Core Competencies: All Programs, Middle and High School

**Scale:** Social Conscience

**Instrument:** Student Questionnaire Based upon the 5 C’s

**Developers:** Richard M. Lerner

**Year:** 2005 (original survey), June 2008 for short version 1.2

**Target Audience(s):** Middle school youth. The survey is still in the early stages of development and relevance across various target groups has yet to be determined.

**Language other than English available:** No

**Type:** Attitudes

**Data collected:** Quantitative

**Data collection format:** Self report - Pre/post

**Reading Level:** Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 5.7

**Existence of test/technical manuals, user guides, supplemental materials:** Survey available by request from Richard M. Lerner, Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development, Eliot-Person Department of Child Development, 301 Lincoln Filene Building, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155. email: richard.lerner@tufts. Short version of the survey includes information on administration and scoring. There is no cost associated with use of the survey or its scales; however, proper citation of developers is necessary and the developer’s request that any findings that may be relevant to the further development of the survey be shared.

**Level of training necessary for administration/scoring/interpretation:** None necessary. Paper and pencil scoring by summing the ratings.

**Widespread Use/Professional Endorsements:** The 5 C’s survey has been used between 2005 and present to model pathways of positive youth development and outcomes such as Contribution, Depression, and Risk Behavior. The five C model is currently being endorsed for the development of assets rather than deficit based intervention/prevention programming. Lerner and colleagues are well known and respected for their research in youth development.

**Cost of Use:** No costs associated with the use of this instrument.
Description:
Social Conscience is a subcomponent of the Character factor. [One of the five theoretical "Cs" that are proposed to be related to positive youth development: Caring, Character, Connection, Competence, and Confidence.]
7 items that are focused on the importance of civic engagement.

Psychometrics:
Information on reliability and validity are provided below. If information on a particular psychometric was not found, it is indicated as “no information provided.” It should be noted that this is not necessarily an indication of a lack of reliability or validity within a particular scale/instrument, but rather a lack of rigorous testing, for various reasons, by the developers or other researchers.

Reliability: A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability as evidence; however, standards range from .5 to .9 depending on the intended use and context for the instrument.

- **Test-Retest:** No information provided
- **Internal Consistency:** .92 (Lerner et al., 2005); .92 (Jelicic et al., 2007)
- **Inter-rater reliability:** No information provided

Validity: The extent to which a measure captures what it is intended to measure.

- **Content/Face Validity:** The development of the 5 C’s survey is based upon the Positive Youth Development perspective or model. This particular scale uses pre-existing scale items with their own reliability and validity.
- **Criterion Validity:** Has been shown to be predictive of youth contribution.
- **Construct Validity:** Confirmatory factor analysis indicated fit into the positive youth Development Perspective (5 Cs)
Scale: Personal Values

Instrument: Student Questionnaire Based upon the 5 C’s

Developers: Richard M. Lerner

Source: Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development

Year: 2005 (original survey), June 2008 for short version 1.2

Target Audience(s): Middle school youth. The survey is still in the early stages of development and relevance across various target groups has yet to be determined.

Language other than English available: No

Type: Attitudes

Data collected: Quantitative

Data collection format: Self report - Pre/post

Reading Level: Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 5.3

Existence of test/technical manuals, user guides, supplemental materials: Survey available by request from Richard M. Lerner, Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development, Eliot-Person Department of Child Development, 301 Lincoln Filene Building, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155. email: richard.lerner@tufts. Short version of the survey includes information on administration and scoring. There is no cost associated with use of the survey or its scales; however, proper citation of developers is necessary and the developer's request that any findings that may be relevant to the further development of the survey be shared.

Level of training necessary for administration/scoring/interpretation: None necessary. Paper and pencil scoring by summing the ratings.

Widespread Use/Professional Endorsements: The 5 C’s survey has been used between 2005 and present to model pathways of positive youth development and outcomes such as Contribution, Depression, and Risk Behavior. The five C model is currently being endorsed for the development of asset rather than deficit based intervention/prevention programming. Lerner and colleagues are well known and respected for their research in youth development.

Cost of Use: No costs associated with use of this instrument.
Description:
Personal Values is a subcomponent of the Character factor. One of the five theoretical "Cs" that are proposed to be related to positive youth development: Caring, Character, Connection, Competence, and Confidence.
Items for the Personal Values scale are drawn from the Search Institute Profiles of Student Life--Attitudes and Behaviors. Copyright 1996; www.search-institute.org. 5 items that are focused on the importance of doing what is best and right.

Psychometrics:
Information on reliability and validity are provided below. If information on a particular psychometric was not found, it is indicated as “no information provided.” It should be noted that this is not necessarily an indication of a lack of reliability or validity within a particular scale/instrument, but rather a lack of rigorous testing, for various reasons, by the developers or other researchers.

Reliability: A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability as evidence; however, standards range from .5 to .9 depending on the intended use and context for the instrument

Test-Retest: No information provided
Internal Consistency: .89 (Lerner et al., 2005); .89 (Jelicic et al., 2007)
Inter-rater reliability: No information provided

Validity: The extent to which a measure captures what it is intended to measure.

Content/Face Validity: The development of the 5 C’s survey is based upon the Positive Youth Development perspective or model. This particular scale uses pre-existing scale items with their own reliability and validity.
Criterion Validity: Has been shown to be predictive of youth contribution.
Construct Validity: Confirmatory factor analysis indicated fit into the positive youth Development Perspective (5 Cs)
**Scale: Caring**

**Instrument:** Student Questionnaire Based upon the 5 C’s

**Developers:** Richard M. Lerner

**Source:** Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development

**Year:** 2005 (original survey), June 2008 for short version 1.2

**Target Audience(s):** Middle school youth. The survey is still in the early stages of development and relevance across various target groups has yet to be determined.

**Language other than English available:** No

**Type:** Attitudes

**Data collected:** Quantitative

**Data collection format:** Self report - Pre/post

**Reading Level:** Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 4.6

**Existence of test/technical manuals, user guides, supplemental materials:** Survey available by request from Richard M. Lerner, Institute for Applied Research in Youth Development, Eliot-Person Department of Child Development, 301 Lincoln Filene Building, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155. email: richard.lerner@tufts. Short version of the survey includes information on administration and scoring. There is no cost associated with use of the survey or its scales; however, proper citation of developers is necessary and the developer’s request that any findings that may be relevant to the further development of the survey be shared.

**Level of training necessary for administration/scoring/interpretation:** None necessary. Paper and pencil scoring by summing the ratings.

**Widespread Use/Professional Endorsements:** The 5 C’s survey has been used between 2005 and present to model pathways of positive youth development and outcomes such as Contribution, Depression, and Risk Behavior. The five C model is currently being endorsed for the development of asset rather than deficit based intervention/prevention programming. Lerner and colleagues are well known and respected for their research in youth development.

**Cost of Use:** No costs associated with the use of this instrument.
Description:
Caring is one of the five theoretical "Cs" that are proposed to be related to positive youth development: Caring, Character, Connection, Competence, and Confidence. The Caring scale includes a composite of items from the Eisenberg Sympathy Scale and the Empathic Concern subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index for a total of 9 items.

Psychometrics:
Information on reliability and validity are provided below. If information on a particular psychometric was not found, it is indicated as “no information provided.” It should be noted that this is not necessarily an indication of a lack of reliability or validity within a particular scale/instrument, but rather a lack of rigorous testing, for various reasons, by the developers or other researchers.

Reliability: A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability as evidence; however, standards range from .5 to .9 depending on the intended use and context for the instrument

  Test-Retest: No information provided
  Internal Consistency: .87 (Lerner et al., 2005); .87 (Jelicic et al., 2007)
  Inter-rater reliability: Teacher and student ratings of sympathy were significantly correlated

Validity: The extent to which a measure captures what it is intended to measure.

  Content/Face Validity: The development of the 5 C’s survey is based upon the Positive Youth Development perspective or model. This particular scale uses pre-existing scale items with their own reliability and validity.
  Criterion Validity: Modestly to moderately related to a variety of measure of social competence including teacher ratings of social skills and peer ratings of popularity.
  Construct Validity: Child reports of sympathy and physiological responses related to sympathy were significantly correlated.
**Scale: Decision Making**

**Instrument:** Youth Engagement, Attitudes, and Knowledge (YEAK) Survey

**Developers:** Melissa Cater, Mary Arnold, Lisa Bouillion Diaz, Katherine Heck, June Mead, Beverly Spears, Ben Silliman, and Maureen Mulroy, with Jill Walahoski and Suzanne LeMenestrel

**Source:** Policy Studies Associates, 1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20009

**Year:** 2010

**Target Audience(s):** Ages 9-18

**Language other than English available:** No

**Type:** Knowledge, attitudes, and behavior

**Data collected:** Quantitative

**Data collection format:** Self-report

**Reading Level:** Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 4.9

**Existence of test/technical manuals, user guides, supplemental materials:** Report and instrument available from Policy Studies Associates.

**Level of training necessary for administration/scoring/interpretation:** None

**Widespread Use/Professional Endorsements:** Used by National 4-H for the evaluation of the 4-H Science, Engineering, and Technology Initiative.

**Cost of Use:** No costs associated with the use of this instrument.

**Description:** Five items assess decision making skills. Items were adapted from Mincemoyer and Perkins' scale "Making Decisions in Everyday Life".
Psychometrics: Information on reliability and validity are provided below. If information on a particular psychometric was not found, it is indicated as “no information provided.” It should be noted that this is not necessarily an indication of a lack of reliability or validity within a particular scale/instrument, but rather a lack of rigorous testing, for various reasons, by the developers or other researchers.

Reliability: A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability as evidence; however, standards range from .5 to .9 depending on the intended use and context for the instrument.

- **Test-Retest**: No information provided
- **Internal Consistency**: .83
- **Inter-rater reliability**: No information provided

Validity: The extent to which a measure captures what it is intended to measure.

- **Content/Face Validity**: No information provided
- **Criterion Validity**: No information provided
- **Construct Validity**: No information provided
Scale: Critical Thinking

Instrument: Youth Engagement, Attitudes, and Knowledge (YEAK) Survey

Developers: Melissa Cater, Mary Arnold, Lisa Bouillion Diaz, Katherine Heck, June Mead, Beverly Spears, Ben Silliman, and Maureen Mulroy, with Jill Walahoski and Suzanne LeMenestrel

Source: Policy Studies Associates, 1718 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20009

Year: 2010

Target Audience(s): Ages 9-18

Language other than English available: No

Type: Knowledge, attitudes, and behavior

Data collected: Quantitative

Data collection format: Self-report

Reading Level: Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 4.9

Existence of test/technical manuals, user guides, supplemental materials: Report and instrument available from Policy Studies Associates

Level of training necessary for administration/scoring/interpretation: None

Widespread Use/Professional Endorsements: Used by National 4-H for the evaluation of the 4-H Science, Engineering, and Technology Initiative.

Cost of Use: No costs associated with the use of this instrument.

Description: Five items assess critical thinking skills. Items were adapted from Mincemoyer and Perkins' scale "Critical Thinking in Everyday Life".
Psychometrics:
Information on reliability and validity are provided below. If information on a particular psychometric was not found, it is indicated as “no information provided.” It should be noted that this is not necessarily an indication of a lack of reliability or validity within a particular scale/instrument, but rather a lack of rigorous testing, for various reasons, by the developers or other researchers.

Reliability: A correlation of at least .80 is suggested for at least one type of reliability as evidence; however, standards range from .5 to .9 depending on the intended use and context for the instrument

- **Test-Retest:** No information provided
- **Internal Consistency:** .82
- **Inter-rater reliability:** No information provided

Validity: *The extent to which a measure captures what it is intended to measure.*

- **Content/Face Validity:** No information provided
- **Criterion Validity:** No information provided
- **Construct Validity:** No information provided
Core Competencies: All Programs, Middle and High School

This 30-item questionnaire measures behavior and attitudes related to five constructs that are common to the goals of all CYFAR programs: social conscience, personal values, caring, decision making, and critical thinking.

**Reading level:** Flesch-Kincaid Grade level: 4.9

Combines Critical Thinking and Decision Making scales from the Youth Engagement Attitudes and Knowledge Survey (Cater et al., 2010) and Caring, Personal Values, and Social Conscience scales from the Positive Youth Development Survey (Lerner, 2008).

**Items 1-6** are from Lerner's Social Conscience Scale (2008, part of the PYD survey)
Scoring: No items are reverse coded. Sum all item ratings together. Range of scores= 0 to 18. Higher scores indicate greater social conscience.

**Items 7-11** are from Lerner's Personal Values Scale (2008, part of the PYD survey)
Scoring: No items are reverse coded. Sum all item ratings together. Range of scores= 0 to 15. Higher scores indicate greater personal values.

**Items 12-20** are from Lerner's Caring Scale (2008, part of the PYD survey)
Scoring: Reverse scoring (3=not well to 0=very well) for items indicated with a (R). Sum all item ratings together. Range of scores= 0 to 27. Higher scores indicate greater caring.

**Items 21-25** are from Cater et al.'s Decision Making Scale (part of the YRBS)
Scoring: No items are reverse coded. Sum all item ratings together. Range of scores= 0 to 15. Higher ratings indicate strength in decision making.

**Items 26-30** are from Cater et al.'s Critical Thinking Scale (part of the YRBS)
Scoring: No items are reverse coded. Sum all item ratings together. Range of scores= 0 to 15. Higher ratings indicate strength in critical thinking.
Rating Scale for items 1-11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>extremely important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important is each of the following to you in your life?

1. Helping other people.
2. Helping to make the world a better place to live in.
3. Giving time and money to make life better for other people.
4. Helping to reduce hunger and poverty in the world.
5. Helping to make sure all people are treated fairly.
6. Speaking up for equality (everyone should have the same rights and opportunities).
7. Doing what I believe is right, even if my friends make fun of me.
8. Standing up for what I believe, even when it’s unpopular to do.
9. Telling the truth, even when it’s not easy.
10. Accepting responsibility for my actions when I make a mistake or get in trouble.
11. Doing my best, even when I have a job I don’t like.

Rating Scale for items 12-20:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>very well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well does each of these statements describe you?

12. I don’t feel sorry for other people when they are having problems. (R)
13. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I want to help them.
14. It bothers me when bad things happen to good people.
15. It bothers me when bad things happen to any person.
16. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I don’t feel sorry for them. (R)
17. I feel sorry for other people who don’t have what I have.
18. When I see someone being picked on, I feel sorry for them.
19. It makes me sad to see a person who doesn’t have friends.
20. When I see another person who is hurt or upset, I feel sorry for them.
Rating Scale for items 21-25:
0=Never
1=Sometimes
2=Usually
3=Always

When I have a decision to make I…

21. Look for information to help me understand the problem.
22. Think before making a choice.
23. Consider the risks of a choice before making a decision.
24. Think about all the information I have about the different choices.
25. Think of past choices when making new decisions.

Rating Scale for items 26-30:
0=Never
1=Sometimes
2=Usually
3=Always

When I think about things I….

27. Usually have more than one source of information before making a decision.
28. Compare ideas when thinking about a topic.
29. Keep my mind open to different ideas when planning to make a decision.
30. Am able to tell the best way of handling a problem.