

***Development of Positive Youth Development Indicators
in The Context of Thai Adolescent***

Kaninthorn Lohkum, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand
Sittipong Wattananonsakul, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand

The Asian Conference on Psychology & the Behavioral Sciences 2017
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Research on Positive Youth Development (PYD) has been widely studied, based on the Positive Youth Development model (Lerner, 2005). The objectives of this study were to develop and validate a scale for measuring the positive youth development of Thai adolescent. There was a full form for the measurement of grades 10 to 12.

The data were collected from 550 high school students, ranging in age from 15 to 18 years ($M = 16.62$, $SD = 0.967$), in Bangkok, Thailand. The PYD scale was developed through a two-phase process. The first phase involved the generation of an item pool and the second phase was a validation of the psychometric properties of the PYD scale in the Thai version.

Factor analysis was employed to study the dimensions of PYD. Factor analysis demonstrated that items loaded on 3 specific dimensions consists of Confidence, Connection and Character. The results showed that a three-factor model of PYD had a better overall fit to the empirical data. These findings were consistent with previous research in terms of the indicators. These indicators should be utilized in further developmental strengthening programs for students. the limitation of this study and suggestion for future research are discussed.

Keywords: Positive Youth Development, development indicator, measurement scales, Thai adolescent

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Since its inception over a century ago, the scientific study of adolescence has largely been framed by a “deficit perspective” in which the second decade of life was considered a period of “storm and stress” (Hall, 1940), developmental disturbance (Freud, 1969), or crisis (Erikson, 1968). From this perspective adolescents were problems to be managed (Roth and Brooks-Gunn, 2003), and if there was to be positive development during this period of life, it involved the absence or the reduction of problems. The pervasive influence of the “deficit perspective” on research aims, policy, and practice is reflected in the prevalence of risk measurement and problematic behaviors that are most often collected by researchers, programs and service organizations. It appears that it is much easier to determine what youth should avoid (violence, drugs) or not be marked by mental health problems than to agree on the characteristics and experiences that are either indicators of thriving or anything else that could enhance the lives of adolescents (Moore et al., 2004).

The problems and deficits among young people and the positive youth development (PYD) perspective was an innovative approach to adolescent development that emerged over the last 20 years. The PYD perspective moves beyond the negative, deficit view of youth that dominated developmental science, psychology, education, sociology, public health, and other fields through the twentieth century and towards a view of the strengths of youth and the positive qualities and outcomes that the researcher the wish youth would develop. The PYD has been conceptualized in many ways, and several theoretical frameworks have been posited over the past few decades. The important frame work of PYD was the developmental systems theory which focused on the plasticity of development (Lerner, 2004). The PYD model consist of five factors (5Cs), competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring (Lerner et al., 2005). As these models become more popular with individuals working to enhance the positive growth of young people in homes, schools and youth-serving organizations. However, in Thai culture, there were different social contexts. Therefore, the constructs of the PYD indicators might be different from the model proposed by Lerner (2005)

The objectives of this study were to develop and explore indicators of positive youth development in Thai adolescences. The conceptual framework was based on PYD model of Lerner (2005)

Method

Participants & Procedure

The participants consisted of 550 high school students in Bangkok Thailand, ranging in age from 15 to 18 years ($M = 16.62$, $SD = 0.967$). It was 47.6% male and 52.4% female. The PYD scale was developed through a two-phase process and the third phase was factor analysis which can be described as follows.

The first phase developed the definition of PYD in Thai culture context by reviewing literatures and interviewing adolescent experts. Then, the synthesized definition of PYD was employed to generate an item pool. To finish this phase, the expert of

adolescence checked all of the items and commented by regarding IOC procedure. The PYD definition was presented in Table 1.

The second phase was to validate the psychometric properties of the Thai version of the PYD scale. After correction in first phase, the PYD scale was validated by item discrimination and reliability. The statistical analysis showed that 66 items on the PYD scale presented the good psychometric properties (CITC = .32 - .73, Cronbach's alpha coefficient = .967).

The final phase was Exploratory Factor Analysis that aims to analyze PYD indicators.

This study was certified by the Ethical Review Committee for Research Involving Human Research Subjects, Srinakharinwirot University.

Measurement

The participants were asked to indicate the level of truth with each statement on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 - "not really true" to 4 - "really true". The participants who got higher score mean higher level of PYD. All scales were developed in Thai and tested the psychometric properties (e.g. item analysis, content testing, construct validity and reliability) before collecting data.

Table 1 Definitions of the Positive Youth Development 5Cs model

Factor (Cs)	Definition
Competence	An action in domain specific areas including social academic and physical competence: Social competence pertains to interpersonal skills, academic competence pertains to cognitive abilities including school grades and attendance and physical competence pertains to work habits sports and activities.
Confidence	An internal sense of overall positivity pertaining to self-worth, positive identity and physical appearance.
Connection	Positive bonds with people and institutions that are reflected in bidirectional exchanges between the individual and peers, family, school and community in which both parties contribute to the relationship.
Character	Respect for societal and cultural rules, possession of standards for correct behaviors, a sense of right and wrong, morality, and integrity
Caring	A sense of sympathy and empathy for others; to understand a situation, to be concerned and to share suffering.

Data analysis

The data ($n = 550$) were analyzed for descriptive statistics and correlations with the demographic variables and variables in the conceptual framework. Following data collection, they were analyzed by SPSS statistics program.

The factor analysis was an Exploratory Factor analysis by the principal component method and orthogonal rotation with varimax technique. The criteria of data for factor

analysis was that the KMO should be greater than .05 and Bartlett's test should be significant at a level of .05 (Lewis-Beck, 1994). The eigenvalue of factor extraction should be greater than 1 and factor loading of each variable in factor should be greater than .20 (Velicer & Jackson, 1990)

Results

The item discrimination and reliability of the PYD scale were divided in 5 factors following the conceptual framework presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Item discrimination and reliability of the PYD scale

Factor (items)	CITC (<i>r</i>)	Cronbach's Alpha coefficient
Competence (12)	.340 - .618	.843
Confidence (12)	.505 - .720	.898
Connection (16)	.380 - .651	.878
Character (16)	.535 - .759	.940
Caring (10)	.655 - .793	.928

All data collected for statistical analysis were appropriate with the conditions of factor analysis (KMO = .891, Chi-square = 2320.351). Construct validity of PYD model by Exploratory Factor Analysis demonstrated that items loaded on 3 specific dimensions consist of character, confidence and connection as presented in Table 3 - 4.

Table 3 Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings

Factor	Eigenvalues	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.905	22.343	22.343
2	2.191	16.856	39.198
3	2.176	16.742	55.940

KMO = .891, Bartlett's test = .000

Table 4 Rotation component matrix

Indicator	Factor Loading		
	Fac 1	Fac 2	Fac 3
1. Social conscience	.795	.059	.198
2. Values diversity	.783	.088	.016
3. Caring	.744	.162	.180
4. Morality	.752	.259	.224
5. Academic competence	.165	.715	.121
6. Physical competence	.055	.683	.096
7. Physical appearance	.084	.680	.241
8. Self-esteem	.455	.523	.211
9. Social competence	.248	.469	.444
10. connection to Neighborhood	-.090	.105	.788
11. connection to Peer	.306	.100	.685
12. connection to School	.221	.223	.640
13. connection to Family	.194	.253	.480

Note: Fac_1 = Character, Fac_2 = Confidence, Fac_3 = Connection

The eigenvalues of the first factor (Character) was 2.905 (variance = 22.343%) and the factor loading was between .795 to .752. The eigenvalues of the second factor (Confidence) was 2.191 (variance = 16.856%) and the factor loading was between .715 to .469. The eigenvalues of the third factor (Connection) was 2.176 (variance = 16.742%) and the factor loading was between .788 to .480.

Conclusion and Discussion

The results of this study, the Thai Positive Youth Development scales, showed that there was a good psychometric property (CITC = .32 - .73, Cronbach's alpha coefficient = .967), and appropriate in the context of Thai adolescents. Moreover, this scale evaluate the classification of adolescents for eligibility for a promotional program. The exploratory factor analysis showed that Positive Youth Development indicators in the context of Thai adolescents were comprised of 3 factors from 13 indicators. This included the following: 1) Character, which consisted of 4 indicators (social conscience, values diversity, caring and morality); 2) Confidence, which consisted of 5 indicators (academic competence, physical competence, physical appearance, self-esteem and social competence); and 3) Connection, which consisted of 4 indicators (neighborhood, peer, school and family). As a result, the 3Cs (Character, Confidence and Connection) can be described by the theory of developmental contextualism, in which person can develop behaviors by interaction with an ecological model consisting of individuals, society and culture (Lerner, 2005). The 3 factors of the PYD model in the context of Thai adolescence were consistent with the primarily 3C model of Lerner (Baker, J. et al., 2014). In addition, this model was also consistent with previous research about the good characters of Thai adolescents, with many indicators. Some indicators didn't appears in this research because they were variables for specific purposes in each research. The Thai PYD model was different from the PYD 5Cs model at present (Lerner, 2005). The previous research showed that the 5Cs model divided Competence from Confidence and Caring from Character (Geldhof et al., 2014; Bowers et al., 2010; Lerner et al., 2005). The Positive Youth Development scale for Thai adolescents has already established as a good and valid measurement. This scale could be utilized as a measurement to classify a level of PYD in adolescences before and after the program in youths.

Limitation and further study

The limitations of this study included the participants' range of age as the participants were in middle adolescence. The wide range of adolescent population might be affect to some indicators in factor analysis. Therefore, the future studies should enlarge the population and using confirmatory factor analysis to ensure the construction of the Thai PYD model with empirical data. The PYD indicators which found in this study was conducive to develop in to a programs for promoting strengths in youths.

Acknowledgements

This research was granted by the Graduate School at Srinakharinwirot University (GRAD-S3-2560).

Reference

- Baker, J., Safai, P., & Fraser-Thomas, J. (2014). *Health and elite sport: is high performance sport a healthy pursuit?* (Vol. 38): Routledge.
- Bowers, E. P., Li, Y., Kiely, M. K., Brittian, A., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2010). The Five Cs model of positive youth development: a longitudinal analysis of confirmatory factor structure and measurement invariance. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 39(7), 720-735.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. Oxford, England: Norton & Co.
- Freud, A. (1969). Adolescence as a developmental disturbance. In G. Caplan & S. Lebovici (Eds.), *Adolescence* (pp. 5–10). New York: Basic Books.
- Geldhof, G. J., Bowers, E. P., Boyd, M. J., Mueller, M., Napolitano, C. M., Schmid, K. L., ... Lerner, R. M. (2014). The creation and validation of short and very short measures of PYD. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24(1), 163-176.
- Habing, B. (2003). *Exploratory Factor Analysis*. Retrieved from South Carolina:
- Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education* (Vols. 1 & 2). New York: Appleton.
- Lerner, R. M. (2004). *Liberty: Thriving and civic engagement among American youth*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lerner, R. M. (2005). *Promoting positive youth development: Theoretical and empirical bases. Paper presented at the 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. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., et al. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H Study of Positive Youth Development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(1), 17–71.
- Lewis-Beck M. S. (1989). *Factor Analysis & Related Techniques*. Singapore: SAGE Publications Inc.,
- Moore, K. A., Lippman, L., & Brown, B. (2004). Indicators of child well-being: The promise for positive youth development. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Special Issue: Positive Development: Realizing the Potential of Youth*, 591, 125–145.

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

Velicer, W. F., & Jackson, D. N. (1990). Component analysis versus common factor analysis: Some issues in selecting an appropriate procedure. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 25(1), 1-28.

Contact Email: kaninthorn@gmail.com