

**Framework on Evaluating the Impact of Youth Service Programs**  
Innovations in Civic Participation  
May 2008

*Thank you to Alan Melchior from Brandeis University, Michael Patton from Utilization-Focused Evaluation, Manish Subharwal from Student Partnerships Worldwide, Ami Thakkar and Karin Atkins from the International Youth Foundation, Steve Powell from Promente, Minna Mattero, Silvia Paruzzolo, and Naoko Kataoka from the World Bank for their initial feedback and contributions to this document. As this is a working document, we welcome additional feedback. Please send any comments to [buhrer@icicp.org](mailto:buhrer@icicp.org).*

- I. Introduction
- II. Definitions
- III. Key Questions to consider when designing an evaluation
- IV. Methodological Considerations
- V. Identification of Outcomes and Indicators
- VI. Annotated Bibliography of Evaluations
- VII. Evaluation Resources
- VIII. Bibliography of Research

## **I. Introduction**

Innovations in Civic Participation (ICP), in partnership with the World Bank Children and Youth Unit and participants at the International Experts Meeting on Measuring the Impact of Voluntary Youth Service Programs, has developed this document to provide guidance for evaluating youth service programs in different contexts. To prepare this document, ICP staff conducted a literature review of research on youth civic engagement programs, with an emphasis on youth service programs (please see accompanying bibliography).<sup>1</sup>

Review of the research found very few formal, publically available evaluations of national youth service programs outside North America and Europe. The majority of studies of programs in both the US and the developing world take the form of case studies describing the program rather than studying program impacts. Before promoting further investment in youth service programs globally, it is important to ensure that they are having positive effects on young people and on the communities they serve. To do this requires a stronger evidence base for the impact of youth service programs, especially in regions where little research has been conducted to date. It is also important not to make assumptions about the applicability of impact results for programs in the US or Europe for programs in other parts of the world. Context and program outcomes should determine program and evaluation design, and given the difference in contexts, evaluation designs cannot be easily transferred from one setting to another.

The research also demonstrates a lack of high-quality data and of standardized criteria for gauging program effectiveness. Youth service programs have a complex relationship with the community and cannot be isolated from the context in which they are operating or the specific outcomes for which programs are designed. However, we also recognize that in order to stimulate more investment in youth service programs, it is important existing programs are rigorously evaluated and demonstrate significant positive impact. We hope that this document will provide practical guidance regarding evaluation of youth

---

<sup>1</sup> We would like to acknowledge that the bibliography is not complete, and we welcome suggestions for additional studies that might be added. We also acknowledge that the literature search is incomplete. To date we only searched for documents in English and have not carried out searches for documents in other languages. Several other organizations have useful sources of bibliographies and research reports on youth service and volunteering: the National Service Learning Clearinghouse, Corporation for National and Community Service, Institute for Volunteering Research in London, VOSESA in Johannesburg, ABT Associates, International Center for Research on Civic Engagement and Service-Learning, Center for Social Development at the Washington University in St Louis, among others.

service programs that meet the needs of program practitioners and policymakers, as well as potential investors like the World Bank and other donor organizations.

This document lays out a framework for evaluation providing information on key questions, methodological considerations, identification of outcomes and indicators and an annotated bibliography of youth service evaluations.

## **II. Definitions**

### **Youth**

For this framework, we use the UN definition of youth to include young people between the ages of 10 and 24 years of age. We recognize, however, that each policy and program may have its own definition of youth. What is important is that the target group is explicit at the outset of programming.

### **Assets-Based Approach**

This approach views young people as positive actors in their lives and communities. It sees investing in young people as a significant opportunity to harness their potential to improve their communities, while developing skills for future success. It focuses on the contributions young people can make rather than harm they can cause. Within this context, young people need to be supported to engage positively and effectively in their communities' development through youth-friendly education emphasizing the importance of participation, life and livelihood skills development, and access to a variety of structured opportunities for civic engagement appropriate for young people's individual interests, goals, and skill sets. This approach is contrasted with a needs-based approach, which views young people as "at-risk" or in need of help. Programming stemming from a needs-based approach tends to focus on services provided to young people rather than by them.

### **Positive Youth Development**

According to the National Research Council, "youth development is the transformation of children into competent, confident, connected, and contributing people of character who are fully prepared and fully engaged in their communities."<sup>2</sup> The NRC identifies four areas for youth development: physical, intellectual, psychological and emotional, and social. The Search Institute has also developed a measure of youth development, based on the "40 Developmental Assets" that identifies concrete, common sense, positive experiences and qualities essential to raising successful young people. These assets have the power during critical adolescent years to influence choices young people make and help them become caring, responsible adults.

### **Civic Engagement**

Defined as individual and collective actions designed to identify and address issues of public concern. Civic engagement means working to make a difference in the civic life of communities and developing the combination of knowledge, skills, values, and motivation to make that difference. Civic engagement can take many forms, from individual voluntarism to organizational involvement to electoral participation. It can include efforts to directly address an issue, work with others in a community to solve a problem or interact with the institutions of representative democracy.

### **Youth Service**

Although civic engagement can take on many forms, our focus for this project is on voluntary youth service, defined by the Global Service Institute as "an organized period of substantial engagement and contribution to the local, national, or world community, recognized and valued by society with minimal or no monetary contribution to the participant." Common elements of the programs we are focusing on include:

- a participant's engagement in service is frequent

---

<sup>2</sup> Eccles, Jacquelynne and Jennifer Appleton Gootman (Eds). (2002). *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

- the young person is viewed as an active participant in the program rather than a beneficiary of services
- the commitment to service is consistent over time, rather than episodic
- the service may be remunerated in some way, but at less than market rates
- the program is structured
- the program addresses either difficult public problems or needs that have been defined collectively<sup>3</sup>

### **Impact**

Impact is the extent and nature of the positive and negative changes resulting from a specific intervention, program or policy. Impacts can be measured at different levels in individuals, communities and at a national level.

### **Impact evaluation**

The following evaluation definition has been adopted by the NONIE (Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation): "Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended" (DAC Evaluation Glossary June 2002).

### **III. Key Questions<sup>4</sup>**

1. What is the purpose of the evaluation?  
 Impact (or *summative*) evaluations answer questions such as: *Does the policy (program, intervention) work? How large is the likely effect size?*  
 Process (or *formative*) evaluation answers questions such as: *How, why, and under what conditions does the policy (program, intervention) work?*
2. Who is the audience for the evaluation?  
 Internal, external
3. Is the evaluation intended to be program-specific or generalizable (i.e., internal or external validity)?
4. Who are the stakeholders? Who needs to be involved in the evaluation?  
 Consider whether the evaluation will use participatory methods.
5. What is the perspective of the evaluation?  
 Impact on participants, community, institutions?
6. What are the units of analysis?  
 Individuals, groups, program components, whole program, organizations, communities, time periods, etc.
7. What will be the sampling strategy?  
 Purposeful sampling, probability sampling. Variations in sample size from a single case study to a generalizable sample.
8. What types of data will be collected?  
 Qualitative, quantitative, mixed?<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from Perry, J. L., & Thomson, A. M. (2003). *Civic service: What difference does it make?* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

<sup>4</sup> These questions were derived from a set of questions in Patton, Michael Quinn. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

<sup>5</sup> Qualitative data tends to stem from three kinds of data collection: 1) in depth interviews; 2) direct observation and 3) written documents. Quantitative data tends to stem from surveys, tests, experiments, secondary data. Mixed methods combine qualitative and quantitative data collection. (Patton 2002: 13)

9. What type and degree of control will be exercised?  
Experimental, quasi-experimental, no control
10. What analytical approach or approaches will be used?  
Inductive, deductive
11. How will the validity of and confidence in the findings be addressed?  
Triangulation, multiple data sources, multiple methods, multiple perspectives, multiple investigators
12. What resources are available to conduct the evaluation?
13. Who will conduct the evaluation?  
Internal evaluation team, external team comprised of evaluation expert, universities
14. How will the cultural and political contexts be taken into account during the evaluation?

In general, the analysis of program impact requires a common set of preliminary information and steps:

- Identification of the intended outcome, and selection of measurable indicators.
- An empirically verifiable logical frame of the chain of events that explains how the program is expected to affect beneficiaries (individuals, households, institutions, etc.)
- Information about the implementation of the program activities via process evaluation and output monitoring to understand whether the program is properly executed.
- Measurement of the outcomes of the intervention.
- Analysis: do the outcomes change, and are changes due to the intervention?

#### IV. Methodological Considerations<sup>6</sup>

Measuring the impact of a program is an attempt to confirm whether the intervention is likely to have caused program outcomes. Impact evaluation designs attempting to demonstrate if an observed change is caused by the intervention can be broadly classified into three categories: experimental, quasi-experimental and non-experimental.

In **experimental designs**, the beneficiary and control groups are randomly selected from a well-defined population. When designed with a large enough sample size and controlled to prevent or limit influence from outside factors, any observed difference in the outcomes between the beneficiary and control groups can be safely attributed to the intervention and not to underlying differences between the two groups. The main **benefit** of this technique is the comparative simplicity of constructing the counterfactual and interpreting the results. Some **challenges** to this approach include ethical concerns (denying benefits or services to otherwise eligible individuals), difficulty in offering the intervention to only certain groups, a high cost and time requirement, an unrealistic design for certain programs, and an inapplicability to pilots, small programs and other program models.

Another category of evaluation includes **quasi-experimental** techniques which generate comparison groups that are not randomly chosen, but are selected so that they closely resemble the beneficiary group. In these designs, program participants are compared to non-participants using complex statistical methods to account for the differences between the groups and correct for the selection bias that might arise from non-random allocation of benefits. The main **benefit** of these designs is that they can draw on existing data sources and are thus often quicker and cheaper to implement than randomized designs. They can also be performed after a program has been implemented, provided that sufficient data exists. A major **challenge** to quasi-experimental techniques is selection bias, which can arise with non-random assignment and when it is possible that some of the characteristics determining assignment to treatment

---

<sup>6</sup> The Methodological Considerations are adapted from the International Experts Meeting on Measuring the Impact of Voluntary Youth Service Programs Report produced by the World Bank and ICP.

or control groups might also influence final outcomes. Moreover, some quasi-experimental designs cannot say anything about what would have happened to the beneficiaries if they had not received the treatment; nor can they control for unrelated external (non-intervention) changes. The reliability of results also depends on a set of maintained assumptions and fairly complex statistical methods.

Furthermore, a problem with both experimental and quasi-experimental approaches is that they can be conducted as “black box” evaluations, showing the impact of the program on the measured outcomes, without providing any understanding about which particular elements of the program contributed to the impact or paying attention to the process.

In **non-experimental designs**, program participants are compared with non-participants using statistical methods to account for the differences between the groups. Some non-experimental evaluation methods do not establish control/comparison groups but use other sophisticated techniques to attempt to demonstrate causality. The main **benefit** of these approaches is that they take into account the complexity of the program and the context within which it operates. These techniques offer a more flexible and low cost technique that can be applied in situations where experimental or quasi experimental techniques are not appropriate or possible. The primary **disadvantage** of these methods is that the information they provide is complex and difficult to analyze differentially and to generalize from. While many evaluators and practitioners argue that this is not necessarily a disadvantage because programs are complex and the data should reflect this complexity, complex information that is not generalizable is not very helpful for funders and donors looking to draw lessons about the impact or replicability of a program. There is also some debate about the validity of these evaluations, since they may not rigorously establish causality nor explicitly determine the standard against which impact is to be defined and measured.

The different design categories are all appropriate methods in different circumstances for different programs. There is not one “gold standard” for evaluating impact, but instead “methodological diversity and appropriateness in support of rigor” (NONIE) are of main importance. Each impact evaluation has to be individually designed, taking into consideration the program’s unique characteristics and environment. The methodologically simplest and most robust way to establish the counterfactual is by using an experimental approach, randomly assigning individuals either to receive treatment or to serve in a control group. However, a mixed methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative methods, can provide the most comprehensive results as these techniques combines well contextualized studies with quantitative rigor.

**V. Identification of Outcomes and Indicators**

ICP has developed a list of possible/likely program outcomes for youth service programs based on our experiences with youth service programming and the research we have conducted up to now.

<b>Y O U T H  D E V E L O P M</b>	<b>Program Goal</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Indicator of Success</b>	<b>Instruments</b>	<b>Existing Evidence</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
	<b>Increased participation in civic and political life</b>	Youth service empowers young people to become more actively engaged in their communities and provides them with a means to do so, increasing	More hours spent volunteering or participating in other forms of civic life; more meaningful/sustained/long-term volunteer commitments; Increase in voter participation among participants in youth	- Youth surveys (pre and post, when possible) - Interviews or focus groups with participants	AmeriCorps	Longitudinal study with control group
Unis-Cité					Pre/Post Survey	
City Year					Longitudinal Study with control group	

<b>E N T</b>		the likelihood that they will stay involved in the future	service programs; membership to voluntary/community/local associations		Nokia-IYF	Pre/Post and Retrospective Surveys
	<b>Life Skills Development</b>	Youth service helps build life skills such as: a sense of agency, independence, self-confidence, leadership, teamwork, emotional and physical well-being, decision-making and communication	Increased sense of agency, independence, self-confidence, leadership, teamwork, emotional and physical well-being, decision-making and communication	- Observational interviews with participants, parents, teachers - Youth surveys (pre and post, when possible)	Katimavik	Retrospective interviews and surveys; Pre/Post surveys
					Green Corps	Retrospective
					Unis-Cité	Pre/Post Surveys
					AmeriCorps	Longitudinal study with control group
					Nokia-IYF	Pre/Post and Retrospective Surveys
					Arci Servizio Civil	Retrospective Interviews
					Green Corps	Retrospective
AmeriCorps	Longitudinal study with comparison group					
<b>Prevention of Risky Behaviors</b>	Youth service gives young people a more structured way to spend their out-	Decrease in teen pregnancy; Decrease in STDs/HIV; Decrease in risky sexual behavior or increase in	- Youth surveys (pre and post, when possible)	Student Partnerships Worldwide	Retrospective, participatory	
<b>Intercultural Competence</b>	Youth service exposes young people to a more diverse group of people and provides them with training and tools for interacting with	- Improvements in cultural competency - Improvements in youth-adult partnerships and intergenerational communication - Improved tolerance and empathy for others	-Pre and Post tests -Interviews with participants - Youths surveys (pre and post)	Katimavik	Retrospective interviews and surveys; Pre/Post surveys	
<b>Improved Education Attainment</b>	Youth service enhances young people's commitment to education by providing them opportunities to apply what they are learning to real life situations	Increase in grades; increased literacy levels; improved academic knowledge/skills; improved attendance or graduation rate; improved classroom behavior	- Grades - Teacher surveys - Attendance records and graduation rate	Student Partnerships Worldwide	Retrospective, participatory	
				Nokia-IYF	Pre/Post and Retrospective Surveys	
<b>C O M</b>	<b>Community Strengthening</b>	Youth service strengthens linkages between	Enhanced organizational capacity, stronger civil society,	- Focus groups, interviews	AmeriCorps (1999)	Quasi-experimental

<b>M U N I T Y  D E V E L O P M E N T</b>		community organizations and young people and improves community	enhanced perception of young people in society	- Organizational assessments	Learn and Serve America (1999)	Quasi-experimental
	<b>Peace-building – fostering unity and trust</b>	Youth service can build/restore trust between participants and communities, particularly when used in post-	Reintegration of child soldiers into the community, increased dialogue and cooperation in the community, reduction of inter-group conflict	- Community surveys		
	<b>Disease Prevention</b>	Youth service can focus on peer education to reduce risky behaviors, which can reduce STDs or other	Reduced incidence of diseases in the community	- Statistical comparisons - Surveys		
	<b>Infrastructure Development</b>	Youth service can mobilize young people to contribute to infrastructure development through building homes, roads or other critical national infrastructure needs	Enhanced community infrastructure, housing, roads, water supply etc.		AmeriCorps (1999)	Quasi-experimental
					Un Techo mi Pais	Experimental
					YouthBuild USA	Pre/post
	<b>Literacy and Education</b>	Youth service that is targeted toward education and literacy can significantly enhance literacy rates in a country	Increased literacy rates	Statistics, interviews with teachers, students		
<b>Environmental Restoration</b>	Environmental service can have positive effects on restoring environmental damages and potentially also on preventing future damages through education and retrofitting	Restoration of environmental damages, such as cleaner waterways, trees planted, etc		Green Corps	Retrospective	

## VI. Annotated Bibliography of Youth Service Evaluations

Aguirre International (1999). *Making a difference: Impacts of AmeriCorps\*State/National direct on members and communities 1994-1995 and 1995-1996*. Report prepared for the Corporation for Community and National Service.

A two-year, three-tier investigation to assess the outcomes and impacts of AmeriCorps State/National Direct programs on beneficiaries, members and communities served. Study used a multi-tiered evaluation design utilizing quantitative and qualitative approaches. Programs studied had meaningful service accomplishments for the populations served, including increased life skills, civic engagement and educational attainment.

Anderson, Leslie M, Laguarda, Katrina G. and Williams, Imeh J.. (2007). *The Effect of the City Year Experience Over Time: Findings from the Longitudinal Study of Alumni*. Prepared for City Year by the Policy Studies Institute.

Longitudinal study was based on a random sample of 107 corps members who participated in the 2002-03 program year. The study examined participants' levels of civic engagement, civic leadership, and development of social capital over four years, compared with a group of 85 similarly situated young adults. Findings suggest that City Year has generated a greater amount of social capital for its alumni than would have been expected, based on the attitudes, values, and behaviors of these studies' respective comparison groups.

Anderson, Leslie M. and Fabiano, Lara. (2007). *The City Year Experience: Putting Alumni on the Path to Lifelong Civic Engagement*. City Year Inc.

City Year Alumni Study presents a set of three interlocking studies designed to assess City Year's impact on alumni at various intervals of time after the completion of their City Year community service experience through survey data from 2,189 City Year alumni. Findings show that City Year increased the social capital of alumni across racial/ethnic categories (with the exception of Asian alumni) and all levels of prior education, but also reduced the gap between alumni who came with large initial civic resources (i.e., who are not from minority groups and/or who came with a bachelor's degree) compared with those alumni who came with fewer civic resources (i.e., members of minority groups and/or having only some college).

Bequet, Valérie. (2007) *Service Civil : quel impact sur les jeunes ?* Paris: Unis-Cité.

Evaluation of Unis-Cité national youth service program in France. Study used pre and post questionnaires that included questions about satisfaction with experience and background; participants are from various education levels, primarily from urban areas, more women than men, from different socio-economic backgrounds. Key findings include information about behaviour change and skill development.

Burghardt, J., Schochet, P.Z., McConnell, S., Johnson, T., Gritz, R.M., et al. (2001). *Does Job Corps work? Summary of the National Job Corps Study*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Study based on a national random sample of all eligible applicants to Job Corps in late 1994 and 1995. Findings suggest that Job Corps centers effectively deliver the planned services called for by the program model, provides extensive education, training, and other services, and substantially increases the education and training services that youths receive as well as skills and educational attainment. Other findings include reduced involvement with crime and earning gains.

Corporation for National and Community Service, Office of Research and Policy Development. 2008. *Still Serving: Measuring the Eight-Year Impact of AmeriCorps on Alumni*. Washington, D.C., 2008.

Results from a rigorous evaluation of AmeriCorps show that AmeriCorps has long-term impacts on members' years after they serve. Over the last eight years, since 1999 CNCS has followed

more than 2,000 individuals in AmeriCorps State and National and NCCC to look at the effect of service on their future civic engagement and volunteering, employment and careers, and educational attainment. Researchers controlled for factors which may influence study participants' life outcomes such as demographic characteristics, economic status, and prior service and volunteering. Findings reveal that AmeriCorps is a pipeline to careers in public service and creates civic leaders who continue to serve in their communities long after their service has been completed.

Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Commonwealth of Australia. *"It's why you're swinging the mattock."* *An Evaluation of the Green Corps Programme: Final Report.* May 1999.

Evaluation of Green Corps, an environmental service programme for Australians aged 17 to 20. The main data sources were administrative systems, post programme employment, education and training information collected three months after programme participation, a survey of 149 former participants from fifteen projects selected for environmental assessment, and consultations with stakeholders. A range of benefits for participants were identified including improved employment prospects, the acquisition of vocational and life skills, and increased environmental awareness, and self esteem. Evaluators also conducted an environmental assessment to determine impact of environment from volunteers. Overall the findings of the evaluation were positive.

ECOTEC Research and Consulting. (2001) *Evaluation of the European Volunteering Services Programme Executive Summary.*

Study looks at impacts of EVS programme on participants and finds improved language skills, improved self-confidence, social skills and enhanced cultural awareness. Also identifies benefits to host organizations and communities. Calls for an improved evaluation framework and more developed set of indicators.

Evaluation Services. (2006) *Summative Evaluation of Katimavik.* Department of Canadian Heritage, Corporate Review Branch.

Study of the Canadian National Youth Service Program, Katimavik. Used surveys, focus groups, opinion polls and background research to assess the impact and success of the program.

Family Health International. *Rapid Appraisal Student Partnerships Worldwide Zambia.*

A rapid appraisal was conducted to gauge the relative importance of the five major program elements within specific school contexts from a wide range of perspectives. The appraisal found widespread belief that the program has an impact on knowledge and risk-taking behaviors of Zambian students.

Hahn, Andy, Susan Lanspery and Tom Leavitt. (2006) *Measuring Outcomes in Programs Designed to Help Young People Acquire Life Skills.* The Heller School for Social Policy and Management Center for Youth and Communities, Brandeis University.

A 20-month outcomes study of a global youth development initiative funded by the Nokia Corporation and managed by the International Youth Foundation addressed the knowledge deficit regarding whether life-skills can be strengthened and the effect of life-skills programs in helping young people realize their potential. The outcomes study generally found positive results from participation in the program in the areas of life-skills, greater community engagement, stronger school performance, improved employability and more positive attitudes toward the future and achievement of personal goals.

Hahn, A., Leavitt, T.D., Horvat, E.M., & Davis, J.E. (2004) *Life after YouthBuild: 900 YouthBuild graduates reflect on their lives, dreams and experiences*. Report available at YouthBuild USA.

Results of research study using surveys of 882 YouthBuild graduates from more than 60 sites and in-depth interviews with a cross-section of 57 graduates from eight sites. The study showed significant positive results for the graduates on a number of key measures, and a very positive assessment by them of the value of the program.

Harris, Colette. *Annual Review of Students Partnership Worldwide (SPW) Programme*. Department for International Development, Sierra Leone. (not date)

An evaluation of SPW programme in Sierra Leone. Evaluation consisted of site visits, interviews, and observations. Project indicators show that most elements are on target. Study looks at program impact and included a risk assessment of the programme.

Harris, Lewis and Associates, Ind. (1969). *A Study of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers*.

Study examined past service activity, career goals, level of community involvement, marital and military status, political views and activity. Volunteers were compared with a control group composed of people who had applied to Peace Corps but later declined invitations to join. Major findings indicated that service was valuable to participants, service contributed to changes in their career goals, and relative to control, volunteers were more liberal and maintained those views for a longer period of time.

Jastrzab, J., Giordano, L., Chase, A., Valente, J., Hazlett, A., LaRock, R., & James, D. (2004). *Serving country and community: A longitudinal study of service in AmeriCorps*. Cambridge: Abt Associates.

A longitudinal study of AmeriCorps members. Demonstrates the impacts of national service on members' civic engagement, education, employment, and life skills. Findings of the study reveal that AmeriCorps alumni are more connected to their communities; more knowledgeable about problems facing their communities; more likely to participate in community activities; and more likely to choose public service careers.

Jastrzab, JoAnn, Michele Ciurea, Carolyn Cohen, Carl Hostica, Deborah Small, Anne St. George. (2000) *Evaluation of the Washington Service Corps -- Final Report*. Cambridge: Abt Associates.

Study finds that the program provides important services by making a difference in communities. Alumni are overwhelmingly positive in their assessment of the program experience, reportedly learning valuable skills and earning access to an education award that helped support their continued education. Finally, program benefits outweighed program costs by 1.67 percent, not counting additional benefits which could not be monetized.

Jastrzab, J., Masker, K., Blomquist, J., and Orr, L. (1996). *Impacts of service: Final report on the evaluation of AmeriCorps*. Report prepared for the Corporation for Community and National Service.

An evaluation of the participant and community impacts of the Conservation and Youth Corps. In general, participants found the corps experience worthwhile. The value of program output averaged \$13.24 per service hour. The eight sites generated services worth nearly \$14 million. The study found that large, mature programs produced a net monetary benefit of \$1.04, over and above costs, for each hour of service.

Jastrzab, J., Masker, J., Bloomquist, J. and Orr, L. (1996). *Impacts of service: Final report on the evaluation of American Conservation and Youth Corps*. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc.

An experimental design was used to assess the impact of YC on participants. Forty-one outcome measures in nine categories were used (e.g., civic, social, and personal development; current and planned involvement in other social service; educational aspirations and expectations). Program applicants were randomly assigned to either the treatment group or the control group. A follow-up period that covered about 15 months after enrollment occurred in conjunction with a follow-up telephone interview. The most significant impacts were related to employment and earnings. The treatment group was more likely to have worked for pay and worked more hours (40 percent more than the control group) over the follow-up period. Other results were that program participants were less likely to have been arrested and less likely to have earned a technical certificate or diploma (suggesting that participation in YC may have been a substitute for additional education, in the short run). The study also looked across subgroups (race, gender) for significant differences between the impacts of program participation and non-program participation. The most significant impacts were on African-American males.

Melchior, A. (1999). *Summary Report: National Evaluation of Learn and Serve America*. Waltham, MA: Center for Human Resources, Brandeis University.

This evaluation report describes the results of a two-year evaluation conducted by Brandeis University and Abt Associates that examined the impacts of the Learn and Serve America programs in 17 middle schools and high schools across the country, using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods. The study concluded that at the end of one year of service, the program had a positive impact on participants' civic attitudes, involvement in volunteer service, educational attitudes and school performance.

Mitchell, Maxine V. *et al.* (2003). *Evaluation of the YouthBuild Program*. Chicago, Illinois: Applied Real Estate Analysis, Inc.

Comparison of YouthBuild program to Job Corps, JOBSTART, and the youth components of Supported Work Demonstration (SWD) and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Finds JobCorps to be most effective. Finds programs are high cost, similar academic achievements across programs, and limited employment achievements.

Perry, J., Thomson, A., Tschirhart, M., Mesch, D., & Lee, G. (1999). *Inside a Swiss army knife: An assessment of AmeriCorps*. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 9(2): 225-250.

Study identifies five AmeriCorps goals: satisfying unmet social needs, developing corps members, enhancing the civic ethic, reinvigorating lethargic bureaucracies, and bridging race and class. The evidence of AmeriCorps' effectiveness is not definitive. Self-reports from recipient programs, selective cost-benefit analyses, and some survey evidence indicate some positive results. More fine-grained survey and field research raise questions about AmeriCorps' overall effects.

Rappaport, Catherine Dun; Anne Hazlett. (2004). *Civic Works at Ten Years: A Program Assessment*. Abt Associates.

Study surveying 2002/2003 corps members and conducted case studies and a cost/benefit analysis of two Civic Works service projects.

Starr, Jerold M. (1994) *Peace Corps Service as a Turning Point*. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, v39 n2 p137-61.

Longitudinal study of 21 U.S. Peace Corps volunteers, first interviewed in 1960s during tour of service in Republic of Philippines and then 20 years later as middle-aged adults. Life events reported after their service and high degree of response agreement in two interviews confirm that Peace Corps experience constituted turning point in their life courses.

Student Partnerships Worldwide. (2007). *Evaluation Report of SPW Nokia School Empowerment Programme, India*.

Evaluation to assess outcomes against outputs and inputs; assess impact of programme and stakeholder perception of programme and make recommendations for improvement. Overall conclusions include: the program is meeting all basic objectives as per logframe and programme design; the programme enjoys strong government, school and community support; the program model is replicable and scalable.

Wolf, Wendy, Sally Leiderman, and Richard Voith. 1987. The California Conservation Corps: An Analysis of Short-Term Impacts on Participants. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.

Four-year assessment of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) that included baseline and follow-up interviews with 943 participants and 1,083 comparison group members. The assessment addressed the economic and non-economic effects of CCC and found that the program pays for itself in the value of the work and the earnings it produces for corps members.

## VII. Evaluation Resources

Berger, Michael A. "Studying Enrollment Decline (and Other Timely Issues) via the Case Survey." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 5:3 (1983), 307-317.

Bonbright, David. (December 2007) "Measuring Impact, Who Counts?" *Alliance*, Vol. 12, No 4.

Center for Global Development. (2006). *When Will We Ever Learn: Improving Lives through Impact Evaluation*. Report of the Evaluation Gap Working Group.

Chatterji, Madhabi. (September 2007) "Grades of Evidence: Variability in Quality of Findings in Effectiveness Studies of Complex Field Interventions." *American Journal of Evaluation*. Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 239-255.

Compton, Donald, Micahle Baizerman and Stacey Hueftle Stockdill. (2002) The Art, Craft, and Science of Evaluation Capacity Building. Jossey-Bass, Number 93.

Datta, Lois-Ellin (1990). *Case Study Evaluations*. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office, Transfer paper 10.1.9.

Davey, Lynn. 1991. *The Application of Case Study Evaluations*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests Measurement and Evaluation, Washington DC. <http://www.ericdigests.org/1992-5/study.htm>

Earl, Sarah, Fred Carden, and Terry Smutylo. 2001. *Brochure on Outcome Mapping: The Challenges of Assessing Development Impacts*. IDRC. [http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-64698-201-1-DO\\_TOPIC.html](http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-64698-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html)

Flores, Kim Sabo. (2008) Youth Participatory Evaluation. San Francisco: Wiley & Sons.

Institute for Volunteering Research. *Volunteering Impact Assessment Toolkit*.

Miles, Matthew B., and Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Nichols, Austin. *Impact Evaluation: Regression Discontinuity* The Urban Institute  
<<http://www.urban.org/toolkit/data-methods/regression.cfm>>

Patton, Michael. "Appropriate Methods: The Paradigms Debate and a Utilization-Focused Synthesis." In *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*.

- Patton, Michael. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage
- Pawson, Ray & Nick Tilley. *Realist Evaluation*. Development Policy Review Network. Utrecht, The Netherlands. <http://dprn.fss.uu.nl/Realistic%20Evaluation.pdf>
- Robert O. Brinkerhoff, *The Success Case Method* (2003) Berrett Koehler : San Francisco
- Salmen, Lawrence F. 2002. *Beneficiary Assessment: An Approach Described*. The World Bank.
- Williams, Bob and Iraj Imam (2006). *Systems Concepts in Evaluation – An Expert Anthology*. AEA Monograph, EdgePress/AEA Point Reyes CA.
- WK Kellogg Foundation. *Success Case Study Summary*. [www.wkkf.org](http://www.wkkf.org)
- World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. *Impact Evaluation- The Experience of the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank*. Independent Evaluation Group
- World Bank, The. (2004). *Monitoring & Evaluation: Some Tools, Methods & Approaches*. Operations Evaluation Department.
- World Bank, The. (2006). *Conducting Quality Impact Evaluations Under Budget, Time and Data Constraints*. Independent Evaluation Group.
- The World Bank. *Impact Evaluation - Beneficiary Assessment*. [go.worldbank.org/IF3Z0L5G20](http://go.worldbank.org/IF3Z0L5G20)
- Yin, Robert K. (1989). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

## VIII. Bibliography of Research

### YOUTH SERVICE and VOLUNTEERING

- Angel, W.D. (2003). *National youth policy and national youth service: Towards concerted action*. In H. Perold, S. Stroud, & M. Sherraden (eds), *Service Enquiry: Service in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa (pp. 33-45).
- Association of Voluntary Service Organizations. (2003) *Voluntary service: Opening doors to the future, research report*. Brussels: AVSO.
- Cabero, Javier. *Programa Nacional de Jóvenes con la Participación Popular*. UNV Bolivia
- Cohen, C. (1996). *What service teaches about citizenship and work: The case of AmeriCorps*. Seattle, Washington.
- Danzig, Richard and Peter Szanton. (1986) *National Service: What Would It Mean?* DC Health
- Deguchi, Masayuki. *Civil Society and Civic Service: Linguapoltical issues on Japan's "Civic Service" programs to the international community*. National Museum of Ethnology and Graduate University for Advanced Studies.
- Eberly, Don. (1988) *National Service: A Promise to Keep*. Rochester, New York: John Alden Books.
- Eberly, D.J., & Gal, R. (2006). *Service without guns*.
- Febbraro, A. (2001). *Encouraging volunteering among Ontario youth*. Retrieved January 31, 2007 from [http://www.givingandvolunteering.ca/reports/1997\\_ontario\\_youth/page02.asp](http://www.givingandvolunteering.ca/reports/1997_ontario_youth/page02.asp)

- Foley, P. (2003). *Youth service for employment: The Umsobomvu Youth Fund initiative in South Africa*. In H. Perold, S. Stroud, & M. Sherraden (eds), *Service Enquiry: Service in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa (pp.159-171).
- Gal, Reuven. (2007) *National Youth Service as a Psycho-Social Process*. Paper.
- Gaskin, Katherine. (2004). *Young People, Volunteering and Civic Service*. A report for the Institute for Volunteering Research.
- Gouault, Jean-Marie. *Pour Avec, National Service, what are the choices?* UNESCO Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service. No Date
- Haan, Norma. (1974) "Changes in Young Adults After Peace Corps Experiences: Political-Social Views, Moral Reasoning, and Perceptions of Self and Parents." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 3, 3, 177-94.
- Hall, M., Lasby, D., Gumulka, G., Tryon, C. (2006). *Caring Canadians, involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2004 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering, and Participating* (Catalogue No. 71-542-XIE). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Hills, Greg and Adeeb Mahmud. (2007) *Volunteering for Impact: Best Practices in International Corporate Volunteering*. FSG Social Impact Advisers.
- Institute for Volunteering Research. (2004) *Young People and Volunteering: Preliminary findings and emerging lessons from primary research*.
- James Pratt Consulting. (2005) *Volunteering as a Stepping Stone for Marginalized Youth*. Prepared for Volunteer Victoria. Accessed from [http://www.volunteervictoria.bc.ca/\\_pdfs/stepping\\_stone.pdf](http://www.volunteervictoria.bc.ca/_pdfs/stepping_stone.pdf)
- Johnson, L., Benitez, C., McBride, A. M., & Olate, R. (2004). *Youth volunteerism and service in the Latin America and Caribbean region: A potential strategy for social and economic development* (Research Background Paper). St. Louis: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- Kelly, P. (2007). *National Youth Service – Transforming lives*. Government of Jamaica, Ministry of Education and Youth, Jamaica Information Service. Retrieved on August 23, 2007 from [http://www.jis.gov.jm/education/html/20060724t100000-0500\\_9511\\_jis\\_national\\_youth\\_service\\_transforming\\_lives.asp](http://www.jis.gov.jm/education/html/20060724t100000-0500_9511_jis_national_youth_service_transforming_lives.asp)
- Kuperminc, G.P., Holditch, P.T., & Allen, J.P. (2001.) "Volunteering and community service in adolescence." *Adolescent Medicine: State of Art Reviews*, 12, 445-457.
- McBride, A.M., & Sherraden, M. (2007). *Civic Service Worldwide: Impacts and Inquiry*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- McBride, Amanda Moore et al. (January 2003). *The Forms and Nature of Civic Service: A Global Assessment*. Washington University: Global Service Institute, Center for Social Development.
- Metz, Edward, Jeffrey McLellan and James Youniss. (March 2003) "Types of Voluntary Service and Adolescents' Civic Development." *Journal of Adolescent Research*. Vol 18, No. 2 pages 188-203.
- Mysliwicz, Eva. (2005) *Youth, Volunteering and Social Capital in Cambodia. Results of a feasibility study conducted for a Cambodian youth service program*. Youth Star Cambodia.

- National Youth Agency. (2007). *Young people's volunteering and skills development: A research project undertaken by the National Youth Agency on behalf of the Department for Education and Skills from October 2006 to March 2007; Executive summary*. Leicester, U.K.: National Youth Agency.
- National Youth Agency. (2007). *Young people's volunteering and skills development*. Leicester, U.K.: National Youth Agency. [www.dfes.go.uk/research](http://www.dfes.go.uk/research)
- Obadare, Ebenezer. (2005) *Statism, Youth and Civic Imagination: A Critical Study of the National Youth Service Corps (NYSC) Programme in Nigeria*. Center for Social Development, Global Service Institute.
- Ojo, Folayan. (September 1980) "Youth Employment and the Impact of the National Youth Service Corps on Labor Mobility in Nigeria." *African Studies Review*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 51-62.
- Perold, H., Stroud, S., & Sherraden, M., (eds.). (2003). Service Enquiry: Service in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa.
- Perry, J. L., & Thomson, A. M. (2003). Civic service: What difference does it make? Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Powell, Steve and Bratović, E.. (2007) *The impact of long-term youth voluntary service in Europe: a review of published and unpublished research studies*. Brussels: AVSO.
- Powell, S. & Čelebičić, I. (2008). Outcome Mapping evaluation of six civil society projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina: summary report. Sida, Sarajevo. [www.promente.org/sida2eng](http://www.promente.org/sida2eng)
- Powell, S. & Bratović, E. (2007b). We can. We volunteer. Pro-social values/behaviour and employability amongst young people in SEE and the impact of volunteer work camps. SEEYN: South-East European Youth Network. [www.promente.org/seeyn5](http://www.promente.org/seeyn5)
- Quarter, J., Mook, L., & Richmond, B. J. (2002). *What volunteers contribute: Calculating and communicating value added*. Toronto: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.
- Reinders, Heinz and James Youniss. (2006) *Community Service and Civic Development in Adolescence: Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Evidence*. In A. Sliwka, M. Diedrich, & M. Hofer (eds.) Citizenship education: theory, research, and practice. Munster, Germany: Waxmann, pp. 195-208
- Schroer, R. (2003). *Voluntary service: Opening doors to the future; the integration of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds in transnational voluntary service; a cross-national analysis of France, Germany, Greece, Italy and United Kingdom*. Brussels: AVSO.
- Shannon, Charlene and Brenda J. Robertson. (2007) *Engaging Youth Ages 8 to 12 as Volunteers: An Opportunity for Youth Development?* Volume 2, Number 2.
- Sherraden, Michal. (October 2001) *Civic Service: Issues, Outlook, Institution Building*. Washington University: Global Service Institute, Center for Social Development.
- Sherraden, M., & Eberly, D. (1982). *The impact of national service on participants*. In M. Sherraden & D. Eberly (Eds.), National service: Social, economic, and military impacts (pp. 179-187). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Sherraden, M., Sherraden, M., & Eberly, D. (1990). *Comparing and understanding non-military service in different nations*. In D. Eberly and M. Sherraden (Eds.), The moral equivalent of war?: A study of non-military service in nine nations (pp. 159-190). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Sutherland, D., Doerkson, M., Hanslip, T., Roberts, J., Stewart, S., Sagnes, E., & Friesen-Storz, T. (2006). *Youth volunteerism: Measuring the benefits of community service learning programs*. Toronto, ON: Imagine Canada, Knowledge Development Centre
- Thoits, P.A., & Hewitt, L.N. (2001). "Volunteer work and well-being." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 42, 115-131.
- Thomas, Franklin A. (1984) *National Service: an Aspect of Youth Development* (adapted from remarks given before a group of civic and business leaders in Monte Rio, CA on July 22, 1984)
- Thomson, A. M., & Perry, J. L. (1998). "Can AmeriCorps build communities?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 27(4), 399-420.
- Tolman, Joel and Karen Pittman. (2001) "Youth Acts, Community Impacts: Stories of Youth Engagement with Real Results." *Community and Youth Development Series*, Volume 7. Takoma Park, MD: The Forum for Youth Investment, International Youth Foundation.
- United States Department of Labor. (2007). *Volunteering in the United States, 2006*. Retrieved January 31, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/volun.pdf>
- UNV. *Youth Volunteering for Development: Africa in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Discussion Paper 4 October 2006.
- Vian, Taryn. (2007) *Measuring the impact of international corporate volunteering: Lessons learned from the Global Health Fellows Program of Pfizer Corporation*.
- Viva Rio (2005) *A Policy for Preventing and Providing Alternatives to Youth Involvement in Urban Violence in Brazil*. Viva Rio.
- VOSESA. (2007) *Research Partnerships Build the Service Field in Africa*. The Social Work Practitioner-Researcher, Journal of Social Development in Africa
- Youniss, J., McLellan, J., & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

## **SERVICE-LEARNING**

- Astin, A.W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., & Yee, J. A. (2000). *How service-learning affects students* (Executive summary). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, Higher Education Research Institute.
- Berkas, T. (February, 1997). *Strategic Review of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation's Service-Learning Projects, 1990-1996*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Billig, S. H. (2000). "Research on K-12 school-based service-learning: The evidence builds." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81(9), 658-664.
- Billig, S. H. (2002). "Adoption, implementation, and sustainability of K-12 service-learning." In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-Learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 245-267). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Corporation for National and Community Service. *The Impact of Service-Learning: A Review of Current Research*. January 2007.
- Eyler, J. (2002). "Reflection: Linking service and learning -- Linking students and communities." *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 517-534.

- Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1997). "The importance of program quality in service-learning." In A. S. Waterman (Ed.), *Service-Learning: Applications from the research* (pp.57-76). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eyler, J. & Giles, D. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Kraft, N. & Wheeler, J. (2002, October). *Service-learning and resilience in disaffected youth: A research study*. Paper presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual International Service-Learning Research Conference, Vanderbilt University.
- Melchior, Alan and Lawrence Niel Bailis. (2002) *Impact of Service Learning on Civic Attitudes and Behaviors of Middle and High School Youth*. In Billig, Shelly and Andrew Furco, eds. Service-Learning: The Essence of the Pedagogy. Advances in Service Learning Research. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Muscott, H. S. (2000). "A review and analysis of service-learning programs involving students with emotional/behavioral disorders." *Education and Treatment of Children* 23(3), 346-368.
- National Youth Leadership Council. *The National Survey on Service-Learning and Transitioning to Adulthood*. December 2005.
- O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A., San Doval, A., Duran, R., Haber, D., Atnafou, R., et al. (1999). "The effectiveness of the Reach for Health Community Youth Service Learning Program in reducing early and unprotected sex among urban middle school students." *American Journal of Public Health*, 89(2), 176-181.
- Pritchard, I. A. (2002). Community service and service-learning in America: The state of the art. In A. Furco & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *Service-Learning: The essence of the pedagogy* (pp. 3-21). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Scales, P., Blyth, D., Berkas, T., & Kielsmeier, J. (2000). The effects of service-learning on middle school students' social responsibility and academic success. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 20(3), 332-358.
- Scales, P. & Blyth, D. (1997). Effects of service-learning on youth: What we know and what we need to know. *Generator*, Winter, 6-9.
- Shumer, R. (1994). "Community based learning: Humanizing education." *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 357-367.
- Tapia, M.N., & Mallea, M.M. (2003). *Service-learning in Argentina*. In H. Perold, S. Stroud, & M. Sherraden (eds), Service Enquiry: Service in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa (pp. 203-215).

## **CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

- Baizerman, Michael, Ross VeLure Roholt, R.W. Hildreth. "The Place of Evaluation." In *Deepening the Craft of Youth Civic Engagement*.
- Calvert, Matthew, Shepherd Zeldin, and Amy Weisenbach. 2002. *Youth Involvement for Community, Organizational, and Youth Development: Directions for Research, Evaluation, and Practice*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin and Innovation center for Community and Youth Development/Tides Center.

- Eccles, J.S., & Barber, B.L. (1999). "Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters?" *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14, 10-43.
- Flanagan, Constance A., Jennifer Boes, Britta Jonsson, Beno Csapo, and Elena Sheblanova. (1998) "Ties that Bind: Correlates of Adolescents' Civic Commitments in Seven Countries," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 54, No. 3. pp. 457-475.
- Flanagan, Constance and Nakesha Faison, "Youth Civic Development: Implications of Research for Social Policy and Programs," *Social Policy Report XV:1* (2001):
- Hildreth, R.W. (2000) *Theorizing Citizenship and Evaluating Public Achievement*. University of Minnesota.
- Kahne, J. (2007) *Developing Citizens: A Longitudinal Study of School, Family, and Community Influences on Students' Commitments to Civic Participation* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association [http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p209253\\_index.html](http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p209253_index.html)
- Keeter, Scott, et al. (2002). *The Civic and Political Health of the Nation: A Generational Portrait*. CIRCLE.
- Lopes, Mark Hugo and Jason Kolaczowski. (2002) *Civic Engagement Among Non-College Attending 18-25 Year Olds*. CIRCLE
- Michelsen, Erik, Jonathan F. Zaff, and Elizabeth Hair. (May 2002). "Civic Engagement Programs and Youth Development: A Synthesis." *Child Trends*. Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
- Reinders, Heinz and James Youniss. (2006). "School-Based Required Community Service and Civic Development in Adolescents." *Applied Developmental Science*. Volume 10, Issue 1, pages 2 – 12.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Yates, Miranda and James Youniss, Ed. (2006). Roots of Civic Identity. Cambridge University Press.

## **YOUTH DEVELOPMENT**

- Baizerman, Michael and Doug Magnuson (Eds.) (2007). Work with Youth in Divided and Contested Societies. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Cahill, Michelle. (1997) *Youth Development and Community Development: Promises and Challenges of Convergence*. New York and Baltimore: Ford Foundation and International Youth Foundation.
- Eccles, Jacquelynne and Jennifer Appleton Gootman (Eds). (2002). *Community Programs to Promote Youth Development*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Jelicic, Helena, Deborah L. Bobeka, Erin Phelps, Richard M. Lerner, and Jacqueline V. Lerner. (2007) "Using positive youth development to predict contribution and risk behaviors in early adolescence: Findings from the first two waves of the 4-H Study of Positive Youth Development." *International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development*. 31 (3), 263–273
- Knowles, James C. and Jere R. Behrman. (2003) *Assessing the Economic Returns to Investing in Youth in Developing Countries*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.
- Lerner, Richard. *Thriving Youth, Flourishing Civil Society: How positive youth development strengthens democracy and social justice*. Bertelsmann Foundation White Paper.

- Ministry of Youth, Employment Opportunities and Sports. (2005) *Life Skills Education Report*. Fiji.
- Patterson, Jan. (2001) *The Concept of Youth Development: A review of literature from the United States of America on the concept of youth development*. Occasional Paper: AusYouth.
- Perold, H. (2000). *Worldwide workshop on youth involvement as a strategy for social, economic, and democratic development*. New York: The Ford Foundation.
- Rappaport, Catherine Dun and JoAnn Jastrzab. (2003) *Promising Practices for Helping Low-Income Youth Obtain and Retain Jobs: A Guide for Practitioners*. Report produced for the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps by Abt Associates with funding from the U.S. Department of Labor.
- Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). "What exactly is a youth development program? Answers from research and practice." *Applied Developmental Science*, 7, 94-111.
- Search Institute. (2003). *40 developmental assets*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from <http://www.search-institute.org/assets/40AssetsMC.pdf>
- Inter-Agency Working Group on Children's Participation (IAWGCP). (2008). *Children as Active Citizens: Commitments and society's obligations for children's civil rights and civic engagement in East Asia and the Pacific*. Bangkok.
- UNICEF. (2007). *Adolescents and Civil Engagement: Social Entrepreneurship and Young People: A summary of the role of social entrepreneurship in the development of young people, communities and the achievement of the MDGs*. Adolescent Development and Participation Unit Programme Division, October 2007. New York.
- UNDP. *Civic Engagement*. ESSENTIALS No. 8 October 2002
- Wesley, C. (1995-2005). "Children as catalysts of change: Children's participation in rural development in India." *Children's Environments*, 12 (4), 38-48. [www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/](http://www.colorado.edu/journals/cye/)