Adams, Bueche, Munro, & Munro, 1979). These underlying assumptions often resulted in programming that amounted to attempting to control youth such as zero tolerance schools (APA, 2008), confinement in state training schools with little treatment, or boot camp programs that shock and humiliate youth into conformity (Bazemore, 1999; Zehr, 1990; Schwartz, 1987). Such control is perceived by the youth as constraining him or her to do what the socializing agent wants (Thomas & Weigart, 1997).

As understanding of the socialization process has matured, so have views regarding the role children and youth play, which have in turn influenced contemporary youth programming. For instance, Hitlin (2006) argues adolescents are more than just inactive recipients of family and peer influences. Instead, youth make choices shaped by an analysis of possibilities and exercise agency in their lives. These emerging models of youth development and problem prevention are influencing contemporary youth policies and practices. Instead of focusing narrowly on reducing risk, the emphasis is on supporting the normal socialization and healthy development of youth (Quinn, 1999). Generally, such programming is grouped into one of three types: prevention, resiliency, and PYD (Small & Memmo, 2004).

The ideas of prevention, resilience, and PYD vital to effective socialization have led to the creation of the youth development sector. Numerous organizations serve the diverse needs of youth and supersede an earlier era where the juvenile court system was the dominant social

institution that interacted with troubled young people. The juvenile court system attempted to fulfill the complicated dual roles of *societal disciplinarian* able to punish and of *parental substitute* to treat, supervise, and rehabilitate children (Schwarz, Weiner, & Enosh, 1999). However, trying to fulfill both of these roles can limit the actions of children and may in fact inhibit rather than enhance successful socialization. Although there is a lack of clarity surrounding the definitions of prevention, resilience, and PYD (Small & Memmo, 2004), the promotion of healthy youth development is now an acceptable goal worthy of social science investigation. As late as 1999, there was no standard definition of a youth development program, although public and private organizations began to utilize a variety of after-school programs to form the youth development sector (Quinn, 1999). Thus, some schools and other youth-focused organizations have been utilizing PYD activities and interventions well before the formal conceptualization of this field.

Social scientists have recognized that contrary to previous theories of childhood socialization, children are not just passively shaped by adult-imposed socialization (Corsaro, 2011; Corsaro & Eder, 1990; Eder, Evans, & Parker, 1995; Everhart, 1983). Children can and do operate independently of social structure, yet are also restrained and shaped by the deterministic aspects of the social structure. An emerging theory of interpretive reproduction places emphasis on peer culture, routines, and adult-child interaction. Essential to this view of socialization is the recognition of the importance of collective, communal activity—how children negotiate, share, and create with adults and each other. I argue that integrating these contemporary views on socialization with emerging youth development models operating in the child welfare and juvenile justice fields can benefit the field of youth development. Similar to PYD, interpretive reproduction stresses youth's collective actions, shared values, and often-positive contributions

to cultural reproduction (Corsaro, 2011). Currently, programming for PYD reflects many aspects of Corsaro's theoretical approach in the form of peers helping each other and influencing program activities. Examples include service learning projects, peer group counseling, promoting social justice, and authentic program design itself (Damon, 2004; Catalano et al., 2004; Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002). However, the link between contemporary sociological theories of socialization and PYD based youth programming has not been made in the extant literature.

PYD approaches within youth organizations and education have emerged as best practices. Research on Developmental Assets (Benson, 1997) shows that is it not enough to prevent problems in order to prepare youth for adulthood. While scholars and professionals may not all agree on exactly what PYD is (Whitlock & Hamilton, 2001; Roth, Brooks-Gunn, Murray, & Foster, 1998), they are recognizing that there are a number of critical experiences, opportunities, and supports that young people need to develop successfully into adulthood (Small & Memmo, 2004). This dissertation focuses on a specific PYD model called the Circle of Courage.

Circle of Courage

Brokenleg and Brendtro first presented the Circle of Courage model at an international conference of the Child Welfare League of America in 1988 (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & VanBockern, 1990, 2002; Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 2005). An early focus was to inform the practices of professionals working with children labeled "at risk" or "troubled". As the model has gained recognition, Christopher Peterson keynoted a 2008 conference at Wayne State University in Detroit, which explored applications of the Circle of Courage model as an exemplar of positive psychology (Peterson, 2008). As a theoretical model, the Circle of Courage constructs can be independent or dependent variables in a sociological model of socialization.

Successful socialization has been defined as internalization (Klein, 1992). Within the theoretical framework of this research project, successful childhood socialization is presumed to be related to the internalization of these beliefs:

Belonging: I am loved/cared about/important to someone.

Mastery: I can succeed and learn.

Independence: I can make decisions for myself.

Generosity: there is something more important than me. These constructs can be further defined once a valid and reliable instrument is developed to guide research. What is internalized--the successful outcome of socialization is influenced by the type of interactions individuals have with each other and their environment consistent with Urie Bronfenbrenner (1986) ecological model.

Ecological systems theory explains how everything in a child and the child's environment affects how a child grows and develops. From a sociological perspective, Bronfenbrenner's work reflects how childhood socialization is affected by environmental factors. He labeled different aspects or levels of the environment that influence children's development: the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem. Children's microsystems include any immediate relationships or organizations in their life space such as family or caregivers and their school or daycare. The Circle of Courage constructs function as dependent variables in the Bronfenbrenner's microsystem and are reliant upon immediate family members or caregivers to help children internalize belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity. The larger agents of socialization such as the mass media, education, government, and the economy exist in exosystem and macrosystems. These systems have a direct impact on the socialization process although children may not have direct interaction with the various actors

and structural components. Thus poverty, neighborhood factors, and other structural forces negatively affect children by interfering with developmental processes.

When the Circle of Courage constructs are reliant on the socialization process, they function as dependent variables. For example, the Circle of Courage constructs function as dependent variables within large social institutions like education. Education professionals use the Circle of Courage developmental model as a guide to classroom management, curriculum development, and other activities designed to assist the internalization of belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity in the students.

Within a developmental model of socialization focusing on the outcome of social responsibility and functionality, internalization of the Circle of Courage constructs function as independent variables. Approaching socialization as a process of internalization, becoming socially responsible and a properly functioning individual in society, is dependent upon the internalization of the Circle of Courage constructs. Socialization as internalization is a cognitive recognition by an individual that the four universal constructs exist within themselves. The internalization of the Circle of Courage constructs is therefore a prerequisite, the independent variable necessary for successful socialization—the dependent variable in this case. Stated another way, how well an individual functions in society is dependent upon the level of internalization of each Circle of Courage construct.

The various agents of socialization such as the family, peers, school, and community influence the Circle of Courage constructs. Successful socialization, the internalization of the Circle of Courage, is largely the result of interaction between the social structures and individuals that make up our society. The ability of families, peers, schools, and communities to successfully socialize children in environments of poverty, segregation, and discrimination is

often a formidable challenge. The broader societal problems associated with social-class subordination result in a disproportionate number of these youth being labeled as "at-risk". An at-risk label may simply result from being born and residing in certain neighborhoods, even though most youth are showing the normal problems of adolescence. If they resided in middle- or upper-class neighborhoods, they might be considered just "boys being boys", playing pranks, or fooling around.

The impact of poverty and other neighborhood factors are clearly discernable in the American educational and juvenile justice systems. Youth residing in high poverty neighborhoods frequently live next to other poverty-stricken families where underemployment or unemployment is high because the parents lack training and skills. Individuals may be engaged in street crime and other forms of problem behavior as described in Wilson's (1987) definition of the underclass. These communities often have poor schools and lack of community resources like recreational facilities, fine arts, and other opportunities for pro-social interaction. Familial factors such as long periods of unemployment, drug use, lack of education, threats of violence, and homelessness may dramatically affect family members and parent-child interaction. Youth in such contexts may lack a sense of being cared for by family and friends interested in their positive well-being. They may develop negative peer attachments and make decisions that are harmful to themselves or others.

Children experiencing these types of daily interactions are at-risk of poor academic performance and involvement with the child welfare and or juvenile justice systems. Far too often, students suspended, expelled, or even arrested for minor offenses are from underclass communities. A 2007 study by the Advancement Project and the Power U Center for Social Change indicated that for every 100 students who were suspended, 15 were Black, 7.9 were

American Indian, 6.8 were Latino, and 4.8 were white. Additionally, black youth encountering the juvenile justice system have a much higher probability of being detained and formally charged (Bonnie, Johnson, Chemers & Schuck, 2013). Disciplinary policies disproportionately target students of color and those with a history of abuse, neglect, poverty or learning disabilities.

Discussions of the issue of the underclass frequently turn into debates of the importance of race versus class. Race plays a primary role in American society and the Circle of Courage constructs. Deindustrialization or hyper-segregation described by Massey and Denton (1993) and economic segregation (Dreirer et al., 2004) interfere with meeting growth needs and fuel anti-societal socialization. Liberal policy makers might attribute these deficits in the Circle of Courage constructs as the result of the plight of disadvantaged groups related to the problems of the broader society, including discrimination and social-class subordination. Conservative policy makers may stress the importance of different group values and competitive resources to account for the deficit in Circle of Courage constructs. Regardless of the approach taken, the Circle of Courage constructs can provide policy makers, youth development professionals, parents, and anyone interested in the successful childhood socialization with a means to overcome these structural barriers. However, we must first effectively quantify a child's level of internalization of the constructs and establish evidence of actions and interventions capable of helping achieve successful socialization.

Professionals associated with youth and education have drawn on Native American philosophies of childhood development and strength-based approaches to address the needs of children at risk (Brendtro, Brokenleg, &Van Bockern, 2002; Morse, 2008; Long, Morse, Fecser, & Newman, 2007). These socialization philosophies provide a powerful alternative to narrowly focused perspectives associated with America's European cultural heritage that often viewed

children as lacking any ability to influence society until they have been properly socialized adults. The central purpose in Native American culture is the education and empowerment of children (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Van Bockern, 1990; Brendtro, Ness, & Mitchell, 2001; Gilgun, 2002). The Circle of Courage constructs can be considered to be growth needs and cultural values. The Circle of Courage model is a unifying philosophy characterized by a positive, asset-building orientation that builds on strengths rather than categorizing youth according to their deficits. Therefore, it is consistent with the definition of PYD (Whitlock & Hamilton, 2001) and interpretive reproduction. I argue that these constructs, upon psychometric validation, can be used as program outcome measures to provide much needed clarity currently lacking within the PYD paradigm. Moreover, the development of valid measurement instruments can move the youth development sector forward by providing a tool by which professionals can determine what programming is most effective for at risk youth.

Professionals working with youth are utilizing strength-based principles to refocus and redesign approaches to helping troubled children (Steele & Raider, 2001; Benard, 2004; Peterson, 2006; Brendtro, Mitchell, & McCall, 2009). If developmental needs are neglected, children exhibit a variety of social, emotional, and behavior problems that can hinder the socialization process. The theory of interpretive reproduction provides a solid basis to explain the process of how children build deep lasting relationships, cultivate talents, develop self-discipline, and contribute to others. There is widespread agreement that additional work must occur to create useful outcome measures associated with PYD (Peterson, 2004). If a psychometrically valid measurement instrument can be developed to assess the four constructs recognized by the Circle of Courage, then such an instrument could be used to generate specific outcome measures critical to the evaluation of programs aimed at positive childhood

socialization. The Circle of Courage framework recognizes the strengths of youth and the impact of positive connections between youth, their peers, and caring adults. Additional empirical evidence of how the Circle of Courage achieves its outcomes and the underlying processes operating within the model necessitate further research. Professionals throughout the world have integrated the Circle of Courage constructs into areas of youth development such as education, juvenile justice, child welfare, recreation, sports, and healthcare.

CHAPTER II

Theory and Literature Review

How do children become productive adults? An emphasis on socialization represented a significant change in the field of child development in the mid-nineteenth century. Classic childhood socialization theory focused on the processes by which individuals acquire the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values current in the groups of which they will become members of adult society (Sewell, 1963). Socialization is also defined as the process by which individuals prepare for participation in the society in which they live (Cogswell, 1968). Therefore, conceptions of childhood socialization have included a focus on the role of family, group membership, social structure, social learning as well as personality, culture, and social functioning. While definitions vary, most authors reference the processes by which children are assimilated into a particular culture and the changes in the behavior of individuals to conform to the demands of social life (Holland, 1970; Kerckhoff, 1970).

Problems have been associated with prevailing definitions of socialization. First, they overextend socialization to all parts of life, indeed to all social interaction, and thus they fail to discriminate socialization from other phenomena. Moreover, there is a lack of specificity about the nature of socialization activity (Long & Hadden, 1985). Thus, Long and Hadden's new

conceptualization sees socialization as a confidence-building process for gaining membership in a social group. Knowledge, skill, and commitment are all necessary to certify the novices' development. In other words, children are apprentices in training for full group membership. This new definition locates socialization in society's activities toward achieving the goal of producing new productive adults.

The challenges and problems of child and adolescence socialization continue to be an integral focus of social science research. Children and adolescents have been traditionally viewed as playing a minor if nonexistent role in their own socialization in contrast with more contemporary approaches associated with interpretive reproduction and PYD (Park, 2004; Walker, 1999; Scales, 1996; Lerner, Dowling, & Anderson, 2003). This dissertation's motivation is the role young people play in the present-day processes of socialization recognized in the PYD paradigm. The theory of interpretive reproduction moves social scientists away from traditional approaches to childhood socialization by placing emphasis on the agency and the strengths of children (Corsaro, 1988, 2011). The Circle of Courage becomes the blueprint necessary to achieve the goal of effective socialization and positive youth development.

Interpretive reproduction highlights how children obtain information from adults and use it to manufacture their own peer cultures. Ethnographic studies of peer cultures in schools and other settings accentuate the reciprocal nature of relationships between adults and children (Corsaro, 1988: Corsaro & Rizzo, 1990; Corsaro, 1992). Such an approach represents a significant change from sociology's traditional functionalist or deterministic approaches to children's socialization. Cook and Howard (1992) note that Corsaro's sociological approach also contrasts with more traditional approaches due to his emphasis on the active role of children in socialization, in creating culture, and re-shaping adult culture. Future research on childhood

socialization can use this interpretive perspective to explore how children themselves construct meaning about belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity. Such a scientific step forward will bring clarity and lead to increased utility of a psychometrically valid measurement. Despite the progress made by professionals in the PYD field, the missing link is an effective instrument capable of producing outcome data necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of PYD programming.

Socialization

Early sociological approaches to childhood socialization viewed children as needing to be taught by adults in order to be productive in adulthood. Children were seen as devoid of cognitive strengths and if left to their own devices would not be able to become suitable adults. This traditional approach did not recognize that children contribute in significant ways towards the socialization of their peers. Society controlled what a child needed to learn and social theory portrayed the child negatively, examining what the child is going to be and not what the child presently is (Alanen, 1988). The PYD paradigm approaches socialization differently by recognizing that children can and do play a significant role in their own development. From this perspective, children are valued and respected as an asset rather than seen as potential problems to be managed. For example, policies and programs associated with the PYD field focus on the developmental needs and tasks of children, promote self-understanding, self-worth, and resiliency (Oregon Commission on Children & Families, 2006).

Early socialization frameworks represented the world from the viewpoint of adults. This ideology fits with deterministic assumptions about childhood socialization as internalization of adult beliefs. Although internalization of adult values is a part of the process of socialization, it should not be considered the only goal. In the years after Freud, Parson's (1991) view of

socialization as internalization further moved the concept from sociology into the domain of psychology (Alanen, 1988). From the adult-dominated viewpoint, children must internalize the values and norms associated with adulthood civilization. It fell to individuals like Piaget (1968) and Vygotsky (1978) to show that children can also construct meaning for themselves. It is this constructivist viewpoint that the PYD field is advancing. This new paradigm takes a strength-based approach to defining and understanding how children influence and are influenced by their constructions of reality over time (Benson et al., 2006).

Sociological studies often seek to identify variables within society, the social environment, and cultural systems that shape the development of a child. The family was viewed as the primary cultural system in which children receive their socialization. For example, researchers sought to identify key variables such as power, support, parental control, and adolescent conformity to parents. They also studied how children disconnect from family influence, become deviant, and are lured into in crime and delinquency (Straus, 1964; DeLamater, 1968; Thomas & Weigart, 1971; Hagen, Simpson, & Gillis, 1979). PYD is not about learning what is wrong with children and fixing them. Instead, PYD attempts to examine the people, programs, institutions, and systems that provide children with the supports and opportunities for successful development (Benson et al., 2006).

Attitude development, identity construction, and family violence are also of interest to social scientists studying children. An example of attitude development research suggests that it is not what parents actually think but what their children perceive they think that predicts the children's attitudes (Acock & Bengston, 1980). Also, early childhood socialization and stressful life conditions are among the prominent explanations for family violence in adulthood (Seltzer & Kalmuss, 1988). The transmission of social knowledge considered essential for occupancy of

social statuses and the implementation of corresponding roles is a common conceptualization of traditional socialization (DiRenzo, 1977). Racial identity is an example of the transmission of social knowledge and status influenced by parental socialization (Demo & Hughes, 1990). Clearly attitude development, identity construction, and family violence remain of interest; however, many children experiencing stressful life conditions are able to avoid or minimize its impact. PYD recognizes that the best way to solve problems is to build on the strengths of children.

Children have been viewed as completely at the mercy of the adults and social institutions around them. Zigler and Child (1969) refer to "socialization" as the age-old problem of raising children to become productive members of the society. An unstated assumption is that life before adulthood is a vacuum that the adults must fill. In contrast, the PYD paradigm gives attention to the agency of children and youth. I argue that because socialization is an inherently interactive process, sociology must re-assert itself and lead the way in studying how children themselves affect socialization. An important step is the establishment of psychometrically valid measurement instruments capable of reliably gauging the outcomes of PYD programming. Such an instrument must be based in contemporary views of socialization that acknowledge the active role of children in the process.

Modern-day Socialization Theory

Contemporary childhood socialization has emerged in the form of PYD in the past twenty years. There is a lack of consensus as to exactly what is PYD and definitions and descriptions abound (National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth, 2001; Zarrett & Lerner, 2008; Benson et al., 2006; 4-H, 2009). The definitions share many core ideas, which have been elaborated on in different forms (Quinn, 1999; Delgado, 2002; Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003; Catalano et al.,

2004; Eccles & Templeton, 2002; Silliman, 2004; Smalls & Memmo, 2004; Damon, 2004). It not the intent of this dissertation to assert a definitive definition of PYD, but to take steps towards a unified framework useful for practice, evaluation, and research made possible with a psychometrically valid instrument.

It is difficult to determine exactly when or who is responsible for the PYD movement in the United States. The concept youth development is a precursor to that of "PYD". The term "youth development" has at least three different meanings, including: 1) the *process* of socialization, 2) *principles* underlying youth programs, and 3) *practices* that foster thriving (Hamilton, Hamilton, & Pittman, 2004). In a review of PYD, Delgado (2002) notes that the classic studies of resilience by Emmy Werner (Werner & Smith, 1992) laid the foundation for this movement and has strongly influenced contemporary practice (Baines & Seita, 1999).

The lack of a parsimonious definition of PYD results from the variety of components, frameworks, and principles associated with it. This diversity of viewpoints is a barrier to building a unified and consistent approach within the paradigm. Nevertheless, PYD has become the marquee description of nearly all forms of services delivered by youth professionals and organizations (Delgado, 2002). For example, PYD models are being applied to education, after-school, community development, parent education, and sports (Dryfoos, 1999; Eccles & Templeton, 2002; Kerpelman, 2004; Nicholson, Collins & Holmer, 2004; Weissberg & O'Brien, 2004; Lawson, Claiborne, Hardiman, Austin, & Surko, 2007; Gomez & Ang, 2007; Zaff & Lerner, 2010). PYD frameworks promote better behavior and performance in school or extra-curricular activities, offer a platform to develop more effective parenting programs, and identify how components of extracurricular activities like service learning promote youth development.

Schools applying a PYD framework have utilized an ecological approach (Bogenschneider, 1996). However, despite the strengths of the paradigm, it is limited by the inability to examine the complex social, economic, and political forces that affect the lives of urban youth (Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002). Instead, the authors' propose a social justice model for youth development that shifts attention from individual and psychological frameworks to providing opportunities to heal from the impact of hostile forces, develop critical consciousness, and social action. The variety of PYD approaches is providing practitioners, researchers, policy-makers, and youth with a fresh approach to examining old problems associated with youth development.

Positive Youth Development Movement

Establishing a consensus within the PYD field requires that both research and practice combine to form a basis for future movement. The idea of consilience, crosschecking knowledge from independent disciplines to identify powerful core concepts, first developed by philosopher-scientist William Whewell (1847) is a useful tactic to employ within the PYD field. Socio-biologist E. O. Wilson of Harvard contends that all fields of knowledge have difficulty identifying core constructs because of the massive explosion of data and specialization of science (Wilson, 1998). The PYD field is no exception. The use of research tools such as psychometrically valid measurement instruments can provide vital outcome data when combined with the natural sciences, knowledge from our practical experiences, and cultural values. The movement towards a science-based practice to increase the availability and quality of resources in order to establish program standards within the PYD field is critical (Silliman, 2004). Towards this end, fifteen constructs of PYD programs, a summary of youth development outcomes, and the characteristics of PYD programs were examined (Catalano et al., 2004). This

research identified a wide range of PYD approaches that promote positive youth behaviors and the prevention of problem behaviors. Different outcomes were achieved although a consensus of what comprises a full set of PYD outcomes is lacking. A complete measurement package to increase our understanding of the processes and help to establish a shared language and framework is recommended.

The lack of a framework to unify and establish a platform to develop measurable outcomes has plagued the PYD paradigm. Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity regarding concepts associated with the paradigm. PYD scholarship must identify and understand the mechanisms that help explain a problem, the factors that contribute to its reduction, and the strategies that generate positive adaptation and development (Small & Memmo, 2004). "If the field of youth development is to mature into a unified discipline, more consistent use of terminology is needed, as is work toward developing a more integrated conceptual framework and creating opportunities for dialogue among both practitioners and researchers" (Small & Memmo, 2004: p. 10).

Has the PYD field progressed since the Small and Memmo's suggestion? Complexity continues to be prevalent based on the Search Institutes' examination of PYD. The report describes four vocabularies of PYD, eleven core constructs, and the fifteen objectives for building development nutrients (Benson et al., 2006). A major contribution of the PYD field is the identification of multiple contexts and settings to enlighten developmental trajectories and the recommendation of an interdisciplinary approach, integrating multiple fields in common pursuit of joint positive ecological and individual-level strengths (Benson et al., 2006). However, achieving this goal will not be possible without valid and reliable measurement instruments and an agreed upon PYD framework.

Small and Memmo (2004) and Benson et al. (2006) advocate for a joining of forces, a unification of the discipline. However, such an integrated approach remains elusive. Researchers studied the comparative strengths and weaknesses of models of youth development which have been used within the 4-H program (Heck & Subramaniam, 2009). The five frameworks selected were *Community Action Framework*, *Targeting Life Skills, Assets, The Four Essential Elements* (i.e., the Circle of Courage)*, and *The Five Cs*. These youth development frameworks are important guides to future PYD research, evaluation, and practice. Based on context, any of the five frameworks can be useful and some are better supported by empirical research than others are. *The Four Essential Elements* framework has been used extensively within 4-H, an American youth development organization serving more than 6.5 million youth focusing on science, health and citizenship. *The Four Essential Elements,* namely the Circle of Courage constructs, is the most parsimonious framework. However, it lacks empirical evidence identifying its elements (Belonging, Mastery, Independence, and Generosity) as the most critical for youth to develop. The most extensively studied framework is *The Five C's* constructs: competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring. *The Five C's* has achieved validation and demonstrated positive impact for youth participating in 4-H programming (Lerner, Lerner, & Phelps, 2009). Lerner's constructs are substantially a paraphrase of the earlier Circle of Courage constructs and the work of Karen Pittman (1991).

The youth development field has advanced from claiming nearly any type of youth programming to the recognition of five youth development frameworks. Nevertheless, the paradigm is still in its infancy and lacks the scientific rigor associated with other social science research (Lerner, Fisher, & Weinberb, 2000; Silliman, 2004; Peterson, 2004; Smalls & Memmo, 2004; Moore, Lippman, & Brown, 2004). The development of PYD scales in China and

America have increased recognition as well (Shek, Siu, & Lee, 2007; Sabatelli, Anderson, Kosutic, Sanderson, & Rubinfeld, 2009; Sun & Shek, 2010, 2012). A group design was used to validate the Chinese Positive Youth Development Scale (CPYDS) with research subjects consisting of adolescents with well and poor adjustment. The scale consists of fifteen subscales with between four and seven items associated with each. Results indicate the Self-Efficacy Scale, the CPYDS, and its subscales were positively related to indices of thriving, life satisfaction, academic results, and negatively related to substance abuse, delinquency, and intention to engage in high-risk behavior (Shek, Siu, & Lee, 2007).

Another instrument called The Youth Development Assessment Device (YDAD) designed to measure a youth's experiences within youth development programs was also developed. Each conceptual dimension such as supportive relationships or meaningful involvement is the result of an assemblage of interrelated sub dimensions and the goal of the YDAD was to develop items representative of these multidimensional constructs. The twenty-four item instrument revealed three factors and two hypothesized dimensions were confirmed by the data. Another example of a measurement instrument developed to assess the developmental quality of youth programs from the perspective of the youth (Sabatelli, Anderson, Kosutic, & Sanderson, 2009) called The Life Satisfaction, Positive Youth Development, and Problem Behavior Instrument. The instrument examined the relationships between life satisfaction and positive youth development. Twenty-one theoretical constructs each with between three and eighty items were administered to nearly fourteen thousand youth. Results indicated that life satisfaction was positively correlated with other measures of positive youth development. While providing empirical support for PYD, these examples also revealed a lack of uniformity or an integrated conceptual framework. It is quite possible that this complexity and confusion will

limit implementation of policies associated with PYD (Bogenschneider & Gross, 2004; Walker, 1999; Lerner, Dowling, & Anderson, 2003; Benson et al., 2006). The use of parsimonious PYD frameworks such as the Circle of Courage could lead to a standardization and uniformity within the field.

Positive Youth Development and Circle of Courage

The PYD paradigm is rapidly becoming the dominant approach of youth organizations and practitioners throughout the United States. One organization active in the PYD field is 4-H. Since 2002, a team of researchers have surveyed more than 7,000 youth from nearly all fifty states enrolled in 4-H programs. The research features The 5 Cs of PYD and it discovered that youth participating in 4-H programs are more likely to abstain from drug use, delay sexual intercourse, and maintain higher academic achievement (Lerner, Lerner, & Phelps, 2009).

The research conducted on youth participating in 4-H programs is valuable and necessary to increase recognition and promotion of the agency of youth within the PYD field. Moreover, because the constructs described as the Five Cs are synonymous with the Circle of Courage, Lerner's work provides further validation of the central role of belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity in PYD. Prior to Lerner's research, Pittman and colleagues described the Five Cs constructs (Hamilton, Hamilton & Pittman, 2004): Confidence - a sense of self-worth and mastery; having a sense of self-efficacy (belief in one's capacity to succeed); Character - taking responsibility; a sense of independence and individuality; connection to principles and values; Connection - a sense of safety, structure, and belonging; positive bonds with people and social institutions; Competence - the ability to act effectively in school, in social situations, and at work; Contribution - active participation and leadership in a variety of settings;

making a difference Regardless of whether it is Lerner's or Pittman's Five Cs model, the Circle of Courage encapsulates these constructs within its framework.

The Circle of Courage first entered 4-H programming 20 years ago under the leadership of Cathann Kress (2014). Subsequently, the National 4-H Assessment project identified eight youth development principles; these were synthesized into the four Circle of Courage constructs and designated as the 4-H Essential Elements of Youth Development (Cornell Cooperative Extension, 2003; Kress, 2003).

The Circle of Courage in Practice

The Circle of Courage framework has guided programming activities in a variety of settings associated with children and youth. Although there are many examples of the Circle of Courage framework being applied in schools and youth agencies data associated with specific outcomes is scarce. Contributing to this limited empirical evidence is the absence of a psychometrically valid measurement instrument necessary to measure belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity. Thus, the insertion of the Circle of Courage framework firmly in the realm of childhood socialization and the development of a measurement instrument will be advantageous to future scientific studies within the paradigm.

The PYD paradigm advocates for a healthy ecology in the family, school, peer group, and community demonstrating the influence of the ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). This social ecological perspective is integrated with the Circle of Courage model (Van Bockern, Brendtro, & Brokenleg, 2000, 2003). Brendtro and Van Bockern (1994) describe how the Circle of Courage integrates sociological, psychodynamic, behavioral, and ecological approaches into its PYD structure. In addition, the Developmental Assets model identifies 20 internal assets and 20 external assets as central to PYD. The internal assets correspond to the Circle of Courage

constructs and the external assets are ecological supports designed to foster the internal assets (Leffert, Benson, & Roehlkepartain, 1997).

Schools in North America and beyond have worked to integrate Circle of Courage dimensions and provide opportunities for belonging, mastery, independence, and generosity (Van Bockern and McDonald, 2012). For instance, *Response Ability Pathways* (RAP) training model puts Circle of Courage principles into practice. The RAP curriculum is now offered to professionals working with children in a variety of professions in Africa, Australasia, Europe, and North America. In 2011, thousands of indigenous North Americans participated in the Alberta Indigenous Games, six days of sport, education and cultural awakening. Circle of Courage values were a part of all events, combining the wisdom of indigenous cultures with modern research on PYD (Marchand, 2011).

The Circle of Courage framework recognizes and promotes the agency of children in a manner that is consistent with PYD field. Delgado (2002) describes the social dimension as one of the five vital elements of PYD programming. Peer cultures are established and maintained within the Circle of Courage framework. Positive Peer Culture is a strength-based strategy for children and youth that captures peer influence and applies it to a therapeutic group model committed to promoting the developmental constructs of the Circle of Courage (Brendtro & Van Bockern, 1994; Giacobbe, Traynelis-Yurek, & Laursen, 1999, Gold & Osgood, 1992). Featured in residential group care, child development is integrated with the peer culture (Fulcher & Ainsworth, 1985). The Circle of Courage is also a central element in the Cornell University CARE curriculum Children and Residential Experiences (Holden, 2009). The study of the interaction of children in peer groups demonstrates that childhood socialization is characterized by agency rather than passivity (Corsaro, 2011). Children's own private logic within the peer

group influences how they relate to adults around them. Thus, the influence of children and adults on the development and socialization process is reciprocal rather than a one-way process. Research on moral development in children and youth describes applications of Positive Peer Culture as a framework for fostering pro-social behavior and development (Gibbs, 2003). Therefore, Positive Peer Culture directly emphasizes children's agency within the peer culture consistent with interpretive reproduction theory's investigation of childhood socialization captured within the PYD movement.

Peer pressure is generally been viewed from a deficit perspective, often examining the extent youth are prone to engage in risky behavior because of peer influence and pressure (Patrick et al., 1999 cited in Delgado, 2002, p. 114). Osgood and Briddell (2006) note that deviant peer influence is a destructive process in modern society while Positive Peer Culture was designed to elicit PYD, even with populations of delinquent youth. The development of the Positive Peer Culture and Circle of Courage strength-based models is documented in Europe and cited as exemplars of positive psychology (Vandries, 2010; Steinebach, Steinebach, & Brendtro, 2013).

The Circle of Courage framework has been practiced in a variety of formats throughout, North America, Canada, Europe and Africa. The educational system has emerged as a principal location for the application of PYD models such as the Circle of Courage. Educational professionals have used the Circle of Courage framework as a guide to classroom management, curriculum development, improved retention, building student/teacher trust, accessing the climate of schools by youth, and reducing student conflicts (McDonald, 2010; Tew, 2002; DeJong & Hall, 2006; Corrigan, Klein, & Issacs, 2010; Duke & Mechel, 1984; Odney, 1992; Kress & Forrest, 2000; McNeil & Hood, 2002). Within the educational arena, the Circle of

Courage is seen as a PYD model that prevents trauma and fosters post-traumatic growth (Steele & Malchiodi, 2011).

Practitioners working in the juvenile justice field have also incorporated the Circle of Courage framework into their strategies to help troubled youth. James Anglin (2002) of University of Victoria, British Columbia, conducted research on ten Canadian programs for at-risk youth. When the basic needs for children as identified in the Circle of Courage are not met, children react with pain-based behavior. Life Space Crisis Intervention is an essential tool for organizations providing a series of sophisticated therapeutic strategies for meeting the needs of youth as identified by the Circle of Courage (Brendtro & Long, 2005). The University of Manitoba also used the Circle of Courage framework to show "how physical education can provide a reclaiming versus alienating learning environment for young people" at the Macdonald Residential Treatment Center in Manitoba (Halas, 2002, p. 267). The Circle of Courage has been used to establish developmental milestones, replacing point level systems in behavior management programs (Pike, Millspaugh, & Desalvatore, 2005).

The Circle of Courage framework has also influenced the medical field. Polly Nichols (1998) established a Circle of Courage school at the University of Iowa Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Service. While the four constructs were designated as goals of the program, the assessment systems were not tied to these. The Circle of Courage principles were proposed as the universal cross-cultural framework for working with students with emotional and behavior disorders (Kauffman 2000; Whelan & Kauffman, 1999). In another application, the Circle of Courage was used to develop a mental health curriculum based on literature (Herman & Neidenthal, 1996). The Circle of Courage is being used by pediatricians as a framework for

interviewing children and youth to identify and develop strengths (Duncan et al., 2007; Frankowski, Leader, & Duncan, 2009; Frankowski & Duncan, 2013).

Outside the United States, the Circle of Courage Framework continues to gain influence. President Nelson Mandela of South Africa formed The Inter-Ministerial Committee on Young People at Risk to transform services to children and youth (ICYPR, 1996). With the work of Lesley du Toit, the Circle of Courage became the central approach to PYD in South Africa (Brendtro & du Toit, 2005). The National Youth Development Outreach (NYDO) in Pretoria, South Africa, serves adolescents in conflict with the law by incorporating Circle of Courage constructs into a music therapy program (Lotter, 2003). Traditional cultures are considered more effective in meeting the developmental needs of children than modern Western cultures (Herbert, 1993). Erik Erikson (1987) formed his developmental theories by studying child rearing in Native cultures. Traditional societies have used socialization processes more attuned to developing the positive assets of youth Diamond (2012). German applications of the Circle of Courage are described in fields of adventure education and social work (Brendtro & Brokenleg, 1994; Brendtro, 1995).

Scholars from a variety of backgrounds have generated the development of an assortment of instruments centered on the Circle of Courage model in the past twenty years. A recent example is the Positive Youth Inventory a collection of 34 Likert scale items designed to measure changes in PYD. The scale measures the following constructs: pro-social values, future orientation, emotional regulation, personal standards, adult support, friendships, and contribution (Arnold, Nott, & Meinhold, 2012). Additional instruments have been developed to measure resilience, school connectedness, youth assets, spirituality, school alienation and the strengths of children (Tess, Gleckman, & Spence, 1992; Oman et al., 2002; Prince-Embury, 2007; Dunlop,

Van Patten, Mandsager & Larson, 1997; Epstein & Sharma, 1998; Snook, 2000). The 4-D is an assessment tool completed by staff based on the four quadrants of the Circle of Courage focusing on the four identical constructs associated with this dissertation (Gilgun, 2002; Gilgun, Chalmers, & Kesinen, 2002).

Research involving the conceptualization and measurement of positive indicators of youth development continues. The book *What Do Children Need to Flourish?* edited by Moore and Lippman (2005) contains more than twenty examples of instruments ranging from positive formation of the self to enacting positive values and behaviors in communities. Examples include the Children's Hope Scale, a twelve item scaled initially given to fourth through sixth graders in the public schools of Edmond, Oklahoma (Snyder, 2005). In another effort to meet the challenge of identifying and measuring positive functioning in youth, Brian Barber (2005) developed the Positive Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Functioning: An Assessment of Measures among Adolescents scale. The seven measures of positive adolescent functioning Barber developed include self-esteem, empathy, peer connection and communication with mother and father each closely associated with one or more of the Circle of Courage constructs. These instruments provide further confirmation of the ways in which researchers are seeking to identify positive attributes of children rather than focusing on their deficits.

While many of the instruments are in various stages of evaluation to determine their usefulness and psychometric properties they represent examples of instrument construction utilizing children as research subjects and the survey items will help to establish the validity of the measures constructed for this study. Researchers developed an instrument called A Scale of Positive Social Behaviors to examine social competence with peers and adults, compliance with rules and adult direction, and autonomy or self-reliance (Epps, Park, Huston, & Ripke 2005).

The Scale of Positive Social Behaviors directs its focus towards children's social agency associated with belonging, mastery and independence associated with social competence, compliance with rules and self-reliance respectively. These scales all represent a concerted effort by researchers to utilize children as research subjects providing needed experiences for those interested in pursuing a similar path.

Whether referred to as the Four Essential Elements or the Circle of Courage, this framework is an example of PYD methodology. The process of PYD is essentially the adjustment from infancy of an individual's behavior to conform to the demands of social life— socialization (Jary & Jary, 1991). Sociology can play a more active role within the PYD paradigm by making the link between contemporary sociological perspectives on socialization and PYD more explicit. By recognizing children's agency and applying the Circle of Courage framework a measurement tool useful for future PYD research can be developed. Early childhood socialization had a tendency to place emphasis on what goes wrong in novice-agent interactions and sought to identify variables thought necessary for proper development. However, more contemporary childhood socialization recognizes the agency of children and it is within the PYD movement that peer influence plays a central role. The PYD movement recognizes the positive impact of peer culture in helping youth to meet certain developmental needs.

The Circle of Courage is a parsimonious framework within the PYD field that captures peer influence and identifies four developmental needs necessary for successful socialization. Though applied widely in practical settings the Circle of Courage framework still lacks empirical confirmation. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a psychometrically valid measurement instrument for the four Circle of Courage constructs. Such an instrument will provide an

invaluable tool useful in generating scientific evidence needed to establish belonging, mastery, independence and generosity as outcomes for the PYD field taking the next step in gathering evidence to confirm this developmental theory and improve services that professionals deliver to improve the outcomes for children and youth.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Starr Commonwealth's mission is to create positive environments where children flourish. A 501(c)(3) human service organization, Starr Commonwealth (SC) has served troubled children for 100 years and is internationally recognized as a leader in transformational programs for children, families, schools and communities. SC's treatment philosophy is rooted in seeing something good in every child, which serves as the guiding principle in its strength-based approach. SC serves children from birth to adulthood, offering a full spectrum of community-based early intervention, prevention and treatment services along with specialized residential programs at locations in Michigan and Ohio.

SC's residential treatment care includes programs for substance abusing, sexually reactive, delinquent, and abused or neglected youth. In addition, SC's Montcalm Schools for Boys and Girls offer a therapeutic and educational alternative for family-referred youth in a residential setting. Families seeking access to Montcalm Schools have children with a variety of issues, from delinquent behaviors and legal conflicts, to unresolved anger or grief relating to adoption, autism, Asperger's Syndrome and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). SC's community-based programming includes treatment foster care, in-home mental health services, after school and weekend programming, school- and parent-referred programs for

suspended youth and those wishing to recover academic credits to graduate, supervised independent living for older teens, and more.

SC is committed to serving the needs of disadvantaged and at-risk youth in the metro Detroit area. Since 1987, SC's Detroit location has provided a continuum of care from birth to adulthood for neglected, abused, at-risk and delinquent children in Detroit and surrounding areas. SC Detroit's community-based programs include Foster Care, New Boundaries Residential Transition and Reintegration Support, Alternatives Substance Abuse Treatment, Supervised Independent Living for older teens, and Youth Assistance Program. In 2010-11, approximately 500 children and youth from Wayne County and southeast Michigan participated in these programs.

Starr Commonwealth is the managing partner of StarrVista, Inc. a juvenile justice care management organization (CMO) for the Wayne County Department of Children and Family Services (CAFS). StarrVista is one of five CMOs in this innovative juvenile justice service system for children and adolescents in Wayne County. StarrVista provides comprehensive, individual case management services for the county, the Wayne County juvenile court, prosecutors, and Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS) working in conjunction with CAFS.

Youth experience intake and release from SC's programs throughout the year. The following client demographics represent a period of time between October 1, 2011 and September 30, 2012. Of the 2,225 clients served during this time period, some may have enrolled more than once. The mean age at intake is 13.53 years, 74.2% male and 25.8% female. African Americans comprise 49.5% and Caucasians 40.3% of the total population. Eighth, ninth and tenth graders combine to total 50.51% of the grade levels, the highest percentage is ninth

grade 19.15%. The three largest categories of legal status is parent responsible 38.2%, temporary court/county ward 22.8% and county ward delinquent 17.8%. More than twenty referral sources place children at SC. The highest percentage is juvenile justice through StarrVista 16.58%, followed by children's services/division of family and child 13.84%. Michigan County DHS and schools refer 10.92% and 10.07% respectively. The living arrangements prior to intake at SC vary but the majority of clients were living with their parent(s) 53.71% before enrolling at SC.

The average number of previous placements prior to enrollment is 2.76. The initial problems identified upon admission to SC include, family, school, peer related, and behavioral. The most prevalent presenting problem is behavioral with a frequency of 1,298 representing 58.3% of the clients served. Criminal behavior is listed as presenting problem nearly half as frequent as either school or family related problems. The offense most frequently resulting in the commitment to state or county custody is a status offense. A status offense is an act that would not be considered illegal if the youth were an adult such as truancy from school or home 13.9% were listed in this category. Status offense is also the foremost offense resulting in adjudication at 7.5%.

The families of the clients served at SC have histories of neglect 44.6%, school related problems 40.0%, judicial system involvement 37.6% and out-of-home placements 34.6%. Illegal substance use, abuse, mental illness and family instability is also prevalent. The majority of the families are single parent households 44.3%, both biological parents present make up 17.9% and 7.6% are from an adoptive family. This research project was approved by the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board in order to project the rights of the adolescent participants.

Participants

The sample consisted of fifty-one youth (46 male, 5 female) enrolled in programming at Starr Commonwealth in 2014 ranging in age from thirteen to seventeen (*M*=15.5; *SD* =1.2).

Thirty-four youth were from Wayne County, Michigan, fifteen lived in a county in Michigan other than Wayne and one youth lived in a state other than Michigan. The highest percentage of youth were African American (64.7%) followed by Caucasian (21.6%). Nearly ten percent of the youth were of mixed race (9.8%), one Asian youth and one Hispanic/Latino also participated in the study. The majority of the sample participants lived with their mother (47.1%), the next largest group lived with both parents (21.6%) and third largest group consisted of some combination of parent(s), grandparent(s) and other relatives (11.8%). The last grade completed ranged from 5th grade to 12th grade (M=9.1; SD=1.5). Twenty-six (51.0%) of the sample had between one and three siblings while the remaining participants were nearly equally divided between three to five and five or more siblings (27.5%) and (21.6%) respectively. Starr Commonwealth's largest treatment option is its one-hundred year old residential programming and 30 youth (58.8%) were placed there, the remaining youth were enrolled in various Starr community-based programming in the Detroit area.

Measures

Eighty-seven Circle of Courage items were generated from an original list of three-hundred ten items. Four experts with a combined total of more than one hundred years of experience in positive psychology, sociology, juvenile justice and the child welfare field developed the items from existing instruments or rational expert judgment and experience. All items have a 6-point Likert response scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with higher scores indicating a stronger endorsement of the item. The items selected for this study reflect the universality of the constructs and center on the strengths of youth and their families. For example, "Our family sticks together during bad times." reflects the positive qualities of families including those that have experience the removal of children from their homes. Others

items represent the belief that the influence of positive relationships between youth and adults (e.g., "My teachers really care about me." or "I get along with my teachers." The impact of peer relationships in the socialization process is reflected in items such as "I have a lot of friends at school.", "Most kids like me a lot." and "Some kids make fun of me."

Research Procedures

A research assistant administered the questionnaire to a convenience sample of seven youth enrolled in Starr Commonwealth's residential programming located in Albion, Michigan after parental consent forms were received. After students completed the questionnaire, they participated in a focus group discussion to determine if subjects found any questions confusing, redundant or hard to answer. The primary researcher reviewed a verbatim transcription of the focus group to ensure that the participants understood the questions and that the questions were written at an appropriate reading level. When no changes to the questionnaire resulted from Phase I, the recruitment of youth to participate in main data collection phase began.

A research assistant administered the questionnaire to youth placed in programming at the Starr - Albion or Detroit locations. On two occasions youth that had been transferred to another agency were administered the questionnaire at the facility where they were currently located. The pre-specified sample size was 400, but the sluggish response rate of 12.8% for returned parental consent forms and the time limitations to complete the research resulted in 54 consent forms (2 were outside the age parameters 13-17) from a pool of approximately 421 possible participants.

Results

The first step of the analysis involved the examination of 87 items using SPSS Version 22.0 for Windows. Scale item means, standard deviations, interitem correlation matrix, and item

total correlations were computed and examined. Descriptive data were calculated, including frequencies for each response. Item number 7, "I feel close to some adult in my family" had the highest mean score of 4.47 and the item with the lowest mean score of 2.02 was number 82, "It is hard for me to trust someone else because they will probably let me down". Items number 6.7,9, 10, 38, 61, 70, 71, and 74 were eliminated from the item pool due to excessive skewness (<2) or kurtosis (>5). No items were eliminated because of redundancy , as the highest inter-item correlation was between item 11 "I can talk to my parents" and item 4 "Our family sticks together during bad times." Table 1 below presents the descriptive statistics for all of the analysis variables.

Table 1 – Descriptives

	N	MEAN	SD
Q1 I get along well with my parents/caregiver	49	4.00	1.021
Q2 I can talk to my parents/caregiver about them	50	3.92	1.140
Q3 My family trusts each other	50	3.96	.968
Q4 Our family sticks together during bad times	50	4.14	1.050
Q5 I feel calm when I am with my family	51	4.22	.879
Q6 I can trust my family	50	4.26	1.103
Q7 I feel close to some adult in my family	49	4.47	.680
Q8 My parents/caregivers try to understand my point of view	49	3.92	1.115
Q9 My parent often shows he or she loves me	50	4.44	.861
Q10 May parents/caregiver want to know where I am	51	4.39	1.021
Q11 I can talk to my parents/caregivers about my feelings	49	3.78	1.433
Q12 My family expects me to be responsible	50	4.64	.485
Q13 People in my family listen to one another	50	3.82	1.082
Q14 In my family, people show that they care about each other	50	4.10	.995
Q15 I have trouble keeping friends	51	3.35	1.412
Q16 I can make friends	50	4.42	.731
Q17 I find it easy to talk with other kids	51	3.92	1.074
Q18 I feel calm with my friends	49	4.31	.742
Q19 I can trust my teachers	46	3.61	1.164
Q20 I can trust my friends	46	3.93	1.104
Q21 The kids I live with do a lot of things together	48	3.96	1.071
Q22 Kids in my class always pick on me	50	4.02	1.348
Q23 I like my teachers a lot	49	3.57	1.061
Q24 My teachers don't pay much attention to me	47	3.43	.950

Q25 Kids always make fun of me	49	2.08	1.170
Q26 My teachers don't like me as much as other kids	45	3.60	1.095
Q27 I get along with my teachers	49	3.92	.862
Q28 I have a lot of friends at school	50	3.78	1.130
Q29 Most kids like me a lot	49	4.06	.876
Q30 Kids at school are always making fun of me	48	3.98	1.211
Q31 My teachers are really interested in me	46	3.85	1.010
Q32 I feel close to people at school	45	3.18	1.284
Q33 I feel safe in my school	48	3.58	1.269
Q34 I have a hard time making friends	48	3.81	1.214
Q35 Some kids make fun of me	45	3.84	1.186
Q36 I am afraid of some kids	49	4.20	1.099
Q37 I worry about how well other kids like me	47	3.72	1.280
Q38 I worry about getting beat up at school	50	4.30	1.199
Q39 My teachers really care about me	46	3.70	1.152
Q40 The principal in my school really cares about me	43	3.40	1.237
Q41 I know kids who are afraid of each other at school	46	2.46	1.224
Q42 Students keep their problems secret from one another	44	2.68	1.308
Q43 Students keep their problems secret from adults	41	2.20	1.123
Q44 When school staff have a problem with a student, they are respectful	46	3.48	1.243
Q45 School is a safe place I fit in and belong	46	3.57	1.294
Q46 I have at least on adult in school I can talk to	46	3.89	1.233
Q47 Most of my friends stay out of trouble	45	3.51	1.199
Q48 Teacher treat students fairly	45	3.80	1.057
Q49 Teachers push me to do my best	47	4.04	1.042
Q50 I usually can finish assignments on time	48	3.77	1.134
Q51 I can get myself to do schoolwork	48	4.21	.824
Q52 I have a hard time finishing my homework	48	3.17	1.294
Q53 My teacher tell me if I do a good job	46	3.96	1.053
Q54 Teachers believe I will do well	48	3.94	1.019
Q55 I like school because it gives me a chance to learn fun things	49	3.57	1.258
Q56 I like school because I am getting better at solving problems	48	3.58	1.334
Q57 I try to go to school every day	49	4.08	1.115
Q58 School staff believe all students can do well	47	3.83	1.110
Q59 I often think of dropping out of school	48	3.83	1.389
Q60 My friends want me to do well in school	44	4.02	.976
Q61 I expect to do well at school	48	4.13	.937
Q62 My goal in class is to get better grades than other students	47	4.04	1.083
Q63 When I worry about getting bad grades I work harder	45	4.04	1.065
Q64 My goal is to learn as much as I can in school	48	4.29	.713
Q65 I like to do well in school so I can impress others	47	3.51	1.300
Q66 I find it hard to stay motivated in school	47	3.06	1.342
Q67 I have trouble making myself pay attention in class	48	2.92	1.334

Q68 I can stay focused on my schoolwork even when it is dull	46	3.57	1.205
Q69 I am happy with how well I do in school	45	3.73	.963
Q70 I want to do well in school	48	4.42	.647
Q71 I want to learn in school	49	4.39	.640
Q72 I try to do some homework every school day	49	3.73	1.016
Q73 Some people are born smart and some are not	48	3.19	1.283
Q74 I can get teachers to help me when I get stuck on schoolwork	48	4.04	1.010
Q75 I can get another student to help me when I get stuck on schoolwork	48	3.67	1.260
Q76 Students help decide what goes on at school	46	3.13	1.240
Q77 I am easily misled by other students	47	3.66	1.185
Q78 I work well in a group	48	3.63	1.231
Q79 I let others see my feelings	49	2.76	1.283
Q80 If I get upset, there is someone to talk to	49	3.69	1.211
Q81 I don't trust people very much	49	2.51	1.244
Q82 It is hard for me to trust someone because they will probably let me down	49	2.02	1.108
Q83 I participate in sports, youth groups, or other activities	49	3.90	1.279
Q84 If I make mistakes, I can laugh it off	46	3.67	1.194
Q85 I am proud of things I've done	49	3.80	1.258
Q86 My goal in class is to get better grades than other students	49	3.82	1.149
Q87 When I don't do well, I try harder the next time	49	4.06	.922

Factor Analysis

The literature addressing successful childhood socialization described as PYD describes a lack of consistency and clarity regarding the concepts associated with the field. The need for empirically driven socialization models warranted an exploratory analysis technique to assist in determining the best specification of the measurement of the constructs.   Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used to determine if the hypothesized components are sufficient to explain the interrelationships among selected items and describe the structural interrelationships among the items in a succinct and understandable manner (Gorsuch, 1983).   Initial principal components analysis with varimax rotation suggested four-, five-, six-, and seven-factor solutions were most interpretable based on eigenvalues greater than 1 and an examination of the scree plot. After the initial factor extractions, the analysis was conducted numerous times with

the goal of obtaining simple structure in the factor model. The simple structure criteria allows for an acceptable solution when (a) all items have a factor loading of at least .30 or higher on one and only one factor (b) the difference between the highest and second highest loading of each item is at least .20 and all components have at least three items. After testing the factor structure the internal consistency of the components of the four-, six-, and seven-factor solutions were examined further. A four-factor solution containing 27 items was produced by the PCA. The PCA model assumes orthogonal or uncorrelated components which may be unrealistic in most research contexts. Therefore, after an acceptable PCA was obtained, the solution was verified using principle axis factoring with promax rotation. This model indicated that the 27 item, 4-factor solution retained simple structure, explained 52.93% of the variance in the 27 items, and showed moderate inter-correlations among the four factors, all indicative of a good solution (Hatcher 1994). Thus, the four factors model was retained for theoretical coherence, parsimony, and a consistency with the original goals of the factor analysis project (Pett, Lackey & Sullivan, 2003). The rotated factor loadings for this solution is presented in Table 2.

Table 2 - First-Order Factor Structure of the Circle of Courage Scale

Component and item	*M*	*SD*	A	Loading	Communality	Eigenvalue	Variance (%)
Factor 1: Adult/Peer influence			0.88			6.77	25.09
Q49 Teachers push me to do my best	4.04	1.04		.894	0.77		
Q54 Teachers believe I will do well	3.94	1.01		.787	0.73		
Q53 My teacher tell me if I do a good job	3.96	1.05		.777	0.58		
Q19 I can trust my teachers	3.61	1.16		.750	0.61		

Item	Mean	SD	Loading		Communality	Eigenvalue	Variance
Q65 I like to do well in school so I can impress others	3.51	1.3	.720		0.56		
Q44 When school staff have a problem with a student, they are respectful	3.48	1.24	.640		0.5		
Q23 I like my teachers a lot	3.57	1.06	.619		0.47		
Q79 I let others see my feelings	2.76	1.28	.527		0.28		
Q47 Most of my friends stay out of trouble	3.51	1.19	.494		0.28		
Q81 I don't trust people very much	2.51	1.24	.447		0.26		
Factor 2: Belonging			0.92			3.28	12.15
Q4 Our family sticks together during bad times	4.14	1.05	.860		0.7		
Q3 My family trusts each other	3.96	0.96	.817		0.81		
Q8 My parents/caregivers try to understand my point of view	3.92	1.11	.752		0.58		
Q13 People in my family listen to one another	3.82	1.08	.749		0.58		
Q1 I get along well with my parents/caregiver	4	1.02	.746		0.51		
Q11 I can talk to my parents/caregivers about my feelings	3.78	1.43	.734		0.71		
Q5 I feel calm when I am with my family	4.22	0.87	.662		0.49		
Q2 I can talk to my parents/caregiver about them	3.29	1.14	.556		0.36		
Factor 3: Mastery			0.78			2.67	9.9
Q28 I have a lot of friends at school	3.78	1.13	.780		0.58		
Q87 When I don't do well, I try harder the next time	4.06	0.92	.695		0.48		
Q50 I usually can finish assignments on time	3.77	1.13	.688		0.57		
Q16 I can make friends	4.22	0.73	.517		0.24		
Q76 Students help decide what goes on at school	3.13	1.24	.514		0.35		
Q17 I find it easy to talk with other kids	3.92	1.07	.358		0.19		

Factor 4: Peer culture			0.82			1.56	5.79
Q36 I am afraid of some kids	4.2	1.09	.842	0.67			
Q30 Kids at school are always making fun of me	3.98	1.2	.830	0.68			
Q22 Kids in my class always pick on me	4.02	1.34	.667	0.62			

The factors were labeled as Factor 1: Adult/Peer influence (10 items), Factor 2: Belonging, (8 items), Factor 3: Mastery (6 items), and Factor 4: Peer Culture (3 items). The Circle of Courage framework recognizes the strengths of youth and the positive impact of positive connections between adults, their peers and caring adults. Factors 1, 2 and 4 reflect this aspect of the theoretical model. Factor 1: Adult/Peer influence captures attributes of how well a youth has internalized the belief that adults care about them, in this case in a school environment. Factor 2: Belonging represents the influence of our most powerful socializing agent the family and specifically the parent/caregiver. Factors 1,2 and 4 provide an excellent example of consilience combining the Circle of Courage model (Brendtro, Brokenleg & Van Bockern, 2002), the theory of interpretive reproduction (Corsaro, 2011) and the bioecological of Bronfenbrenner (1979) to provide empirical indicators of the construct belonging, significance of peer culture and ecology associated with family, school, peers and community.

Factor 3: Mastery represents empirical indicators of the internalization of "I can succeed". The specific items on this subscale reflect the importance of schools as an agent of socialization. The influence of positive youth development continues to increase in the education profession (Weissberg & O'Brien, 2004; Zaff & Lerner, 2010; Rubinstein-Avila, 2006). Factor 4: Peer culture although there are only three items in this subscale they clearly reflect the role peers may play in the socialization process as described in the theory of interpretive reproduction (Corsaro, 2011). Peer influence can be positive or negative and are

often influenced by social structural precursors such as poverty, community or family. The four subscales share a common source of variance, each have unique components that reflect directly two theoretical dimensions that were hypothesized. Factor 1: Adult/Peer influence and Factor 4: Peer culture do reflect broader theoretical dimensions informing the hypothesized model.

Table 3: Inter-Factor Correlation Matrix

Factor	1	2	3	4
1	1.00	.30	.36	-.08
2	.30	1.00	.20	.02
3	.36	.20	1.00	.19
4	-.08	.02	.19	1.00

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.

The rationale for this analysis is not to establish the Circle of Courage Scale in its current form as a priori model but to determine if the four abstract constructs theorized as outcomes of childhood socialization can be measured indirectly via the use of attributes or indicators derived from construct clarification and definition (Pett, Lackey & Sullivan, 2003). All four subscales demonstrated adequate to strong scale score reliabilities as demonstrated by Cronbach's alpha values of .885 for Adult/Peer influence, .921 for Belonging, .785 for Mastery and .823 for Peer culture. The complexity and abstractness of the constructs will require additional refinement to establish useful empirical indicators linked to the theoretical base of all four constructs necessary to contribute to the content and construct validity of the final instrument (Walker & Avant, 1995).

Discussion

Based on a review of childhood socialization theories and relevant research from positive psychology I developed a Circle of Courage Scale to examine the latent constructs theorized as the goals of successful socialization and the basis of positive youth development. This research project is good start to achieving the goal of a means to measure the four outcomes of childhood socialization. The factor loadings for the four-factor solution indicate that attributes of the four constructs are observable. Factor 1: Belonging was the strongest factor and explained the greatest percentage of variance. Internalization that "I am cared for" is the most important construct in the model. As social beings human connections is vital to our existence and is the foundation necessary to achieve successful socialization. The internal consistency of the all four factors is adequate and the resulting model presents empirical indicators that can be linked to the theoretical base of two constructs directly.

The time constraints associated with research limited the time to refine items and increase sample size. For instance, the participants in this study were designated as prisoners based on federal guidelines, which is protected class and required specific procedures to be followed regarding recruitment of subjects. As a result, the sample size is smaller than desired ten subjects per item (Nunnally, 1978). Future research will be necessary to increase sample size and reduce sampling error. Because the vast majority of the subjects in this research project were all involved in some way with the juvenile or child welfare system we are unable to generalize our findings to any youth outside of this sample. Future research will strive for a representative sample of girls and boys to account for potential gender influences.

Item selection and wording will be improved to avoid issues associated with social desirability bias. Careful consideration when selecting future items for the scale is necessary to

avoid the problem of youth wanting to "be good" in the eye of the adult administering the questionnaire. Situational influences could result in either socially desirable or socially undesirable responses particularly when asked about parents or caregivers. For example, youth in out of home care often have capricious relationships with their parents. How a subject answers a parental item might be influenced by the length of time a youth has been away from home or whom they blame for their removal. Therefore, additional research with adequate sample sizes, across age, gender and background specifications is required to further refine a circle of courage scale.

Summary

The research project is an initial exploration into what young people need in their lives to grow up healthy, caring and responsibly. Future development of the Circle of Courage Scale constructs will be an on-going, complex process determined over a series of studies in a number of different ways. Exploratory factor analysis has helped to define an initial internal structure for the set of items and group the items into four factors. Construct and reliability analysis of this initial research support continued theoretical refinement and analysis.

APPENDIX A: PROGRAM DATA

CLIENT DEMOGRAPHICS

NUMBER OF CLIENTS SERVED   2,225

SEX			AGE AT INTAKE (MEAN)		
	n	**%**			
FEMALE	574	25.8	*13.53 YEARS*		
MALE	1651	74.2			

ETHNICITY

	n	**%**		**n**	**%**
ASIAN	10	.4	*NATIVE AMERICAN*	4	.2
AFRICAN AMERICAN	1101	49.5	*OTHER*	29	1.3
HISPANIC/LATINO	55	2.5	*CAUCASIAN*	897	40.3
MULTI-ETHNIC	129	5.8			

EDUCATION AT INITIAL INTAKE

	n	**%**		**n**	**%**
INFANT/TODDLER	110	4.94	*TENTH GRADE*	302	13.57
PRESCHOOL	35	1.57	*ELEVENTH GRADE*	105	4.72
KINDERGARTEN	66	2.97	*TWELFTH GRADE*	32	1.44
FIRST GRADE	53	2.38	*H.S. DIPLOMA*	22	.99
SECOND GRADE	66	2.97	*GED*	14	.63
THIRD GRADE	74	3.33	*TRADE/TECH SCHOOL*	1	.04
FOURTH GRADE	83	3.73	*SOME COLLEGE/ASSOCIATES DEGREE*	2	.09
FIFTH GRADE	81	3.64	*COLLEGE GRADUATE*	2	.09
SIXTH GRADE	138	6.20	*GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL DEGREE*	1	.04
SEVENTH GRADE	216	9.71	*NONE OF THE ABOVE*	6	.27
EIGHTH GRADE	388	17.44	*NOT GIVEN*	2	.09
NINTH GRADE	426	19.15			

LEGAL STATUS

	n	**%**		**n**	**%**
COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH WARD	32	1.4	*PARENT RESPONSIBLE*	850	38.2
COUNTY WARD ABUSE/NEGLECT	65	2.9	*PROBATION*	153	6.9
COUNTY WARD DELINQUENT	395	17.8	*RESPONSIBLE FOR SELF*	11	.5
DUAL WARD	12	.5	*STATE WARD ABUSE/NEGLECT*	31	1.4
LEGAL GUARDIAN, NOT PARENT	81	3.6	*STATE WARD DELINQUENT*	26	1.2
MCI WARD	62	2.8	*TEMPORARY COURT/COUNTY WARD*	507	22.8

REFERRAL SOURCE

	n	**%**		**n**	**%**
ADOPTION SUBSIDY	2	.09	*MICH COUNTY DHS*	243	10.92
BLACK FAMILY DEVELOPMENT	26	1.17	*OTHER*	3	.13
BRIDGEWAY SERVICES	48	2.16	*OTHER - NAMI GREATER TOLEDO*	1	.04
CARE MANAGEMENT ORG - OTHER	4	.18	*OTHER - APARTMENT COMPLEX (AMETHYST)*	2	.09
CENTRAL CARE MANAGEMENT	13	.58	*OTHER - APARTMENT COMPLEX (HOMEPORT)*	2	.09
CHILDRENS SERV/DIV FAM & CHILD	308	13.84	*OTHER - FAIRFIELD CHILDREN'S SERVICES*	1	.04
COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH	216	9.71	*OTHER - NYAP*	2	.09
DEPT. OF HUMAN SERVICES	104	4.67	*PARENT/FOSTER PARENT/GUARDIAN*	187	8.40
DEPT. OF YOUTH SERVICES	7	.31	*PHYSICIAN*	175	7.87
DHS CASE ASSESS COMM (CAC)	5	.22	*PROBATE/JUVENILE/FAMILY/TRIBAL*	153	6.88

	n	%		n	%
EDUCATIONAL ATTORNEY	3	.13	*SCHOOL*	224	10.07
EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANT	63	2.83	*SELF*	10	.45
GROWTHWORKS	10	.45	*SCVISTA INC.*	369	16.58
JUV. JUSTICE ASSIGNMENT UNIT	37	1.66	*US STATE DEPARTMENT*	7	.31

LIVING ARRANGEMENT PRIOR TO SC

	n	%		n	%
ADOPTIVE HOME	104	4.67	*INDEPENDENT, PEERS (UNSUPER)*	5	.22
CHEMICAL DEPENDENT INPATIENT	1	.04	*PARENT HOME*	1195	53.71
DETENTION	242	10.88	*PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL*	20	.90
FAMILY FRIEND'S HOME	18	.81	*RELATIVE HOME*	201	9.03
FOSTER FAM GRP HOME (4 YTH)	7	.31	*RESIDENTIAL, PRIVATE*	95	4.27
FOSTER FAMILY	199	8.94	*RESIDENTIAL, PUBLIC*	8	.36
GROUP HOME	34	1.53	*SELF*	8	.36
HOMELESS	16	.72	*SHELTER*	25	1.12
HOSPITAL	12	.54	*SUPERVISED INDEPENDENT LIVING*	20	.90
INCARCERATION, ADULT	3	.13	*UNKNOWN*	12	.54

FY2012 Student Demographics

Gender

Total		
Gender	n	%
Male	1651	74.2%
Female	574	25.8%

Site

Gender	Albion		Battle Creek		Columbus		Detroit		Montcalm	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Male	276	100%	514	67.0%	401	74.0%	138	28.0%	106	71.6%
Female			253	33.0%	141	26.0%	354	72.0%	42	28.4%

State

Gender	MI		OH	
	n	%	n	%
Male	1034	56.7%	401	74%
Female	649	43.3%	141	26%

Program Type

Gender	Residential		Community-based	
	n	%	n	%
Male	565	93.10%	1086	67.1
Female	42	6.90%	532	32.9

FY2012 Student Demographics
Race

Race, Total		
Race	n	%
African American	1101	49.5%
Caucasian	897	40.3%
Multi-ethnic	129	5.8%
Hispanic/Latino	55	2.5%
Other	29	1.3%
Asian	10	0.4%
Native American	4	0.2%

Race, Site										
Race	**Albion**		**Battle Creek**		**Columbus**		**Detroit**		**Montcalm**	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
African American	147	53.3%	196	25.6%	303	55.9%	447	90.9%	8	5.4%
Caucasian	114	41.3%	447	58.3%	190	35.1%	27	5.5%	119	80.4%
Multi-ethnic	5	1.8%	76	9.9%	34	6.3%	7	1.4%	7	4.7%
Hispanic/Latino	10	3.6%	25	3.3%	10	1.8%	6	1.2%	4	2.7%
Other	*	*	13	1.7%	5	0.9%	4	0.8%	7	4.7%
Asian	*	*	6	0.8%	*	*	1	0.2%	3	2.0%
Native American	*	*	4	0.5%	*	*	*	*	*	*

Race, State				
Race	**MI**		**OH**	
	n	%	n	%
African American	798	47.4%	303	55.9%
Caucasian	707	42.0%	190	35.1%
Multi-ethnic	95	5.6%	34	6.3%
Hispanic/Latino	45	2.7%	10	1.8%
Other	24	1.4%	5	0.9%
Asian	10	0.6%	*	*
Native American	4	0.2%	*	*

Race, Program Type				
Race	**Residential**		**Community-based**	
	n	%	n	%
African American	260	42.8%	841	52.0%
Caucasian	296	48.8%	601	37.1%
Multi-ethnic	20	3.3%	109	6.7%
Hispanic/Latino	16	2.6%	39	2.4%
Other	12	2.0%	17	1.1%
Asian	3	0.5%	7	0.4%
Native American	*	*	4	0.2%

FY2012 Student Demographics

Family Status

Family Status, Total		
Family Status	n	%
BOTH BIOLOGICAL PARENTS PRESENT	398	17.9%
SINGLE BIOLOGICAL PARENT PRESENT	986	44.3%
BLENDED FAMILY (STEP PARENT OR LTP)	183	8.2%
EXTENDED FAMILY	211	9.5%
NON-FAMILIAL CUSTODIAL ARRANGEMENT	112	5.0%
SELF	102	4.6%
ADOPTIVE FAMILY	169	7.6%
BIOLOGICAL PARENT +ADOPTIVE/STEP PARENT	64	2.9%

Family Status, Site										
Family Status	**Albion**		**Battle Creek**		**Columbus**		**Detroit**		**Montcalm**	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
BOTH BIOLOGICAL PARENTS PRESENT	29	10.5%	190	24.8%	57	10.5%	75	15.2%	47	31.8%
SINGLE BIOLOGICAL PARENT PRESENT	109	39.5%	315	41.1%	268	49.4%	269	54.7%	25	16.9%

	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
BLENDED FAMILY (STEP PARENT OR LTP)	48	17.4%	66	8.6%	35	6.5%	34	6.9%	*	*
EXTENDED FAMILY	24	8.7%	65	8.5%	59	10.9%	60	12.2%	3	2.0%
NON-FAMILIAL CUSTODIAL ARRANGEMENT	2	0.7%	33	4.3%	60	11.1%	15	3.0%	2	1.4%
SELF	33	12.0%	32	4.2%	27	5.0%	9	1.8%	1	0.7%
ADOPTIVE FAMILY	25	9.1%	39	5.1%	25	4.6%	27	5.5%	53	35.8%
BIOLOGICAL PARENT +ADOPTIVE/STEP PARENT	6	2.2%	27	3.5%	11	2.0%	3	0.6%	17	11.5%

Family Status, State	MI		OH	
Family Status	n	%	n	%
BOTH BIOLOGICAL PARENTS PRESENT	341	20.3%	57	10.5%
SINGLE BIOLOGICAL PARENT PRESENT	718	42.7%	268	49.4%
BLENDED FAMILY (STEP PARENT OR LTP)	148	8.8%	35	6.5%
EXTENDED FAMILY	152	9.0%	59	10.9%
NON-FAMILIAL CUSTODIAL ARRANGEMENT	52	3.1%	60	11.1%
SELF	75	4.5%	27	5.0%
ADOPTIVE FAMILY	144	8.6%	25	4.6%
BIOLOGICAL PARENT +ADOPTIVE/STEP PARENT	53	3.1%	11	2.0%

Family Status, Program Type	Residential		Community-based	
Family Status	n	%	n	%
BOTH BIOLOGICAL PARENTS PRESENT	100	16.5%	298	18.4%
SINGLE BIOLOGICAL PARENT PRESENT	213	35.2%	773	47.7%
BLENDED FAMILY (STEP PARENT OR LTP)	59	9.8%	124	7.6%
EXTENDED FAMILY	52	8.6%	159	9.8%
NON-FAMILIAL CUSTODIAL ARRANGEMENT	29	4.8%	83	5.1%
SELF	35	5.8%	67	4.1%
ADOPTIVE FAMILY	90	14.9%	78	4.8%
BIOLOGICAL PARENT +ADOPTIVE/STEP PARENT	27	4.5%	36	2.3%

FY2012 Student Demographics - Other Variables

<u>Categories</u>

Age

School/Grade Level

Legal Status

Living Arrangement Prior to SC

Presenting Problems

DSM I or DSM II diagnosis (category only)

Family History

Committing Offenses

Details are available if you are interested in the above variables.

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

The Circle of Courage

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.   Your answers may help to improve how our understanding about how youth develop.   Answer the questions below to the best of your ability. I just want to know what you think. You don't have to answer any of the questions and no one will be mad at you if you decide to stop answering questions. Please place and X in the circle that best describes what you think.   Remember this is not a test and there is no right or wrong answers. You may think about any adult caregiver or guardian that you consider important when answering questions about parents, even if these caregivers are not your biological parents.

Part 1: About You

Are you a
Male
Female
How would you describe yourself
White
Black/ African American
Hispanic or Latino
Asian
Mixed
Other
How old are you?
How many brothers and sisters do you have?
0
1-3
3-5
More than 5
What city or town do you live in when you are at home?
_____

What is the last grade in school that you finished?

_____

Do you live with your:

Mom
Dad
Mom and Dad
Grandparent(s)
Other Relative
Foster Parent
None of these

What program are you in (check all that apply)?

Residential
Community Based
Foster Care
Supervised Independent Living
Other

Part II: You and Your Family

I get along well with my parents/caregiver.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I can talk to my parents/caregiver about them.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

My family trusts each other.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

Our family sticks together during bad times.
 	
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I feel calm when I am with my family
 	
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can trust my family
 	
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I feel close to some adult in my family.
 	
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

My parents/caregivers try to understand my point of view.
 	
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

My parent often shows he or she loves me.
 	
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

My parents/caregivers want to know where I am.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can talk to my parents/caregivers about my feelings.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

My family expects me to be responsible.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

People in my family listen to one another.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

In my family, people show that they care about each other.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

PART III: You, Your, School and Other Kids

I have trouble keeping friends.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can make friends

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I find it easy to talk with other kids.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I feel calm with my friends.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can trust my teachers.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can trust my friends.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

The kids I live with do a lot of things together.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Kids in my class always pick on me.

    Strongly Agree

    Agree

    Neither Agree nor Disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly Disagree

    Don't Know

I like my teachers a lot.

    Strongly Agree

    Agree

    Neither Agree nor Disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly Disagree

    Don't Know

My teachers don't pay much attention to me.

    Strongly Agree

    Agree

    Neither Agree nor Disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly Disagree

    Don't Know

Kids always make fun of me.

    Strongly Agree

    Agree

    Neither Agree nor Disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly Disagree

    Don't Know

My teachers don't like me as much as other kids.

    Strongly Agree

    Agree

    Neither Agree nor Disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly Disagree

    Don't Know

I get along with my teachers.

    Strongly Agree

    Agree

    Neither Agree nor Disagree

    Disagree

    Strongly Disagree

    Don't Know

I have a lot of friends at school.

    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Most kids like me a lot.

    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Kids at school are always making fun of me.

    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

My teachers are really interested in me.

    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I feel close to people at school.

    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I feel safe in my school.

    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I have a hard time making friends.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

Some kids make fun of me.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I am afraid of some kids.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I worry about how well other kids like me.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I worry about getting beat up at school.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

My teachers really care about me.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

The principal in my school really cares about me.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know
I know kids who are afraid of each other at school.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know
Students keep their problems secret from one another.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know
Students keep their problems secret from adults.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know
When school staff have a problem with a student, they are respectful.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know
School is a place I fit in and belong.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I have at least one adult in school I can talk to.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Most of my friends stay out of trouble.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Teachers treat students fairly.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Teachers push me to do my best.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I usually can finish assignments on time.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can get myself to do schoolwork.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I have a hard time finishing my homework.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

My teacher tells me if I do a good job.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Teachers believe I will be do well.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I like school because it gives me a chance to learn fun things.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I like school because I am getting better at solving problems.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I try to go to school every day.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

School staff believe all students can be do well.
 	
     Strongly Agree
     Agree
     Neither Agree nor Disagree
     Disagree
     Strongly Disagree
     Don't Know

I often think of dropping out of school.
 	
     Strongly Agree
     Agree
     Neither Agree nor Disagree
     Disagree
     Strongly Disagree
     Don't Know

My friends want me to do well in school.
 	
     Strongly Agree
     Agree
     Neither Agree nor Disagree
     Disagree
     Strongly Disagree
     Don't Know

I expect I will do well at school.
 	
     Strongly Agree
     Agree
     Neither Agree nor Disagree
     Disagree
     Strongly Disagree
     Don't Know

My goal in class is to get better grades than other students.
 	
     Strongly Agree
     Agree
     Neither Agree nor Disagree
     Disagree
     Strongly Disagree
     Don't Know

When I worry about getting bad grades I work harder.
 	
     Strongly Agree
     Agree
     Neither Agree nor Disagree
     Disagree
     Strongly Disagree
     Don't Know

My goal is to learn as much as I can in school.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I like to do well in school so I can impress others.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I find it hard to stay motivated in school.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I have trouble making myself to pay attention in class.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can stay focused on my schoolwork even when it is dull.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I am happy with how well I do in school.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I want to do well in school.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I want to learn in school.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I try to do some homework every school day.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Some people are born smart and some are not.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can get teachers to help me when I get stuck on schoolwork.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

I can get another student to help me when I get stuck on schoolwork.

Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Neither Agree nor Disagree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
    Don't Know

Students help decide what goes on at school.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I am easily misled by other kids.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

Part IV: Who I Am

I work well in a group.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I let others see my feelings.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

If I get upset, there is someone to talk to.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I don't trust people very much.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

It is hard for me to trust someone because they will probably let me down.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I participate in sports, youth groups, or other activities.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

If I make mistakes, I can laugh it off.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

I am proud of things of I done.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

My goal in class is to get better grades than other students.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

When I don't do well, I try harder the next time.
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neither Agree nor Disagree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Don't Know

APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE REFERENCES

Arnold, M., Nott, D., & Meinhold, J. (2012). The Positive Youth Development Inventory. Short version. (PYDI-S). Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.

Corrigan, M. Klein, T., & Isaacs, T. (2010). TRUST US: Documenting the relationship of students' trust in teachers to cognition, character, and climate. Journal of Research in Character Education. Information Age Publishing, Inc. HighBeam Research. Available at: http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-2380007951.html

Dunlop, A., Van Patten, D., Mandsager, C., & Larson, S. (1997). Spiritual Access Survey: Identifying needs and framing strategies for youth ministry. Westboro, MA: Straight Ahead Ministries, Prison Fellowship Ministries, and Dare Mighty Things.

Furlong, M., O'Brennan, L., & You, S. (2011). Psychometric properties of the Add Health School Connectedness Scale for 18 socio-cultural groups. Psychology in the Schools, 48(10), 986-997.

Gibbs, J., Barriga, A., & Potter, G. (2001). How I Think (HIT) questionnaire. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Gilgun, J., Chalmers, M., & Kesinen, S. (2002). The 4-D: Assessing four dimensions of youth development, belonging, mastery, autonomy, and generosity. St. Paul, MN: Growing Home National Office.

Hutchinson, R., Tess, D., Gleckman, A., & Spence, W. (1992). Psychosocial characteristics of institutionalized adolescents: Resilient or at risk? Adolescence, 27(106), 339-356.

Hyman, I., & Snook, P. (2000). Dangerous schools/dangerous students: Defining and assessing

student alienation syndrome. Paper presented at the National Association of School

Psychologists, the annual convention and exposition, March 31, 2000, New Orleans,

Louisiana.

Kress, C. (2007). Frames, frameworks, and foundations in youth development outreach.

Presentation at CYFAR (Children, Youth, and Families at Risk) pre-conference.

http://www.slidefinder.net/f/frames_frameworks_foundations_youth_development/frame

works_foundations_cyf07-2/2810080

Oman, R., Vesely, S., McLeroy, K., Harris-Wyatt, V., Aspy, C., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L.

(2002). Reliability and validity of the Youth Asset Survey (YAS). Journal of Adolescent Health,

31(3), 247-255.

Prince-Embury, S. (2007). Resiliency Scales for Children and Adolescents: A profile of personal

strengths. San Antonio, TX: Psych Corporation.

Psychologists, the annual convention and exposition, March 31, 2000, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Kress, C. (2007). Frames, frameworks, and foundations in youth development outreach.

Presentation at CYFAR (Children, Youth, and Families at Risk) pre-conference.

http://www.slidefinder.net/f/frames_frameworks_foundations_youth_development/frame

works_foundations_cyf07-2/2810080

Oman, R., Vesely, S., McLeroy, K., Harris-Wyatt, V., Aspy, C., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L.

(2002). Reliability and validity of the Youth Asset Survey (YAS). Journal of Adolescent

Health, 31(3), 247-255.

Prince-Embury, S. (2007). Resiliency Scales for Children and Adolescents: A profile of personal

strengths. San Antonio, TX: Psych Corporation.

REFERENCES

Acock, A., & Bengston, V. (1980). Socialization and attribution processes: Actual versus perceived similarity among parents and youth. Journal of Marriage and Family, 42(3), 501-515.

Alanen, L. (1988). Rethinking childhood. Acta Sociologica, 31(1), 53-67.

Anglin, J. (2002). Pain, normality, and the struggle for congruence. New York, NY: The Haworth Press.

APA (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? American Psychologist, 63(9), 852-862.

Aries, P. (1962). Centuries of childhood. New York, NY: Vintage.

Arnold, M., Nott, D., & Meinhold, J. (2012). The PYD Inventory. Short version. (PYDI-S). Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University.

Baines, T., & Seita, J. (1999). Raising the rest of the neighborhood. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 8(1), 25-30.

Barber, B. (2005). Positive interpersonal and intrapersonal functioning: An assessment of measures among adolescents. In K. Moore & L. Lippman (Eds.), What do children need to flourish? Conceptualizing and measuring indicators of positive development (pp. 147-162). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.

Benard, B. (2004). Resilency: What we have learned. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Bengston, V., & Black, K. (1973). Intergenerational relations and continuities in socialization. In P. Baltes & W. Schaie (Eds), Personality and socialization (Chapter 9). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Benson, P. (1997). All kids are our kids: What communities must do to raise caring and
     responsible children and adolescents. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Benson, P., Scales, P., Hamilton, S., Sesma, A., Hong, K., & Roehlkepartain, E. (2006). PYD so
     far: Core hypothesis and their implications for policy and practice. Search Institute
     Insights & Evidence, 3(1), 1-13.

Berger, P. (1963). Invitation to sociology: A humanistic perspective. Garden City, NY:
     Doubleday.

Bogenschneider, K. (1996). An ecological risk/protective theory for building prevention,
     programs, policies, and community capacity to support youth. Family Relations, 45(2),
     127-138.

Bogenschneider, K., & Gross, E. (2004). From ivory tower to state house: How youth theory can
     inform youth policy making. Family Relations, 53(1), 19-25.

Boyes-Watson, C. (2008). Peacemaking circles & urban youth: Bringing justice home. St. Paul,
     MN: Living Justice Press.

Brazemore, G. (1999). The fork in the road to juvenile court reform. Annals of the American
     Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 564, 81-108.

Brendtro, L. (1995). "mitakuye oyasin" – Mut für die Entmutigten ["We are all related" –
     Courage for the discouraged.] Sozial Arbeit, 9, 8-15.

Brendtro, L., & Brokenleg, M. (1994). Das "Curriculum der Kontrolle" Überwinden.
     [Overcoming the Curriculum of Control.] Translated by H. Bauer & S. Lhotsky.
     Zeitschrift für Erlebnispädagogik, 9, 5-21.

Brendtro, L., & Brokenleg, M. (2001). The Circle of Courage: Children as sacred beings. In L. Lantieri (Ed.), Schools with spirit: Nurturing the inner lives of children and teachers (pp. 39-52). Boston, MA: Beacon.

Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., & Van Brokern, S. (1990). Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (2002). Reclaiming youth at risk: Our hope for the future. (Rev. Ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (2005). The Circle of Courage and positive psychology. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 14(3), 130-136.)

Brendtro, L., & du Toit, L. (2005). Response Ability Pathways. Cape Town, South Africa: Pretext.

Brendtro, L., & Larson, S. (2006). The resilience revolution. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Brendtro, L., & Long, N. (2005). Psychoeducation in the life space: Meeting growth needs. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 14(3), 157-159.

Brendtro, L., Ness, A., & Mitchell, M. (2001). No disposable kids. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Brendtro, L., Mitchell, M., & McCall, H. (2009). Deep Brain Learning: Pathways to potential with challenging youth. Albion, MI: Starr Commonwealth.

Brendtro, L., & Van Bockern, S. (1994). Courage for the discouraged: A psychoeducational approach to troubled and troubling children. Focus on Exceptional Children, 26(8), 1-16.

Brendtro, L., & Van Bockern, S. (1998). Courage for the discouraged: A psychoeducational approach to troubled and troubling children. In E. Meyen, G. Vergason, & J. Whelen (Eds.), Educating students with mild disabilities, second edition (pp. 47-70). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The Ecology of human development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Alienation and the four worlds of childhood. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 430-436.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Catalano, R., Berglund, M., Ryan, J., Lonczak, H., & Hawkins, J. (2004). PYD in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of PYD programs. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591, 98-124.

Carducci, D. J., & Carducci, J. B. (1984). The caring classroom. Palo Alto, CA: Bull Publishing.

Carr, A. (2004). Positive psychology: The science of happiness and human strengths. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.

Chun, M. (2011). No Na Mamo: Traditional and contemporary Hawaiian beliefs and practices. Honolulu, HI: The University of Hawaii Press.

Clavering, E., & McLaughlin, J. (2010). Children's participation in health research: From objects to agents? Child Care, Health and Development, 36(5), 603-611.

Cogswell, B. (1968). Some structural properties influencing socialization. Administrative Science Quarterly: Special issue on organizations and social development, 13(3), 417-440.

Cook, K., & Howard, J. (1992). Recent theoretical advances in social psychology: Progress and papers. Social Psychology Quarterly: Special issue on Theoretical Advances in Social Psychology, 55(2), 87-93.

Cooley, C. (1964). Human nature and the social order. New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Cornell Cooperative Extension. (2003). Youth Development Foundations for 4-H camp staff: A

    training manual. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Cooperative Extension.

Corrigan, M., Klein, T., & Isaacs, T. (2010). TRUST US: Documenting the relationship of

    students' trust in teachers to cognition, character, and climate. Journal of Research in

    Character Education. Information Age Publishing, Inc. HighBeam Research. Available

    at: http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P3-2380007951.html

Corsaro, W. (1979). "We're friends, right?": Children use access rituals in a nursery school.

    Language in Society, 8, 315-336.

Corsaro, W. (1985). Friendship and peer culture in the early years. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Corsaro, W. (1988). Routines in the peer culture of American and Italian nursery school children.

    Sociology of Education, 61, 1-14.

Corsaro, W. (1992). Interpretive reproduction in children's peer cultures. Social Psychology

    Quarterly, 55(2), 160-177.

Corsaro, W. (2011). The sociology of childhood. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Corsaro, W., & Eder, D. (1990). Children's peer cultures. Annual Review of Sociology, 16,197-

    220.

Corsaro, W., & Rizzo, T. (1988). Discussions and friendship: Socialization processes in the peer

    culture of Italian nursery school children. American Sociological Review, 53, 879-894.

Corsaro, W., & Rizzo, T. (1990). Reply: An interpretive approach to childhood socialization.

    American Sociological Review, 55(3), 466-468.

Costello, B., Wachtel, J., & Wachtel, T. (2010). Restorative circles in schools. Bethlehem, PA:

    IIRP.

Damon, W. (2004). What is PYD? Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591, 13-24

DeJong, J., & Hall, P. (2006). Best practices: A cross site evaluation. American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research, 13(2), 177-210.

Delamater, J. (1968). On the nature of deviance. Social Forces, 46(4), 445-455.

Delgado, M. (2002). New frontiers for youth development in the 21st century: Revitalizing and broadening youth development. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Demo, D., & Hughes, M. (1990). Socialization and racial identity among Black Americans. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53(4). 364-374.

Diamond, J. (2012). The world until yesterday: What can we learn from traditional societies? New York, NY: Viking.

DiRenzo, G. (1977). Socialization, personality and social systems. Annual Review of Sociology, 3, 261-295.

Dodge, K. A., Dishion, T. J., & Lansford, J. E. (Eds.). (2006). Deviant peer influences in programs for youth. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Dreier, P., Mollenkopf, J. H., & Swanstrom, T. (2004). Place matters: Metropolitics for the twenty-first century. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Dryfoos, J. (1999). The role of the school in children's out-of-school time. The Future of Children, 9(2), 117-134.

Duke, D., & Meckel, A. M. (1984). Teachers guide to classroom management. New York, NY: Random House.

Duncan, P., Garcia, A., Frankowski, B., Carey, P., Kallock, E., Dixon, R., & Shaw, J. (2007). Inspiring healthy adolescent choices: A rationale for and guide to strength promotion in primary care. Journal of Adolescent Health, 41(6), 525-535.

Dunlop, A., Van Patten, D., Mandsager, C., & Larson, S. (1997). Spiritual Access Survey: Identifying needs and framing strategies for youth ministry. Westboro, MA: Straight Ahead Ministries, Prison Fellowship Ministries, and Dare Mighty Things.

Eccles, J., & Templeton, J. (2002). Extracurricular and other after-school activities for youth. Review of Research in Education, 26, 113-180.

Eder, D., & Nenga, S. (2003). Socialization in adolescence. In J. Delamater (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology (pp. 157-182). New York, NY: Kluwer/Plenum.

Eder, D., Evans, C., & Parker, S. (1995). School talk: Gender and adolescent culture. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Eisenberg, N., & Mussen, P. (1989). The roots of prosocial behavior in children. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Elder, G. (1994). Time, Human Agency, and Social Change: Perspectives on the Life Course. Social Psychology Quarterly, 57(1), 4-15.

Epp, S., Park, S., Huston, A., & Ripke, M. (2005). A scale of positive social behaviors. In K. Moore & L. Lippman (Eds.), What do children need to flourish? Conceptualizing and measuring indicators of positive development (pp. 163-182). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.

Erikson, E. (1987). Childhood and tradition in two American Indian tribes. In E. Erikson (Ed.), A way of looking at things: Selected papers from 1930-1980 (pp. 446-480). New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Everhart, R. B. (1983). Reading, writing and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high
       school. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Floyd, F., & Widaman, K. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical
       assessment instruments. Psychological Assessment, 7(3), 286-299.

Fulcher, L., & Ainsworth, F. (1985). Group care practice with children. London, UK: Tavistock
       Publications.

Frankowski, B., & Duncan, P. (2013). Always searching for strengths: Interviewing and
       counseling with the Circle of Courage. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 21(4), 32-36.

Frankowski, B., Leader, I., & Duncan, P. (2009). Strength based interviewing. Adolescent
       Medicine, 20, 22-40.

Giacobbe, G. A., Traynelis-Yurek, E., & Laursen, E. (1999). Strengths based strategies for
       children & youth: An annotated bibliography. Richmond, VA: G & T Publishing.

Gibbs, J. C. (2003). Moral development & reality: Beyond the theories of Kohlberg and
       Hoffman. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gilgun, J. (2002). Completing the circle: American Indian medicine wheels and the promotion of
       resilience of children and youth in care. The Journal of Human Behavior and the Social
       Environment, 6(2), 65-84.

Gilgun, J., Chalmers, M., & Kesinen, S. (2002). The 4-D: Assessing four dimensions of youth
       development: Belonging, mastery, autonomy, and generosity. St. Paul, MN: Growing
       Home National Office.

Ginwright, S., & Cammarota, J. (2002). New terrain in youth development: The promise of a
       social justice approach. Social Justice, 29(4). 82-95.

Gomez, B., & Ang, P. (2007). Promoting PYD in schools. Theory in Practice, 46(2), 97-104.

Gorsuch, R. (1983). Factor Analysis (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gossen, D. (2008). It's all about we: Rethinking discipline using restitution (3rd ed.). Saskatoon,

    Canada: Chelsom Consultants Limited.

Grover, A. (2007). The Circle of Courage and meeting the needs of youth: Abridged version.

    Ames, IA: Iowa State University Extension. Retrieved January 4, 2013:

    http://www.extension.iastate.edu/NR/rdonlyres/D8C0E9C9-CD27-468F-B2FA-

F2ADAA79D127/136392/CircleOfCourageMeetingNeeds.pdf

Guskey, T. (1999). Evaluating professional development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hagen, J., Simpson, J., & Gillis, A. (1979). The sexual stratification of social control: A gender-

    based perspective on crime and delinquency. The British Journal of Sociology, 30(1), 25-

    38.

Halas, J. (2002). Engaging alienated youth in physical education: An alternative program with

    lessons for the traditional class. The Journal of Teaching and Physical Education, 21,

    267-286.

Hamilton, S., Hamilton, M., & Pittman, K. (2004). Principles for youth development. In S.

    Hamilton & M. Hamilton (Eds.), The youth development handbook: Coming of age in

    American communities (pp. 3-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Handel, G. (1990). Revising socialization theory. American Sociological Review, 55(3). 463-

    466.

Hanfmann, E., & Jones, R. M. (Eds.). (1965). Neurosis and treatment: A holistic theory. New

    York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hatcher, L. (1994). A step-by step guide for using SAS for factor analysis and structural

    equation modeling. Cary, NC: SAS Publishing.

Heck, K., & Subramaniam, A. (2009). PYD: Youth development frameworks. 4-H Center for

    Youth Development. Davis, CA: University of California, Davis. Available at:

    http://www.ca4h.org/files/1224.pdf

Herman, R., & Neidenthal, G. (1996). Hanbleceya: A quest for vision: A mental health

    curriculum based upon the Circle of Courage, a Native American approach to child

    development. Miami Valley, OH: Miami Valley Juvenile Rehabilitation Center.

Hitlin, S. (2006). Parental influences on children's values and aspirations: Bridging two theories

    of social class and socialization. Sociological Perspectives, 49(1), 25-46.

Hoffman, M. L. (2000). Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice.

    Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hoghughi, M. (1988). Treating problem children: Issues, methods and practice. London, UK:

    Sage.

Holden, M. J. (2009). Children and residential experiences. Alexandria, VA: CWLA.

Holland, D. (1970). Familization, socialization, and the universe of meaning: An extension of the

    interactional approach to the study of the family. Journal of Marriage and Family, 32(3),

    415-427.

Housden, S. (2006). With courage in our hearts: Promoting peace with the Circle of Courage.

    Master's thesis. Faculty of the School of Education, Gonzaga University, Spokane,

    Washington.

Hutchinson, R., Tess, D., Gleckman, A., & Spence, W. (1992). Psychosocial characteristics of

    institutionalized adolescents: Resilient or at risk? Adolescence, 27(106), 339-356.

Hyman, I., & Snook, P. (2000). Dangerous schools/dangerous students: Defining and assessing

    student alienation syndrome. Paper presented at the National Association of School

Psychologists, the annual convention and exposition, March 31, 2000, New Orleans, Louisiana.

ICYPR. (1996). Interim policy recommendations. Pretoria, South Africa: Inter-Ministerial Committee on Young People at Risk.

Jackson, R. (Ed.). (2011). Discovering Camphill: New perspectives, research and developments. Edinburgh, UK: Floris Books.

Jacobs, G. (2006). Charles Horton Cooley: Imagining social reality. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

James, H. (1970). Children in trouble: A national scandal. New York, NY: Pocket Books.

Jary, D., & Jary, J. (1991). The Harper Collins dictionary: Sociology. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Jenks, C. (1982). The sociology of childhood: Essential readings. London, UK: Batsford Academic and Educational.

Kauffman, J. (2000). Future directions with troubled children. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 9(2), 126-131.

Kerckhoff, A. (1970). Comparative studies of socialization: A review essay. Social Forces, 49(2). 309-313.

Kerpelman, J. (2004). Using a comprehensive model of PYD and problem prevention to enhance parent education. Family Relations, 53(1), 16-19.

Klein, H. (1992). Barron's EZ-101 study keys: Sociology. Hauppauge, NY: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.

Kress, C. (2003). Circle of Courage in practice: The 4-H Club study. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 12(1), 27.

Kress, C. (2004). Essential elements of 4-H youth development. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University.

Kress, C. (2006). Youth leadership and youth development: Connections and questions. New Directions for Youth Development, 2006(109), 45-56.

Kress, C. (2007). Frames, frameworks, and foundations in youth development outreach. Presentation at CYFAR (Children, Youth, and Families at Risk) pre-conference. Available at: http://www.slidefinder.net/f/frames_frameworks_foundations_youth_development/frameworks_foundations_cyf07-2/2810080

Kress, C. (2014). Transformational education: The 4-H legacy. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 23(3), 5-9.

Kress, C., & Forrest, N. (2000). The VOICES project. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 9(2), 116-118.

Larson, S., & Brendtro, L. (2000). Reclaiming our prodigal sons and daughters. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Lawson, H., Claiborne, N., Hardiman, E., Austin, S., & Surko, M. (2007). Deriving theories of change from successful community development partnerships for youths: Implications for school improvement. American Journal of Education, 114(1), 1-40.

Leffert, N., Benson, P., & Roehlkepartain, J. (1997). Starting out right: Developmental Assets for children. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.

Lerner, R. (2005). Promoting PYD: Theoretical and empirical bases. White paper prepared for the Workshop on the Science of Adolescent Health and Development, National Research Council/Institute of Medicine. Washington, DC: National Academies of Science.

Lerner, R. (2007). The good teen: Rescuing adolescence from the myths of the storm and stress years. New York, NY: Crown.

Lerner, R., Dowling, E., & Anderson, P. (2003). PYD: Thriving as the basis of personhood and civil society. Applied Developmental Science, 7(3), 172-180.

Lerner, R., Fisher, C., & Weinberg, R. (2000). Toward a science for and of the people: Promoting civil society through the application of developmental science. Child Development, 71(1), 11-20.

Lerner, R., Lerner, J., Phelps, G., et al. (2008). Waves of the future: The first five years of the 4-H study of PYD. Medford, MA: The Institute for Applied Research and Development, Tufts University.

Lerner, R., Lerner, J., Phelps, G., et al. (2009). Waves of the future: The first six years of the 4-H study of PYD. Medford, MA: The Institute for Applied Research and Development, Tufts University.

Little, R. (1993, April). What's working for today's youth: The issues, the programs, and the learnings. In Institute for Children, Youth, and Families Fellows' Colloquium, Michigan State University.

Long, T., & Hadden, J. (1985). A reconception of socialization. Sociological Theory, 3(1), 39-49.

Long, N., Morse, W., Fecser, F., & Newman, R. (2007). Conflict in the classroom (6th ed.). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Lorber, J. (1975). Beyond equality of the sexes: The question of the children. The Family Coordinator, 24(4), 465-472.

Lotter, C. (2003). Circles of courage: Music therapy with adolescents in conflict with the law at a community-based setting. Master's thesis. Faculty of the Humanities, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

Maccoby, E. (1961). The choice of variables in the study of socialization. Sociometry, 24(4), 357-371.

Marchand, D. (2011). Circle of Courage infusion into the Alberta Indigenous Games 2011. Reclaiming Children & Youth, 20(3), 59-61.

Marotz-Baden, R., Adams, G., Bueche, G., Munro, B. & Munro, G. (1979). Family form or family process? Reconsidering the deficit family model approach. The Family Coordinator, 28(1), 5-14.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McDonald, T. (2010). Classroom management: Engaging students in learning. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

McNeil, M., & Hood, A. (2002). Partner learning: The power source for students, schools, and communities. In J. Thousand, R. Villa, & A. Nevin (Eds.), Creativity and collaborative learning: The practical guide to empowering students, teachers, and families (2nd ed.) (pp. 247-265). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Mead, G. H. (1968). George Herbert Mead: Essays on his social philosophy. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Meyen, E. L., Vergason, G. A., & Whelan, R. J. (Eds.). (1998). Educating students with mild disabilities: Strategies and methods (2nd ed.). Denver, CO: Love.

Moore, K., & Lippman, L. (Eds.). (2005). What do children need to flourish? Conceptualizing and measuring indicators of positive development. New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.

Moore, K., Lippman, L., & Brown, B. (2004). Indicators of child well-being: The promise for PYD. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591, 125-145.

Morse, W. (2008). Connecting with kids in conflict: A life space legacy. Lennox, SD: Reclaiming Children and Youth and Starr Commonwealth.

National 4-H Council. (2009). Essential elements of 4-H youth Pprograms. Chevy Chase, MD: National 4-H Council.

Nichols, P. (1998). Circle of Courage Schools: Program manual for parents, educators, clinicians, and administrators. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa.

Nicholson, H., Collins, C., & Holmer, H. (2004). Youth as people: The protective aspects of youth development in after-school settings. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591, 55-71.

Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). Psychometric theory (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Odney, J., & Brendtro, L. (1992). Students grade their schools. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems, 1(2), 4-9.

Oman, R., Vesely, S., McLeroy, K., Harris-Wyatt, V., Aspy, C., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L. (2002). Reliability and validity of the Youth Asset Survey (YAS). Journal of Adolescent Health, 31(3), 247-255.

Oregon Commission on Children and Families. (2006). Best Practices: PYD. NPC Research. Portland, OR. Available at http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/strenghts

Osgood, D. W., & Briddell, L. (2006). Peer effects in juvenile justice. In K. Dodge, T. Dishion, & J. Lansford (Eds.), Deviant peer influences in programs for youth (pp. 141-161). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Park, N. (2004). The role of subjective well-being in PYD. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591, 25-39.

Parson, T. (1991). The social system. London, UK: Routledge.

Patrick, H., Ryan, A., Alfed-Liro, C., Fredricks, J., Hruda, L., & Eccles, J. (1999). Adolescents' commitment to developing talent: The role of peers in continuing motivation for sports and the arts. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28, 741-750.

Pedhazur, E., & Schmelkin, L. (1991). Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach. Hillsdale, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Peterson, C. (2004). Book review essay: Positive Social Science. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 591, 186-201.

Peterson, C. (2006). A primer in positive psychology. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, C. (2008). The strength-based revolution. Presentation to the Roots and Wings conference, Reclaiming Youth International, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, September 20, 2008.

(Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. (2004). Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.)

Piaget, J. (1950). The moral judgment of a child. London, UK: Routledge Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. (1968). Six psychological studies. New York, NY: Vintage Press.

Pike, D., Millspaugh, C., & Desalvatore, G. (2005). Controlling behavior or reclaiming youth? Creating a behavior management system based on the Circle of Courage. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 13(4), 213–217.

Pittman, K. (1991). A new vision: Promoting PYD. Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development.

PYD. (2001). National Clearinghouse on Families & Youth (NCFY), Silver Spring, MD. available at www.ncfy.com.

Prince-Embury, S. (2007). Resiliency scales for children and adolescents: A profile of personal strengths. San Antonio, TX: Psych Corporation.

Quinn, J. (1999). Where need meets opportunity: Youth development programs for early teens. The Future of Children, 9(2), 96-116.

Ranum, B., Baumgartner, C., Grover, V., & Berkland, L. (2001). Boomerang Character Education Program. Des Moines, IA: Iowa State University Extension.

Redl, F., & Wineman, D. (1951). Children who hate. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Redl, F., & Wineman, D. (1952). Controls from within: Techniques for the treatment of the aggressive child. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Roth, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). What exactly is a youth development program? Answers from research and practice. Applied Developmental Science, 7(2), 94-111.

Roth, J., Brooks-Gunn, J., Murray, L., & Foster, W. (1998). Promoting healthy adolescents: Synthesis of youth development program evaluations. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8, 423-459.

Sabatelli, R., Anderson, S., Kosutic, I., Sanderson, J., & Rubinfeld, S. (2009). A validation study of the youth development assessment device. Family Relations, 58, 361-372.

Scales, P. (1996). A responsive ecology for positive young adolescent development. The

Clearing House, 69(4), 226-230.

Scales, P., & Leffert, N. (1999). Developmental assets: A synthesis of the scientific research on

adolescent development. Minneapolis, MN: Search Institute.

Schlein, S. (Ed.). (1987). A way of looking at things. Selected papers from 1930 to 1980, Erik H.

Erikson. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Schwartz, I. (1987). (In)justice for juveniles. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Schwartz, I., Weiner, N., & Enosh, G. (1999). The fork in the road to juvenile court reform.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 564, 126-141.

Seligman, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. American

Psychologist, 55(1), 5-14.

Seltzer, J., & Kalmuss, D. (1988). Socialization and stress explanations for spousal abuse. Social

Forces, 67(2), 473-479.

Sewell, W. (1963). Supplement: Some recent developments in socialization theory and research.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Communist China and

the Soviet Bloc, 349, 163-181.

Shek, D., Siu, A., & Lee, T. (2007). The Chinese PYD scale: A validation study. Research on

Social Work Practice, 17, 380-391.

Shrauger, J., & Osberg, T. (1981). The relative accuracy of self-predictions and judgments by

others in psychological assessment. The Psychological Bulletin, 90(2), 322-351.

Silliman, B. (2004). Key issues in the practice of youth development. Family Relations, 53(1),

12-16.

Small, S., & Memmo, M. (2004). Contemporary models of youth development and problem

   prevention: Toward an integration of terms, concepts and models. Family Relations,

   54(1), 3-11.

Smith, M. (2009). Rethinking residential child care. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Snyder, C. (2005). Measuring hope in children. In K. Moore & L. Lippman (Eds.), What do

   children need to flourish? Conceptualizing and measuring indicators of positive

   development (pp. 61-74). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.

Steele, W., & Malchiodi, C. (2011). Trauma-informed practice for children and adolescents.

   New York, NY: Routledge.

Steele, W. & Raider, M. (2001). Structured sensory intervention for traumatized children,

   adolescents, and parents. Trauma and Loss: Research and Interventions, 1(1), 8-20.

Steinebach, Ch., Steinebach, U., & Brendtro, L. K. (2012). Peerbeziehungen und Gesundheit im

   Jugendalter [Peer Relations and Health in Youth]. In Ch. Steinebach, D. Jungo, & R.

   Zihlmann, (Eds.), Positive psychologie in der praxis. Anwendung in psychotherapie,

   beratung und coaching (pp. 153-161). Weinheim, Deutschland: Beltz Beltz.

Steinebach, C., Steinebach, U., & Brendtro, L. (2013). Positive youth psychology: Lessons from

   Positive Peer Culture. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 21(4), 15-21.

Straus, M. (1964). Power and structure of the family in relation to socialization. Journal of

   Marriage and Family, 26(3), 318-326.

Sun, R., & Shek, D. (2010). Life satisfaction, PYD and problem behavior among Chinese

   adolescents in Hong Kong. Social Indicators Research, 95(3). 455-474.

Sun, R., & Shek, D. (2012). PYD, life satisfaction and problem behavior among Chinese

   adolescents in Hong Kong: A replication. Social Indicators Research, 105(3), 541-559.

Tew, S. (2002). Circle of Courage: An introduction for youth. Master's thesis. Lesley University,

School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Thomas, D., & Weigart, A. (1971). Socialization and adolescent conformity to significant others:

A cross-national analysis. American Sociological Review, 36(5), 835-847.

Thomas, W. I., & Janowitz, M. (1966). W.I. Thomas on social organization and social

personality: Selected papers. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

USDOD/USDA. (2011). Family resilience conference sponsored by Division of Youth and 4-H,

USDA, and Office of Family Policy, Children & Youth, USDOD. April 28, 2011,

Chicago, Illinois.

Vandries, D. (2010). Larry Brendtro, een studie over een pionier in "strength-based" interventies

[Larry Brendtro, a study of a pioneer in "strength-based" interventions]. Thesis submitted

to the faculty of Psychological and Pedagogical Studies, University of Ghent, Belgium.

Van Bockern, S., Brendtro, L., & Brokenleg, M. (2000). Reclaiming our youth. In R. Villa & J.

Thousand, (Eds.), Restructuring for caring and effective education (2nd ed.) (pp. 59-65).

Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Van Bockern, S., Brendtro, L., & Brokenleg, M. (2003). Nurturing our youth. In K. McCluskey

& A. Mays, (Eds.), Mentoring for talent development (pp. 37-57). Sioux Falls, SD:

Reclaiming Youth International.

Van Bockern, S., & McDonald, T. (2012). Creating Circle of Courage Schools, Reclaiming

Children and Youth, 20(4), 13–17.

Vilikazi, H. (1993). Rediscovering lost truths. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems,

1(4), 37.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, G. (1999). The policy climate for early adolescent initiatives. The Future of Children. 9(2), 147-150.

Walker, G. (2000). Youth development: Issues, challenges and directions. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Weeks, H. A. (1958). Youthful offenders at Highfields. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Weissberg, R., & O'Brien, M. (2004).What works in school-based and emotional learning programs for PYD. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591, 86-97.

Wentworth, W. (1980). Context and understanding: An inquiry into socialization theory. New York, NY: Elsevier North Holland, Inc.

Werner, E., & Brendtro, L. (2012). Risk, resilience, and recovery. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 21(1), 18-23.

Werner, E., & Smith, R. (1992). Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Whelan, R., & Kauffman, J. (1999). Educating students with emotional and behavior disorders: Historical perspectives and future directions. Reston, VA: Council for Children with Behavior Disorders.

Whewell, W. (1847). History of the inductive sciences (2 Volumes). London, UK: Trinity College.

Whitlock, J., & Hamilton, S. (2001) Youth development principles and practices: Defining what it is and is not. Ithaca, NY: Unpublished manuscript, Department of Human Development, Cornell University.

Whittaker, J. K. (1979). Caring for troubled children. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, E. (1998). Consilience: The unity of knowledge. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Wilson, W. J. (1997). When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Wilson-Simmons, R. (2007). PYD: An examination of the field. Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson.

Zaff, J., & Lerner, R. (2010). Service learning promotes PYD in high school. The Phi Delta Kappan, 91(5), 21-23.

Zarrett, N., & Lerner, R. (2008). Ways to promote the PYD of children and youth. Washington, DC: Child Trends.

Zehr, H. (1990). Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Zigler, E., & Child, I. L. (1969). Socialization. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology, Vol. 3 (pp. 450-589). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

ABSTRACT

THE CIRCLE OF COURAGE: CHILDHOOD SOCIALIZATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

by

WILLIAM C. JACKSON

December 2014

Advisor: Dr. David Merolla

Major: Sociology

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

The aim of this investigation was to examine the psychometric properties of the Circle of Courage Scale. Data was collected from 51 youth ages 13-17 enrolled in program at Starr Commonwealth a non-profit human services organization headquartered in Michigan. Data was collected over a period of 9 months and used as an aggregate data base. Principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation resulted in a four-factor solution as determined by eigenvalues greater than one, simple structure convergence, item loadings and conceptual clarity. The four components of the Circle of Courage were labeled as Adult/Peer Influence, Belonging, Mastery and Peer Culture. Psychometric properties indicate continuing research is warranted to achieve instrument for program and clinical use.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

William C. Jackson graduated from Cass Technical High School in 1982 and earned a BA in Sociology from Western Michigan University in 1988 after changing majors. He completed a Master's Degree in Sociology at Wayne State University in 1994. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Sociology from Wayne State University with a planned graduation in 2014. William taught introductory sociology class at Washtenaw Community College from 2008 to 2010.

William has been employed at Starr Commonwealth since 1988, and currently serves as Executive Vice President and Chief Clinical Officer. During his nearly 25 year tenure at Starr Commonwealth he has served in many direct service and leadership roles including Counselor, Senior Counselor and Program Supervisor and Program Director and Senior Vice-President of Community Based Programming. In his current role, he is responsible to the delivery and efficacy of all current programming provided by Starr Commonwealth, in addition he is working to improve and expand the scientific rigor of the organization's research efforts.

William's current professional duties and academic pursuits restrict time for volunteer and other community activities currently. However, in the past he was a certified facilitator for the National Institute for the Healing of Racism and in this capacity conducted seminars designed to impact the disease of racism. He has also volunteered as a mentor to 4th, 5th and 8th grade boys in Detroit public schools for Manhood, Inc. for which he was formerly a board member. He is also an active participant in the Birmingham Bloomfield Task Force on Racial Diversity (BBTF) where he assisted in designing and planning discussion groups between suburban and city residents. He served as co-chairman of the 2003 BBTF Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration. He is a former member of the High Risk Youth Collaboration Group, a group of Detroit agencies working to provide a variety of services to at risk youth. He served as Board Member for Ways to Work – Michigan, Inc. a micro loan program serving primarily Detroit residents unable to obtain a conventional loan for items such as automobiles or computers. A graduate of Leadership Detroit's 28th class, William is the author *Functional Independence for 19-20 Year Olds Exiting the Michigan Juvenile Justice System is a Myth* published in Minority Voices: An Official Publication of the University of Louisville's Office of Minority Affairs 2001-2002.