

# AN EVALUATION OF YOUTH/ADULT PARTNERSHIPS IN GEORGIA YOUTH SUMMIT

## TEAMS

by

ROBERT H JONES

(Under the Direction of Maria Navarro)

## ABSTRACT

Youth/adult partnerships are a programmatic idea being utilized around the country to promote youth involved with your development programs (Camino, 2005). Youth/adult partnerships have also become a major part of the Georgia 4-H program today. Youth/adult partnerships can be seen across the organization, but more importantly in Georgia Youth Summit Teams. These teams work with youth/adult partnerships to cover civic engagement for youth and adults to help their communities. These partnerships were evaluated utilizing the Youth and Adult Relationship Within Community-Based Youth Programs Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale. The evaluation was used to gauge youth and adult perceptions on youth/adult partnerships. The youth and adults in this study showed positive perceptions of youth/adult partnerships, and youth and adults showed through their learning in the Georgia Youth Summit program they had a change of perception towards youth/adult partnerships.

INDEX WORDS: Youth/Adult Partnerships, 4-H, Georgia Youth Summit, Youth Development, Civic Engagement

AN EVALUATION OF YOUTH/ADULT PARTNERSHIPS IN GEORGIA YOUTH SUMMIT  
TEAMS

by

ROBERT H JONES

B.S.A., University of Georgia, 2006

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF AGRICULTURAL LEADERSHIP

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Robert H. Jones

All Rights Reserved

AN EVALUATION OF YOUTH/ADULT PARTNERSHIPS IN GEORGIA YOUTH SUMMIT  
TEAMS

by

ROBERT H. JONES

Major Professor: Maria Navarro

Committee: John C. Ricketts  
Nick Fuhrman

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
May 2009

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my family who have supported me all the way through my collegiate studies, but more importantly to the memory of my grandmother Doris L. Jones. Her drive and passion for education, I emulated at a young age, has made all my education and studies possible. I dedicate this to her memory, because she would have enjoyed knowing I achieved her dream for me.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank all of those people who have helped me along the way in my studies. It has been a challenge in my studies as a graduate student and full time County 4-H Agent, but my colleges in Extension and my professors have been great at providing me the support and resources needed to succeed.

I would like to thank Dr. Maria Navarro for your help and compassion with me along the way. You have been a great instructor, advisor, reviewer, committee chair, and friend. I could not have ever dreamed of accomplishing this thesis if it would not have been for your constant drive for excellence.

I would also like to extend a thank you to Dr. John Ricketts and Dr. Nick Fuhrman. You provided me with the insight and guidance through my review to make my thesis a level of success. Your dedication to making this document the best it could be, even up until the final days, is something I appreciate. Also, thank you to Dr. Brian Parr for your help early on with my research design, and Dr. Kenneth Jones, University of Kentucky, for allowing me to utilize your survey instrument and providing me much needed guidance on literature and research into the field of youth/adult partnerships. Thank you to Dr. Roger C. Ryles, State 4-H Leader, and Mr. Jeff Buckley, State 4-H Specialist, for allowing me to study the Georgia Youth Summit teams.

Also, a special thank you to my parents and family, you all have been so supportive and understanding through this time. You have instilled in me the character and drive necessary for me to accomplish this project. I will forever be grateful for all you have done for me over the years.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Rationale.....	4
Purpose and Basis for Study.....	4
Null Hypothesis.....	5
Scope of the Study.....	5
Assumptions .....	6
Limitation of Study .....	6
Significance of the Study .....	8
Definitions of Terms .....	8
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	10
Introduction .....	10
Youth/Adult Partnerships .....	10
Benefits of Youth/Adult Partnerships .....	12
Georgia Youth Summit and Its Benefits .....	16
Measuring the Effectiveness of Youth/Adult Partnerships .....	18
Review of Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and	

	Youth-Adult Interaction .....	21
	Summary .....	22
3	METHODOLOGY .....	23
	Introduction .....	23
	Institutional Review Board.....	24
	Population.....	25
	Sampling.....	25
	Instrument.....	26
	Validity and Reliability .....	27
	Data Collection.....	28
	Data Analysis .....	28
	Timeline.....	29
4	RESULTS .....	30
	Introduction .....	30
	Demographics of Sample .....	30
	Cronbach’s Alpha for Survey Analysis.....	39
	Responses to Instrument Questions, Item by Item Analysis .....	40
	Analysis of constructs With Respect to Population Demographics .....	49
	Open-Ended Response Questions .....	63
5	SUMMARY AND RECOMENDATIONS .....	66
	Introduction .....	66
	Purpose and Objectives of Study.....	66
	Review of Methods .....	68



Summary of Findings .....	69
Conclusion and Recommendations .....	75
REFERENCES .....	77
APPENDICES .....	83
A    COVER LETTER .....	83
B    MINOR ASSENT FORM.....	85
C    PARENTAL CONSENT FORM.....	87
D    ADULT CONSENT FORM .....	89
E    YOUTH AND ADULT RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN COMMUNITY-BASED YOUTH PROGRAMS INVOLVEMENT AND INTERACTION RATING SCALE .....	91
F    GEORGIA 4-H DISTRICT MAP, AS NOTED BY THE DISTRICTING OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAM.....	95

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4-1: Demographics of Sample .....	36
Table 4-2: Number of items, mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's Alpha for Survey	
Constructs .....	40
Table 4-3: Item responses regarding Youth Involvement Perception of Youth, Pre and Post	
Youth Summit .....	41
Table 4-4: Item Responses Regarding Youth Involvement Perception of Adults, Pre and Post	
Youth Summit .....	43
Table 4-5: Item Responses Regarding Adult Involvement Perception of Youth Pre and Post	
Youth Summit .....	44
Table 4-6: Adult Involvement Perception of Adults Pre and Post Youth Summit.....	45
Table 4-7: Youth-Adult Interaction Perception of Youth Pre and Post Youth Summit .....	46
Table 4-8: Youth-Adult Interaction Perception of Adults Pre and Post Youth Summit .....	47
Table 4-9: Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction, as perceived by	
youth, adults and the entire total respondents .....	50
Table 4-10: Pre-Post Comparison of Perceptions of Youth and Adults on Youth Involvement,	
Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction .....	52
Table 4-11: Comparison of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Males and	
Females on Pre and Post Summit Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-	
Adult Interaction.....	54

Table 4-12: Comparison of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Novice and Experienced Respondents on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction.....	57
Table 4-13: ANOVA Comparisons of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Racial Classification on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction.....	59
Table 4-14: ANOVA Comparisons of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Background/Area Classification on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction .....	62
Table 4-15: Responses to Open-Ended Qualitative Questions .....	64

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

After the rise of the Land Grant Universities and the Agriculture Experiment Stations, dissemination of knowledge was important for the new agriculture practices. Different programs sprang up across the country, created by rural school teachers, to disseminate this information to the students (Georgia 4-H History, 2009). While it is hard to pinpoint the exact start of 4-H, A.B. Graham of Ohio is given the credit for forming the Boys Corn Club, which would be the precursor to modern day 4-H program (4-H History Time Line, n.d.). After the start in Ohio, different programs began the county to support the extra curricular education that the Boys Corn Club sought to implement. Mr. G.C. Adams, Newton County School Superintendent, started The Boys Corn Club in Georgia in 1904. The program was successful, and in 1914, when Senator A. Frank Lever of South Carolina and Senator Hoke Smith of Georgia lead a bill that started the Cooperative Extension Service, 4-H found a home in the new system as the youth development component of the Extension program's mission (Georgia 4-H History, 2009)

Like most other youth development programs, 4-H was an adult lead youth development program. In the past, in youth development, adults generally made “decisions on behalf of children and youth without seeking input from the very audience they presume to serve” (Rasmussen, 2003, ¶1). “[Youth/adult partnerships] are an innovation being used increasingly as a key strategy for promoting youth development, as well as for building strong programs and communities” (Camino, 2005, p. 27). There has been a push to incorporate a youth/adult partnership system into the 4-H program. There are efforts at different levels of 4-H

incorporating youth/adult partnerships. On the national level youth and adults serve together on the National 4-H Council Board of Trustees and youth and adults co-serve on the National 4-H Conference Planning Committee. In Georgia varying groups exist that display a youth/adult partnership. The Georgia 4-H Advisory Committee, State 4-H Board of Directors, *Health Rocks! Healthy Life Series* education, and the Georgia Youth Summit are areas where youth are engaged with adults in the steps of program planning and implementation for all of Georgia 4-H'ers. On the district level youth and adults work with the District Board of Directors (Youth) and Conference Planning Committees (Adults) to plan and implement activities and events. On county levels youth and adults have opportunities to enter into youth/adult partnerships through youth summit teams, county councils, advisory committees, citizenship/community service projects, and event planning and implementation. Through these opportunities, the Georgia 4-H program has taken a keen interest into cultivating opportunities and activities for youth/adult partnerships to flourish. Youth/adult partnerships can be seen in 4-H at all levels of the program. The major initiatives that address and incorporate youth/adult partnerships are on the grassroots and local level, through the advisory systems, program and conference planning, and more importantly the youth summit teams operating in communities in Georgia to bring about positive community development.

In 2001 the Georgia Rural Development Council and the Georgia 4-H program started a collaboration to enact a youth and adult-centered summit designed to start and dynamize youth/adult partnerships to address key local and community issues. The Georgia Youth Summit is a program in design to provide community based teams, of four youth and one adult, with tools to carry out civic action and engagement to address local area needs through youth/adult partnerships (Georgia Youth Summit, n.d). UGA Cooperative Extension recognizes that youth

are a vital part of the local community, and this summit is a means to empower youth to work with local adults to better their communities in a youth/adult partnership.

For there to be positive benefit from youth/adult partnerships, there must exist “a balance of power between youth and adults in program planning and decision making” (Einspruch & Wunrow, 2002, p. 2; see also Jones, 2004). The 4-H Program is a youth development program, and it is youth that participate, initiative is placed to have youth in decision making on the programs that affect them. Youth /adult partnerships can also be beneficial when youth and adults collaborate in their communities, and a partnership exists where the youth and adults have a share in the instruction, learning, and implementation of the program (Zeldin, McDaniel, Topitzes & Lorens, 2001, as cited in Russell, Polen & Tepper, 2007).

The National Network for Youth values these relationships because they “are built by people acknowledging and honoring each other's uniqueness while striving to achieve a common goal” (National Network for Youth: Guiding Principles, Youth/Adult Partnerships Section, ¶1). These partnerships serve to not only strengthen the character traits of youth, but also benefit the character of the adults as well. Youth/adult partnerships are at the core of positive youth development, which takes into account mentoring and building up young people, and not viewing them as issues and risks to manage (Lerner, Lerner, & Phelps, 2008). These partnerships are essential to youth development programs where students are entrenched in the foundation of the organization, key parts of the planning and implementation, and a part of the long term vitality of the youth development program (Camino, 2000b).

## **Rationale**

“Although previous empirical studies have provided insight into the benefits of youth decision making, very little reference is directed toward various types of relationships that may exist between youth and adults” (Jones & Perkins, 2005, ¶3). With the emphasis being placed in 4-H on youth/adult partnerships, in addition with the Georgia Youth Summit program being implemented throughout Georgia, the motivation for this research emerged. This research will examine the current perceptions that do exist between youth and adults participating in the 2008 Georgia Youth Summit, about youth/adult partnerships occurring in their local communities. The results of this study will allow some insight into the perceptions of youth/adult partnerships, through evaluating youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interactions in community based youth programs. By examining these perceptions, the data will show if there is credibility of the Georgia Youth Summit, and how youth/adult partnerships training benefits 4-H youth and adults. With this a greater need for trainings may arise on the state and national 4-H level.

## **Purpose and Basis for Study**

Through this study, the researcher will evaluate if a level of partnership truly exists, by measuring youth and adults separately to see their perception on the level of partnership that exists between youth and adults in their local communities. Jones (2004) values these partnerships as a way to empower youth and adults to have positive community impact. Currently this information is lacking in the literature. With limited studies on the level of youth-adult partnership that currently exists in Georgia, little credibility on a research basis can be given for youth/adult partnerships and training in Georgia. The data from this study is intended

to spotlight if there is a level of perception change which would signify learning at the youth summit, and highlight if trainings are valuable assets.

Youth/adult partnerships are a synergy between the two generational groups that allow for shared leadership and shared growth, which creates positive development for youth and adults. With youth/adult partnerships being a valuable asset to Georgia communities, this study will evaluate 1) are youth/adult partnerships existing, in the perspective of youth and adults, in local communities, 2) are there similar perceptions from youth and adults on local based youth/adult partnerships, 3) if there were changes in perceptions before and after the Georgia Youth Summit by respondents, and 4) evaluate responses to see if there is significant difference between demographics of the respondents.

### **Null Hypothesis**

There will be no collaboration between youth and adults in their communities as felt through the views of the Youth Summit Teams, and the youth will merely be placed on these teams as symbolic gestures and not utilized for their leadership capabilities. Also, youth and adults will exhibit no change in perception for youth/adult partnerships in their communities.

### **Scope of the Study**

The scope of this study included all youth and adults from the counties who volunteered at the 2008 Georgia Youth Summit to participate in the study. This group was based on four youth-one adult teams. The adults from each team were the contact for teams volunteering to participate in the study.



## **Assumptions**

The following assumptions can be made concerning this study:

1. Team members are willing to answer honestly to the questions presented by the researcher.
2. Youth and adults answered the questions correctly with respect to their perceptions of youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interactions (the three constructs of the survey) for pre and post Georgia Youth Summit.
3. The youth and adults answered the questions, free of any pressure from their local 4-H agent, adults, or conference facilitators.
4. The adults and youth on these teams were made aware of, by the 4-H program, what the youth/adult partnership model is, through the Georgia Youth Summit conference.

## **Limitations of the Study**

One of the limitations of this study is that not all members were selected from active 4-H'ers but rather from diverse youth development organizations; neither were all members evenly selected nor randomly selected throughout the state. Selection was done on a county level, and no standardized method was used. This study was conducted with volunteers from the participating delegates, and because these counties that volunteered do not reflect randomly on

the Georgia 4-H program, the State of Georgia, or all youth throughout the state, no generalizations can be made to any other population other than the ones participating in the study.

The low response rate is a limitation to this study. While analysis can be performed and conclusions made about the response pool, there is limitation in the ability to apply this outside of the response pool. Generalizations may be made to the respondents, but no conclusions or generalizations can be made to the teams volunteering or the delegates to the Georgia Youth Summit. Further studies with higher responses rates are needed. This study will merely be a starting point and building block to begin showing the perceptions of youth and adults about youth/adult partnerships in Georgia.

Another limitation is the issue that groups volunteered for participation in the study. The adults were the main member to volunteer their county group. Most of the volunteers were from counties in Georgia in which the researcher had a personal relationship with through involvement as a 4-H'er and as a County 4-H Agent. The youth also were not identified by the adult member, and no contact information was given to help promote response from the youth on the teams volunteering. Therefore, neither the volunteers nor the respondents reflect a random sample of the delegates at the 2009 Georgia Youth Summit.

Also, the survey instrument, *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*, by Jones and Perkins was utilized in this study. No pilot was performed on the instrument, as it had already been utilized by Jones (2004) and Jones and Perkins (2005; 2006). Their initial reliability and validity for the instrument was accepted for this study. The instrument is limited to their initial

validity and reliability, however the researcher felt this was sufficient enough to implement with this study and youth development.

### **Significance of the Study**

The Georgia Youth Summit is the major component of the Georgia 4-H program educating young people and adults about youth/adult partnerships. The results of this study were used to evaluate the perceptions of the youth/adult partnerships in Youth Summit teams. This study may also provide reason for further research into the relationships between youth and adults in youth/adult partnerships during their local action plan implementation, as well as other 4-H programs in Georgia 4-H, and other community based youth/adult partnered programs.

### **Definitions of Terms**

4-H – “A youth organization administered by the Cooperative Extension [Program] Service to assist youth in acquiring knowledge, developing life skills, and forming attitudes that will enable them to become self-directing, productive and contributing members of society” (Priest, 2008, p. 13, ¶12).

Adult- for the purpose of this study adults are those individuals 19 years of age and older.

Civic Engagement- is “being able to influence choices in a collective action; it is the purview of every citizen, not only officials and professionals. It has long been a bedrock value of democracy” (Camino & Zeldin, 2002).

Georgia Youth Summit- is a program that is a collaboration between the Georgia Rural Development Council and the Georgia 4-H program. This program seeks to empower youth,

who are emerging leaders, to take an active role in addressing key issues in their communities through youth/adult partnerships (Georgia Youth Summit).

Youth – for the purpose of this study youth are those respondents 18 years of age and younger.

Youth Development- is “all of the essentials necessary for young people to make the transition from childhood to adulthood” (Jones, 2005, p.1).

Youth/Adult Partnerships- is a practice in youth development that brings together youth and adults in shared leadership (Camino 2000b; Jones, 2004; Zeldin & Petrokubi, 2006).

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **Introduction**

This chapter presents a review of the literature for this research study. This review covers what youth/adult partnerships are. The review of literature is divided into the following sections: 1) Introduction, 2) Youth/Adult Partnerships, 3) Benefits of Youth/Adult Partnerships, 4) Georgia Youth Summit and its Benefits, 5) Measuring the Effectiveness of Youth-Adult Partnerships, 6) Review of Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction and 7) Summary.

#### **Youth/Adult Partnerships**

In youth/adult partnerships “youth engagement in . . . adult roles has the potential to maximize [young people’s] sense of community while . . . ensuring youth have the opportunity to be active agents in their own development” (Zeldin, Camino, & Mook, 2005, p. 122). “Youth engagement in community decision-making- be it in a school, youth organization, or community group- is increasingly viewed as an essential component of youth-development models” (Zeldin, 2004b, p. 627-628). According to Warkentin and Rea, youth/adult partnerships “provide an opportunity for youth and adults to share power and responsibility in the pursuit of common goals such as personal development, educations, job training, and community development” (1998, p. xiv). While youth/adult partnerships are a novel idea, they are however, a practice that

is against the way society is structured (Zeldin, Petrokubi, & MacNeil, 2008). “The ideal situation in a partnership would be an equal power balance between young people and adults . . . striving for a common goal . . . utilizing each other’s strengths [,] . . . and . . . [understanding] their individual roles” (Glover & Herrington-Jackson, 1998, p. 23). For benefits of youth/adult partnerships to be achieved, youth should be part of the decision-making process on issues related to them (Williamson, 1998). For the effectiveness of youth/adult partnerships to flourish, there must be a true synergy where all members have a purpose and meaning in the partnership (Mitra, 2007).

Youth as partners is a concept where youth have opportunities to be part of programmatic planning and implementation of youth programs that directly affect them (Camino, 2000a). Young people develop a relationship through the partnering with not only adults but with youth as well (Zeldin & Macneil, 2006). Youth/Adult partnerships “refers to a group of youth and adults working together over a sustained period of time to address issues critical to the overall health of an organization [and] community” (Zeldin & Petrokubi, 2006, ¶5).

“Equal partnership . . . goes beyond simply teaching young people about decision-making and leadership skills, beyond developing programs in which youth have some kind of role, to valuing and respecting young people not only as future leaders, but as individuals who can make worthwhile contributions today” (Youth as Equal Partners in Decision Making, 2003, ¶2). The continuum of youth development program can stretch from one extreme where adults make the decision and youth are left without a sense of control or power to the opposite end where control is in the youth’s hands, and adults have minimal roles. These extremes are not beneficial and provide the least effectiveness in comparison to a youth/adult partnership (Walker, Larson, & Pearce, 2005).

To have a successful youth/adult partnership, all the members of the partnerships need to “[know who they] are working with, identifying roles and leadership styles, and [determine] norms and boundaries” (Youth-Adult Partnerships: A Training Manual, 2003, pg. 99). According to Zeldin, Camino, and Mook (2005), there is a three phase plan to implementing youth/adult partnerships: 1) “Initiation Stage”, 2) “Early Implementation Stage”, and 3) “Institutionalization Phase”. However, youth/adult partnerships take place at all points from start to finish in a program (Youth-Adult Partnerships: A Training Manual, 2003).

Youth/adult partnership can be dependent upon the culture, ethnicity, and the geographical location of where the partnership takes place (Ginwright, 2005; Youth-Adult Partnerships: A Training Manual, 2003). Even with challenges, if adults and youth are willing to work together in a synergy that allows them to bring their own life perspectives and talents to the table, youth/adult partnerships can be very beneficial in youth development programs (Zeldin, 2004a). In the end, while there is limited research into youth/adult partnerships, research has shown the partnerships, while they are different from location to location, work best and perform best when there is a true partnership between adults and youth, and they are equally valued and utilized (Youth-Adult Partnerships: A Training Manual, 2003).

### **Benefits of Youth/Adult Partnerships**

Youth/Adult “partnerships provide a way of bridging . . . diversity . . . and creating social unity. . . . Adults in partnerships do not [need] to make youth over in their image . . . [and neither] youth in [a] partnership do not need to defy adults. [Youth] appreciate adults’ accumulated experience and knowledge because they can benefit from them” (Warkentin & Rea, 1998 p. xiv & xv). Strong partnerships between youth and adults lead to “[preventing] youth

from engaging in problem behaviors, while concurrently, they can help promote knowledge, competency, and initiative among youth” (Zeldin, Larson, Camino, & O’Connor, 2005, p. 1-2)

Youth, “when involved in meaningful ways . . . gain confidence that enables them to develop new skills and further their leadership experience. . . . [Young peoples’] enthusiasm is contagious and often re-energizes the adults with whom they work” (Youth as Equal Partners in Decision Making, 2003, ¶3&4). Youth/adult partnerships serve to break down the division between youth and adults based on age, and promote a synergy between youth and adults on creating overall stability and longevity of the youth development program (Schulman, 2006).

Through the partnership, youth are able to enhance their self image thanks to the new opportunities they have. Adults and the organizations have a key benefit as well from youth/adult partnership. Adults, through working with youth, increase their proficiency in youth/adult partnerships and learn about generational issues which affect the youth. Overall, this causes an increase in diversity relations for youth, adults and organizations (Zeldin & Petrokubi, 2006). Youth are also energized and feel an importance to have civic responsibility and civic action through their work with youth/adult partnerships in their communities. In the long term, youth are able to learn career based skills, and to be independent in their ability to lead their lives which leads to them being better citizens in our world today and in the future (Zeldin, Larson, Camino, & O’Connor, 2005). Even though most research points to youth benefit, Zeldin and Macneil (2006) point out their research shows that adults, while many times not realizing it at first, have lasting and real impacts from the partnerships as well. While the research into the practice is recent, it has shown to benefit the youth in bringing them into a role where they are motivated to help their community (Zeldin, 2004a).



### ***Needs for Youth/Adult Partnership Success***

Zeldin and Macneil, through their research, found that there is a set of needs for youth to feel partnerships are truly beneficial. These needs are: “[1)] the organization strongly [demonstrates] respect for youth voice and competency, [2)] adults [give] youth legitimate authority and responsibility, [3)] adults [take] the time to establish positive relationships with the young people, [4)] youth [gain] a sense of belonging and connectedness with the organization and its mission, [5)] they [enjoy] getting to know and work as a team with their peers” (Zeldin & Macneil, 2006, p. 8).

These points show that young people need to have a level of action that makes them feel entrenched in the task at hand, whether it be programmatic or governance, and youth must feel that their part, as well as other partners, are needed and valued (Mitra, 2009). The effectiveness in the end will be reliant on youth and adults surpassing the generational divide and working together (Zeldin, 2002).

### ***Limitations to Research in Youth/Adult Partnerships***

While youth/adult partnerships are a growing phenomenon in youth development, research about this practice is recent (Camino, 2000b). According to Camino (2005), the concept of youth/adult partnerships is a young practice and is something still needing future research. Camino (2005) also notes that there has not been enough time to see the long term affects of youth/adult partnerships to stakeholders and communities. While the research is recent, the idea of youth/adult partnerships is a concept that dates back many years, perceptions of youth/adult partnerships have been largely studied (Camino, 2000b; Camino 2005).

### ***Positive Youth Development***

Lerner, Lerner, and Phelps (2008) in their report on Positive Youth Development state that through youth development-serving organizations, young people grow through and gain the most in the program when they have “1) positive and sustained relationships between youth and adults, 2) activities that build important life skills, and 3) opportunities for children to use these life skills as both participants and as leaders in valued community activities” (Lerner, Lerner, and Phelps, 2008, p.8).

These positive youth developments can be seen through “youth empowerment and exploration, competence and mastery, emotional health, compassion and generosity, community connections and belonging, and civic participation” (Zeldin, 2000, p. 3). With that 4-H has initiated the four essential elements that are vital to programmatic structuring, including youth/adult partnerships, these elements are mastery, generosity, belonging, and understanding (Essential Elements of 4-H, n.d.). Through positive youth development, youth and adults are able to work together in a partnership for civic action and engagement, which dynamize the youth/adult partnership (Zeldin, 2000). Youth/adult partnerships allow the youth to “be active agents in their own development, the development of others, and the development of the community” (Zeldin, Larson, Camino, & O’Connor, 2005, p. 2).

### ***Limitations to Youth/Adult Partnerships***

Benefits of youth/adult partnerships, as well as the challenges, can be geographical in nature. Culture and ethnicity can play a major role on youth/adult partnerships in an urban setting. The effects of socio-economic status, youth taking on adult responsibilities, and cultural norms can affect the effectiveness of a youth/adult partnership (Ginwright, 2005). To implement

youth/adult partnerships, one must understand the style the partnerships should take to create positive development for youth and adults (Anderson, 2008). Historic perceptions of youth are not of positive mood, where youth serve to better their world, but negatively as rebellious problems that cause community problems and need to be controlled and not involved. These perceptions arise from generation segregation, and little intergenerational partnerships are prevalent (Camino & Zeldin, 2002).

Libby, Rosen, & Sedonean (2005) also note in their research that before young people can be brought into a youth/adult partnership, preparations need to be made. The environment needs to be conducive to the young person being able to be a true partner, or the partnership will not reach its intended benefit to youth development initiatives. Adults must be open-minded, and they should not constrict themselves to societal norms, because youth today are not as youth were in their generation, young people are more active and more involved. This difference forms a strong foundation for youth/adult partnerships (Jones & Perkins, 2006). “Youth-adult [partnerships are] not a “one-size fits-all” concept” (Schulman, 2006, p. s30). For youth/adult partnerships to receive full implementation and benefit, they must start on the local level (Zeldin, Camino, & Mook, 2005).

### **Georgia Youth Summit and Its Benefits**

Georgia Youth Summit participants are a valued part of the longitudinal national study by 4-H and Lerner, et al, on Positive Youth Development (Buckley, 2008). Through the study on positive youth development, it was shown youth, partnered with open-minded adults, and given the opportunities to excel, can have real benefits and impact on their communities, a cornerstone of the Youth Summit program (Lerner, Lerner, & Phelps 2008; Buckley, 2008). Georgia 4-H

has, as a statewide program, centered a large component of its youth development initiatives around civic engagement and has allowed for youth/adult partnerships to flourish and become a foundation of the organization (National 4-H Council, 2007). The goal of the Georgia Youth Summit includes three key themes “(1) create an awareness of state/local issues; (2) enhance youth-adult partnerships on the local level; and (3) equip youth to become active locally in the betterment of their community in the areas of economic development, education, health and safety” (Bowen, 2008, ¶2). However, little empirical data exists documenting the perceptions of youth and adults with regards to these partnerships.

The overall goal of the Georgia Youth Summit is to “create awareness of local and state issues, enhance youth-adult partnerships on the local level and equip youth to better their communities” (Essential Elements of 4-H, n.d., p. 14). Programs, like the Georgia Youth Summit, that work with youth and adult volunteers, government, and youth development organizations are beneficial in building and strengthening local communities through social, economical, community safety, and youth development (Camino, 2000b). The youth development initiatives are local efforts to dynamize youth/adult partnerships through youth and adult civic engagement (Zeldin & Topitzes, 2002). While the Youth Summit provides opportunity for civic engagement for youth, Camino and Zeldin in their research note the overall historic societal practice of civic engagement leaves youth with limited abilities to have a piece of the pie (2002). With the Youth Summit’s aim of promoting youth civic action through youth/adult partnerships, Zeldin, Larson, Camino, and O’Connor note in their findings that these type partnerships allow for real benefits to communities through the collaboration brought about by youth/adult partnerships (2005).

## **Measuring the Effectiveness of Youth-Adult Partnerships**

Denner, Meyer, & Bean published in 2005 a research project done with the Young Women Leadership Alliance. The study worked to see the benefit of youth/adult partnerships in the program. The program targeted young women in the program in three high schools in central California. The qualitative evaluations were summarized by the researchers. Their findings showed “guidance instead of direct instruction . . . and opportunities for adults and youth to create a place to be authentic” created strong youth/adult partnerships (Denner, Meyer, & Bean, 2005, p. 97).

In her research on Youth Infusion, Schulman (2006) worked to see the effectiveness of promoting the youth voice inclusion into organizations serving youth. The study sought to find “(1) what does youth engagement look like now and how does this compare with what youth engagement would ideally look like[,] (2) what in the organization, as it is now configured, works best to support youth as partners and decision-makers[,] (3) how could youth-adult engagement help your organization better fulfill its function? (Schulman, 2006, p. s27)

The research performed by Schulman was qualitative in design and included “discussion groups, structured interviews, photography, organizational mapping, journal mapping, and document reviews” (2006, p. s27). Additional questions arose for evaluation, “(1) What accounts for the differences in organizations’ youth-adult engagement outcomes; and (2) What strategies can organizations adopt to maximize the likelihood of successful outcomes?” (Schulman, 2006, p. s28). The results showed that the two organizations that adopted Youth Infusion showed varying results of youth feeling like symbolic members who had no voice to youth engaged in the decision making process (Schulman, 2006).

Zeldin and Topitzes (2002) utilized a method of measuring community perceptions on key components of youth/adult partnerships. The research was conducted by phone-based interviews where respondents responded to questions on demographics, connection to community, compassion of adults towards youth, adolescence caring about community, community vitality and health, and the volunteerism. Their findings showed a range of opinion, with adults and youth similarly scoring perceptions even between agreeing and disagreeing on youth involvement in community, however, both adolescents and adults have an overall positive feeling about youth involvement. This stands as contrary to societal views, and shows the ability for youth/adult partnerships to work in community civic engagement (Zeldin & Topitzes, 2002).

Mitra in her research utilized 13 high schools to implement a youth/adult partnership program (Mitra, 2007; Mitra, 2009). These implementation sites, funded through a grant, were evaluated through qualitative evaluation utilizing phone interviews (Mitra, 2007; Mitra 2009). The research in Mitra (2007) looked into administrators' effect on youth/adult partnerships. Mitra (2009) looked into the support structure that is needed to support youth adult partnerships in school based settings. Both used the same sampling pool. The research found that while youth/adult partnerships have strong ability to operate in school based settings and have an impact, they require time and commitment (Mitra, 2009). The youth/adult partnerships have to break down cultural and social norms that take time and a joint willingness to learn and grow through the process by both youth and adults (Mitra, 2007; Mitra 2009). For there to be sound adoption and good practice for youth/adult partnerships, administrators must be onboard and active with the process (Mitra, 2007). The youth/adult partnerships serve as a manner in which true change can be achieved in schools (Mitra, 2007).

Einspruch and Wunrow, researched the effects of youth/adult partnerships in the Seven Circles Drug Prevention Coalition in southeast Alaska. The research was conducted utilizing surveys, and consisted of four surveys given over the course of four years. The surveys contained questions related the opinions of the partnership, the youth participation, and adult participation. The surveys utilized a Summated Rating Scale for respondents to respond to questions in the survey. This survey sought to secure perceptions of participants about the youth/adult partnership they were in. The survey results showed that the respondents, both youth and adults, felt there were effective partnerships formed, and that all partners were viewed as contributors to the total Seven Circles program (Einspruch & Wunrow, 2002).

Jones and Perkins utilized a perception rating they title *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*, which they utilized to measure the involvement of youth and adults separately, and the feelings about how effectively the partnerships operated (Jones, 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2005; Jones & Perkins, 2006). The research was conducted on youth and adults participating in the Northeast Region of the National 4-H program operating under the Engaging Youth Serving Community Initiative grant from National 4-H Council (Jones 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2006). The rating scale utilizes a Summated Rating Scale, which gauges the subjective perceptions of the respondents (Jones, 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2005; Jones & Perkins, 2006). The ratings scale was subjected to expert review and reliability analysis (Jones, 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2005). The research was performed on community based program within the 4-H organizational umbrella (Jones 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2006). The research showed, through the 2006 study, differences to adult and youth perceptions, as well as sex based differences, through *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* responses. Overall when the youth and adults work together in coalition, there is greater appreciation for adults and youth, and the partnerships,

when youth are given more control and stake in the relationship, creates stronger interaction (Jones, 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2006).

### **Review of Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction**

Youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction are central to youth/adult partnerships and the constructs of *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* (Jones 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2005; Jones & Perkins 2006). These constructs are the basis for the overall relationships that foster good youth/adult relationships (Jones, 2004). There needs to be active involvement from youth and adults, with collaborative interaction to achieve the benefits of youth/adult partnerships (Camino, 2000b). Youth involvement is an important factor that keeps young people engaged, connected to their community, and provides social and nonsocial development for youth (Rose-Krasnor, 2009). Jones (2004) defines youth involvement as “youth working together and demonstrating responsibility by taking the initiative to carry out group tasks” (Jones, 2004, p. 7). Youth involvement is contrary to social norms and stereotypes, but youth involvement is active and beneficial to the youth and their communities (Camino & Zeldin, 2002). Adult involvement is based on “adults working together to carry out specific group tasks (e.g., providing support for youth, guiding youth leadership, encouraging youth voice, and conducting meetings)” (Jones, 2004, p. 6). Adults’ involvement must be shared leadership, in nature, where they are empowering youth, and viewing them as assets and not liabilities (Anderson, 2008; Jones 2004). With involvement youth and adults then can form a youth-adult interaction, which Jones (2004) defines as “youth and adults working collectively on one or more components of the project . . . and fully exercising and equal opportunity to utilize decision-making and other leadership skills” (Jones, 2004, p. 6-7). These constructs make up the



basis for *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*, which are key components of youth/adult partnerships (Jones, 2004, Jones & Perkins 2005; Jones & Perkins 2006).

### **Summary**

The review of literature shows that there are key benefits of youth/adult partnerships when it comes to youth programming, especially in the Georgia 4-H and Georgia Youth Summit programming. Youth/adult partnership is a relatively recent concept, but a concept that is vital in youth programming. For youth programs to really meet the needs of the youth, youth need to have an active voice in the decision making process. The benefits of this stretch to the three stakeholders in this partnership, the youth by building their leadership and self-confidence, adults in learning about youth and working with diversity, and the organization in having better focused benefits to the community, through service programs. Therefore, it can be determined from this literature that for successful and effective Extension 4-H Programs on the local level, there needs to be active youth and adults working in a partnership in implementing programs. *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*, utilized by Jones and Perkins was selected as the model for the survey of this research. The ratings scales provided a tested and reliable (Jones, 2004; Jones & Perkins, 2006) quantitative survey which was tailored to the community-based programs this research would be looking into. This study utilized *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* with a different respondent pool to check the instrument's reliability. This adds to the reliability of the instrument. This study will determine if the Georgia Youth Summit teams truly have a genuine youth/adult partnership understanding and feel this is part of their communities.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate perceptions of youth and adults on Youth Summit teams about youth/adult partnership, and to see if the partnership, through their perceptions, exists. The responses to the survey were evaluated to measure the perception of youth and adults on youth/adult partnerships in their communities. Also, the study analyzed retrospectively if there was perception change by both youth and adults about youth/adult partnerships after their experience in the Georgia Youth Summit. Overall these results were used in determining the perceptions of youth and adult respondents about youth/adult partnerships and to gauge the change in perception from pre to post Georgia Youth Summit to see if their learning initiated a change in perception. This study will be useful to gauge the level of partnerships, as the perception of the youth and adults, in communities around the state of Georgia. Anderson (2008), provides insight into youth/adult partnerships, however, with little published research on youth/adult partnerships in Georgia, the researcher hopes this research will serve as a stepping stone to future youth/adult partnerships, especially in regards Georgia 4-H youth development initiatives.

The methodology for this was a retrospective survey instrument; the instrument utilized was a modified version of the instrument *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* utilized

by Jones and Perkins (2006). Modifications included a retrospective post perspective (pre-then-post) meaning that the respondents were asked to answer after the summit which were their feelings both BEFORE the Youth Summit, and AFTER the Youth Summit. The instrument also included two open-ended questions, which allowed the questions to be included in the research a mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) approach. In addition, respondents were asked to complete a section on demographic questions.

During the Georgia Youth Summit adult participants were asked whether or not they would consider participating in a research project about youth/adult partnerships. After the Youth Summit, the survey was mailed to adults that had indicated that they would consider participating in the research. The adults indicating they would consider participating in the research cannot be considered a random sample of all adults in the Georgia Youth Summit. The responses were evaluated, and the demographic data was used to compare responses between different groups. For the purpose of this study youth are determined as those individuals eighteen years of age and under, and adults would be considered those individuals nineteen years of age and older.

### **Institutional Review Board**

The University of Georgia, as well as the Federal Government, requires a review to be exercised and approval to be given before studies involving human subjects can be carried out. A request was made to the University of Georgia Institutional Review Board for this study and acceptance was granted by the review board prior to carrying out the research project.

## **Population**

The population was all delegates in the Georgia Youth Summit. The sampling frame was the participants (youth and adults) from delegations in which an adult had indicated willingness to participate in a research study involving youth/adult partnerships . There were 25 adults who indicated willingness to participate. The sampling frame included then 25 delegations, which involved 25 adults and 100 youth (assuming that all delegations had one adult and four youth). .

## **Sampling and procedure**

After the conference, the researchers mailed a package with materials from the research to all adults who had volunteered to participate in the research study (census) The package included five envelopes, one for the adult, and one for each youth (and his/her parents). The adult was asked to complete his/her survey and mail it back to the researcher. The adult was also asked to forward the youth envelopes to the youth and his/her family. Parents of the youth were asked to give parental consent to their youth to participate in the study, and youth were asked to complete the survey and mail back to the researcher. All packages had one envelope that was pre-stamped and addressed to the researcher (see Appendices A, B, C, D).

A total of 21 surveys (16.8%) were returned. The percentage response rate of adults was 40% ( $n = 10$ ) and the youth response rate was 11% ( $n = 11$ ). This response rate was very low, and the researcher indicates that the results should not be generalized to the sampling frame, volunteer population, participants in the Georgia Youth Summit, or any other group. The researchers need to continue this research to send reminder notes, and then to contact non-respondents to assess non-response error. Adult low response rate could be due to the fact that the research was not started until after the Summit had finished, apathy, and the fact that the

researcher did not have the opportunity to send reminder notes given time constraints to finish this research. The youth low response rate could be due to same reasons as described for adults, adults not distributing surveys (very likely for adults that did not answer their own survey), student apathy about participating, or lack of parental consent. The proportion of youth ( $n=11$ ) to adult ( $n=10$ ) respondents was 52% youth (there were four youth per adult in the sample/census) and 48% adults.

### **Instrument**

Utilizing *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* developed by Jones and Perkins (2005), the instrument was a retrospective pre and post survey that measured the perceptions of youth and adults as to youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction in their communities. The survey was modified from the original, *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*, to add a retrospective analysis. This was used to see if the difference before and after education on youth/adult partnerships caused a shift in perceptions for youth and adults. The original survey by Jones and Perkins (2005; 2006) had a single post program evaluation, while the retrospective survey utilized for this research asked the respondents to respond each question twice, one corresponding to their feelings before, and the other one after the Summit. Also, a qualitative analysis was added to the survey to allow respondents to express their opinions on what makes partnerships effective and how youth/adult partnerships can be enhanced (Appendix E).

The item questions were grouped into three sections, yielding three constructs : Youth Involvement (13 questions), Adult Involvement (eight questions), and Youth-Adult Interaction (17 questions) (Jones & Perkins, 2005). Each item was to be answered in a five item continuum

was used for this Scale (Likert-type scale) (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree). The responses to questions within sections (constructs) were summed together creating summated rating scale scores.

The respondents also responded to demographic information related to sex, age, racial classification, background/area, youth development organizations participated in, and past experience with youth/adult partnerships. The results of these questions were put with the answers to the qualitative analysis questions and reviewed by the researcher. The Multi-trait, Multi-method data collection technique was utilized for this study.

### **Validity and Reliability**

The validity of this study was directly dependent on the respondents being able to freely answer the survey with out pressure being placed to have false evaluation done. The instrument validity itself was reviewed by Jones and Perkins, where they subjected the survey to post hoc testing and expert panel review (2005). The panel found that the survey met its intentions to suitably assess the perceptions of youth and adults on youth/adult partnerships, and the survey was reflective of the content area the researchers were evaluating (Jones & Perkins, 2005). The survey was also tested in the field by Jones and Perkins (2006) in their study of youth/adult partnerships in the Engaging Youth Serving Community Initiative grant from National 4-H Council, as well as in Jones' unpublished dissertation referred to by Jones & Perkins (2005; 2006).

The reliability for *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* according to Jones and Perkins (2005; 2006) was .94 on Cronbach's Alpha. The Cronbach's Alpha also broke each section down (Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction) into

reliability for these coefficients, which were .83 for Youth Involvement, .84 for Adult Involvement, and .87 for Youth-Adult Interaction (Jones & Perkins, 2005; Jones & Perkins, 2006). Reliability though can only be strictly held to youth development organizations similar to 4-H, no other organizations can be restricted by the study instrument (Jones & Perkins, 2006).

The demographic data was utilized to place the respondents in their homogenized generational groups. The researcher evaluated all surveys, to prevent the threat of scorer variability. Replication of this study instrument, *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*, provides a measure of validity and reliability. This research was the first for *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* in Georgia, and the results were compared back to the finding of Jones and Perkins (2006).

### **Data Collection**

Each participant was requested to answer the survey, Youth and Adult Relationships within Community based Youth Programs Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale (Appendix E), and return the survey by postal mail. The responses were collected by the researcher from October 2008 thru February 2009. The surveys were returned individually and the respondent was the only one to know their survey results at the local program. The responses were scored by the researcher. The demographic data on the responses are not identifiers, and the consent forms were separated upon receipt and kept separate of the surveys at all times during collection and analysis.

### **Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed by the researcher utilizing SPSS version 16. The data was analyzed to see the relationship between fellow youth and fellow adults then comparing youth to

adults to see if the mean of the results from the two generational groups was similar or different. The data was also analyzed against the demographics of the study. Statistics used were mean, standard deviation, t-scores (independent sample t-tests and paired t-tests). The statistical significance was established a priori, at 0.05.

Qualitative answers were analyzed by the researcher and themes were gathered from the responses. Themes are included in Table 4-15. The qualitative questions were arranged for responses on perceptions of 1) what makes a good youth/adult partnerships and 2) what is needed to enhance youth/adult partnerships. The researcher analyzed the qualitative responses, utilizing domain analysis, for the questions to see similarities between the themes for the two questions in a domain analysis.

### **Timeline**

September 20-22, 2008:	Georgia Youth Summit.
October 25, 2008:	Send e-mail to Extension Agents with project information, as well as consent forms and instrument.
October 27, 2008:	Consent forms and instrument are distributed to adults for adults and youth and parents.
October, 2008 thru February, 2009:	Participants respond and mail survey instrument.
February, 2009:	Data is analyzed.
February thru March, 2009:	Write up results for final thesis.
April, 2009:	Thesis written and presented.



## **CHAPTER 4**

### **RESULTS**

#### **Introduction**

In this chapter, research finding are presented which align with the evaluations aim at gauging perceptions of youth and adults about youth/adult partnerships in their communities. Utilizing the data collected from the returned mail surveys ( $n=21$ ), the data is divided into categories that correspond with the questions addressed in each section of the survey.

#### **Demographics of Sample**

Demographic data was collected about each respondent participating in the survey. Demographic data included sex, age, racial classification, background/area, location in Georgia based on Georgia 4-H district, delegate participation level, youth development organizations participated in, and past experience with youth/adult partnerships.

##### ***Sex***

As presented in Table 4-1, 86% of the respondents were female and 14% of the respondents were males. Of the youth respondents ( $n=11$ ), there were 82% female ( $n=9$ ) and 18% male ( $n=2$ ). The adults' respondent sex was 90% female ( $n=9$ ) and 10% male ( $n=1$ ). The youth and adults were separated by the researcher based on the division of 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults.

## ***Age***

Of the respondents only four age classifications were represented. Less than 15, 19-21, and 22-25 had zero percent or no responses. Of the age ranges noted 48% ( $n=10$ ) were 15-16 years old, five percent ( $n=1$ ) were 17-18 years old, nine percent ( $n=2$ ) were 26-30 years old, and 38% ( $n=8$ ) were 31 and over in age. Of the responses, utilizing 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults, 52% ( $n=11$ ) were youth and 48% ( $n=10$ ) were adults. Age demographics are shown in Table 4-1.

## ***Racial Classification***

The demographics of the sample are illustrated on Table 4-1. In the overall sample population, no respondents classified their race as Asian/Asian American, Native American, or Other. The overall racial classification demographics for the sample population were 19% ( $n=4$ ) Black/African American, 76% ( $n=16$ ) White/Caucasian, and five percent ( $n=1$ ) Hispanic or Latino. The youth and adults were separated by the researcher based on the division of 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults. In the youth population, no classification was given for Asian/Asian American, Native American, Hispanic or Latino, and Other. The racial classification demographics for the youth sample population were 27% ( $n=3$ ) Black/African American and 73% ( $n=8$ ) were White/Caucasian. For the adult population no classification of race was given for Asian/Asian American, Native American, or Other. The adult racial demographics for the sample population were 10% ( $n=1$ ) Black/African American, 80% ( $n=8$ ) White/Caucasian, and 10% ( $n=1$ ) Hispanic or Latino.

### ***Background/area***

The background/area demographics, as noted in Table 4-1, were divided into overall population sample ( $n=21$ ), youth sample population ( $n=11$ ), and adult sample population ( $n=10$ ). The determination for communities was based off *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* (Jones, 2004). The youth and adults were separated by the researcher based on the division of 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults. For the overall population, the background/area demographics were 24% ( $n=5$ ) Rural (with farm); 24% ( $n=5$ ) Rural (no farm); 19% ( $n=4$ ) suburban; 19% ( $n=4$ ) Urban/city; and 14% ( $n=3$ ) Other. The youth population demographics were 27% ( $n=3$ ) Rural (with farm); 27% ( $n=3$ ) Rural (no farm); 9% ( $n=1$ ) suburban; 27% ( $n=3$ ) Urban/city; and 9% ( $n=1$ ) Other. The demographics for background/area for the adult population were 20% ( $n=2$ ) Rural (with farm); 20% ( $n=2$ ) Rural (no farm); 30% ( $n=3$ ) suburban; 10% ( $n=1$ ) Urban/city; and 20% ( $n=2$ ) Other.

For the responses on other, for background/area, respondents specified their classification of their community. Of the two adults who specified other, their response reflected their view that their local community was a small town. The one youth response to other was noted as Romania.

### ***Location***

The locations of the respondents are based on the Georgia 4-H District map, which is in alignment with the University of Georgia Cooperative Extension program's districting. (Appendix F). The locations of the responses are reported by region and not counties to ensure the confidentiality of the sample population. The demographics for the locations are by district and are illustrated on Table 4-1 by overall sample population, youth sample population, and adult

sample population. The youth and adults were separated by the researcher based on the division of 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults.

The locations for the overall population were 24% ( $n=5$ ) for Northwest District, 24% ( $n=5$ ) for Northeast District, 48% ( $n=10$ ) for Southwest, five percent ( $n=1$ ) for Southeast District. The youth population location demographics were 18% ( $n=2$ ) for Northwest District, 55% ( $n=6$ ) for Northeast District, 27% ( $n=3$ ) for Southwest, zero percent ( $n=0$ ) for Southeast District. The location demographics for the adult sample population were 30% ( $n=3$ ) for Northwest District, 20% ( $n=2$ ) for Northeast District, 40% ( $n=4$ ) for Southwest, 10% ( $n=1$ ) for Southeast District. No responses were received from the county in Southeast District where the adult respondent was from.

### ***Participation Level***

Table 4-1 illustrates the breakdown in participation level demographics. For this demographic, no respondents noted Georgia Youth Summit Facilitator or other. All respondents were actual delegates, with no duties with conference planning, implementation, and evaluation. The demographic for participation level was 52% ( $n=11$ ) youth participants and 48% ( $n=10$ ) adult participants.

### ***Participation in Youth Development Organizations***

Table 4-1 has the break down of the different youth development organizations selected by the respondents. The youth and adults were encouraged by the survey to select all youth development organizations participated in. The survey listed a select set of organizations; however, respondents were encouraged to list others. From the organizations listed, a total of 16 organizations were listed, with 55 total participants (multiple participation stated by respondents

in multiple organizations). The organizational involvement demographic is broken into three sections with overall population sample, youth sample population, and adult sample populations. The youth and adults were separated by the researcher based on the division of 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults.

The organizational involvement demographic for the overall population was 38% ( $n=21$ ) for 4-H, seven percent ( $n=4$ ) for FFA, four percent ( $n=2$ ) for Boys & Girls Club, seven percent ( $n=4$ ) for Y Club involvement, 24% ( $n=13$ ) for Church group, and 20% ( $n=11$ ) for other organizations not listed. The youth population sample demographic was 30% ( $n=11$ ) for 4-H, 11% ( $n=4$ ) for FFA, three percent ( $n=1$ ) for Boys & Girls Club, 11% ( $n=4$ ) for Y Club involvement, 22% ( $n=8$ ) for Church group, and 24% ( $n=9$ ) for other organizations not listed. The organizational involvement demographic for adults was 56% ( $n=10$ ) for 4-H, zero percent ( $n=0$ ) for FFA, six percent ( $n=1$ ) for Boys & Girls Club, zero percent ( $n=0$ ) for Y Club involvement, 28% ( $n=5$ ) for Church group, and 11% ( $n=2$ ) for other organizations not listed. No adult respondents identified involvement in FFA or Y Club.

The other organizations listed by respondents were Muscular Dystrophy Association, FCCLA, Youth Council, NAACP (student chapter), Key Club, Student Council, Art Club, NAHS, Beta Club, Boy Scouts, and Band. Of these organizations only one adult listed Muscular Dystrophy Association and only one other adult listed FCCLA. In the youth responses, for other organizations, each organization was only listed once by one respondent, not other organization received multiple listings by separate respondents. Youth involvement in other organizations was Youth Council, NAACP (student chapter), Key Club, Student Council, Art Club, NAHS, Beta Club, Boy Scouts, and Band.

### ***Previous Experience with Youth/Adult Partnerships***

As illustrated in Table 4-1, youth and adults stated whether they had or did not have previous experience with youth/adult partnerships. The data is shown in Table 4-1 by the questions posed if this was the respondents first time with youth/adult partnerships. The data is divided into overall populations sample, youth sample population, and adult sample population. The youth and adults were separated by the researcher based on the division of 18 years and under for youth and 19 and over for adults.

For past experience of the overall population 76% ( $n=16$ ) had previous experience with youth/adult partnerships (listed as “No” to first time) and 24% ( $n=5$ ) experienced their first youth/adult partnership through the Georgia Youth Summit team (listed as “Yes” to first time). For the youth respondents, 64% ( $n=7$ ) had previous experience with youth/adult partnerships (listed as “No” to first time) and 36% ( $n=4$ ) experienced their first youth/adult partnership through the Georgia Youth Summit team (listed as “Yes” to first time). The adult respondents experience was 90% ( $n=9$ ) had previous experience with youth/adult partnerships (listed as “No” to first time) and 10% ( $n=1$ ) experienced their first youth/adult partnership through the Georgia Youth Summit team (listed as “Yes” to first time).

Respondents with experience in youth/adult partnerships were asked to list programs or projects they had been involved in that involved them in youth/adult partnerships. Both adults and youth noted involvement in the student organizations listed (Youth Development Organizations Participated in). Adults and students also listed advisory councils, such as Parent Teach Student Association, community leadership programs, local 4-H councils, inter organizational councils. It was also noted by youth and adults participation in other school and community activities (such as recreation sports, school athletics, school newspaper, etc.). Two

respondents had previous experience and training through the Georgia 4-H Health Rocks! Ambassador program, a program specifically designed for youth/adult partnerships at the community level (Lerner, Lerner, & Phelps, 2008).

**Table 4-1.**  
**Demographics of Sample.**

	<i>N</i>	%
Sex		
Male (overall)	3	14
Female (overall)	18	86
Male (youth)	2	18
Female (youth)	9	82
Male (adult)	1	10
Female (adult)	9	90
Age		
Less than 15	0	0
15-16	10	48
17-18	1	5
19-21	0	0
22-25	0	0
26-30	2	9
31 and over	8	38
Racial classification		
Asian/Asian American (overall)	0	0
Black/African American (overall)	4	19
White/Caucasian (overall)	16	76
Native American (overall)	0	0
Hispanic or Latino (overall)	1	5
Other (overall)	0	0
Asian/Asian American (youth)	0	0
Black/African American (youth)	3	27
White/Caucasian (youth)	8	73
Native American (youth)	0	0
Hispanic or Latino (youth)	0	0
Other (youth)	0	0

	<i>N</i>	%
Asian/Asian American (adult)		
Black/African American (adult)	0	0
White/Caucasian (adult)	1	10
Native American (adult)	8	80
Hispanic or Latino (adult)	0	0
Other (adult)	1	10
	0	0
<hr/>		
	<u>Background/area</u>	
Rural (with farm) (overall)	5	24
Rural (no farm) (overall)	5	24
Suburban (overall)	4	19
Urban/city (overall)	4	19
Other (overall)	3	14
Rural (with farm) (youth)	3	27
Rural (no farm) (youth)	3	27
Suburban (youth)	1	9
Urban/city (youth)	3	27
Other (youth)	1	9
Rural (with farm) (adult)	2	20
Rural (no farm) (adult)	2	20
Suburban (adult)	3	30
Urban/city (adult)	1	10
Other (adult)	2	20
<hr/>		
	<u>Location</u>	
Northwest (overall)	5	24
Northeast (overall)	5	24
Southwest (overall)	10	48
Southeast (overall)	1	5
Northwest (youth)	2	18
Northeast (youth)	6	55
Southwest (youth)	3	27
Southeast (youth)	0	0
Northwest (adult)	3	30
Northeast (adult)	2	20
Southwest (adult)	4	40
Southeast (adult)	1	10



	<i>N</i>	%
<u>Type of Participation</u>		
Youth Participant	11	52
Adult Participant	10	48
Georgia Youth Summit Facilitator	0	0
Other	0	0

Participation in youth development organizations

		(percentages related to total number of organizations listed)
4-H (overall)	21	38
FFA (overall)	4	7
Boys & Girls Club (overall)	2	4
Y Club (overall)	4	7
Church Group (overall)	13	24
Other	11	20
(Youth)		
4-H (youth)	11	30
FFA (youth)	4	11
Boys & Girls Club (youth)	1	3
Y Club (youth)	4	11
Church Group (youth)	8	22
Other (youth)	9	24
(Adult)		
4-H (adult)	10	56
FFA (adult)	0	0
Boys & Girls Club (adult)	1	6
Y Club (adult)	0	0
Church Group (adult)	5	28
Other (adult)	2	11

First time participating in a youth/adult partnership

Yes (overall)	5	24
No (overall)	16	76
Yes (youth)	4	36
No (youth)	7	64
Yes (adult)	1	10

	<i>N</i>	%
No (adult)	9	90

### **Cronbach's Alpha for Survey Analysis**

The survey was broken down into three constructs. These were 1) Youth Involvement, 2) Adult Involvement, and 3) Youth-Adult Interaction. The three constructs had set questions in each grouping with both positive and negative comments related to that construct. Youth involvement had 13 questions; adult involvement had eight questions; youth-adult interactions had 17 questions.

Before doing any summation and rating of the items for construct analysis, the “negative” items were recoded so they were scored in the same sense as the “positive” items. For construct Youth Involvement (items 1 to 13), the negative items were items 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, and 13. For construct Adult Involvement (items 14 to 21), the negative items were items 18 and 20. For construct Youth-Adult interaction (items 22 to 38), the negative items were 25, 31, 34, 35, and 37.

Each construct was calculated separately for pre and post responses. Table 4-2 shows the mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha for the whole sample ( $n=21$ ), which included youth and adults. The Cronbach's Alpha was .76 for pre youth summit responses for Youth Involvement, .64 for post summit responses for Youth Involvement, .66 for pre youth summit for Adult involvement, .78 for post youth summit responses for Adult involvement, .85 for pre youth summit responses for Youth-Adult interaction, .81 for post youth summit responses for Youth-Adult interactions.

**Table 4-2.****Number of items, mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's Alpha for Survey Constructs**

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Cronbach's α</i>
Youth involvement (range of construct 13 to 65)				
Pre (before the summit)	13	44.05	6.90	.76
Post (after the Summit)	13	48.38	5.91	.64
Adult involvement (range of construct 8 to 40)				
Pre (before the summit)	8	28.52	4.11	.66
Post (after the Summit)	8	30.86	4.34	.78
Youth-Adult interaction (range of construct 17 to 85)				
Pre (before the summit)	17	56.71	9.08	.85
Post (after the Summit)	17	62.76	7.56	.81

### **Responses to Instrument Questions, Item by Item Analysis**

The respondents answered each item from one to five (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree). The mean score in the item tables was determined by summing up all the numbers and dividing by the number of respondents for youth ( $n=11$ ) and adults ( $n=10$ ). The items included both positive and negative statements. The responses shown for the item analysis are not reverse coded, and are left as answered by the respondents. The negative statements are noted in each table with an asterisk (\*). However, these items were reverse coded when used to calculate the value of the constructs (as will be explained in the construct section).

### ***Youth Involvement in Community-Based Youth Programs***

The respondents answered thirteen statements on youth involvement in community-based youth programs. The mean score, including standard deviation, for each response is shown in Table 4-3 and Table 4-4. Statements presented in the youth involvement in community-based programs reflected a positive and negative question, and were structure for a retrospective look. Statements in Table 4-3 and Table 4-4 are noted with an asterisk (\*) for negative statements. Respondents scored their perception on the Summated Rating Scale for pre and post Youth Summit perception.

The youth respondents are shown in Table 4-3. Their mean and standard deviation for each statement are listed for pre and post perception responses.

**Table 4-3.**  
**Item responses regarding Youth Involvement Perception of Youth, Pre and Post Youth Summit**

Statements	Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)		Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1) Youth take lots of initiative when working on community projects.	3.5	.53	4.3	.67
2) Youth very often are sitting around with nothing to do. (*)	3.36	1.29	2.73	1.49
3) Youth arrive to meetings/events on time	3.27	1.27	3.45	1.21
4) Youth are given few or no responsibilities for specific tasks or assignments. (*)	2.18	1.25	1.91	1.14
5) Youth rely on themselves to make key decisions.	3.09	1.04	3.45	1.04
6) Youth have access to information that is needed to make decisions.	3.64	1.29	4.18	.98

Statements	Youth (n=11)		Youth (n=11)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
7) Youth almost never discuss their concerns about group decisions. (*)	3.18	1.25	2.27	1.19
8) Youth almost always share ideas about things that matter to them.	4.18	.87	4.36	1.21
9) Youth do not have an equal vote in decision-making process. (*)	3.36	.92	2.73	1.49
10) Youth help one another learn/develop new skills.	4.27	.79	4.73	.47
11) Youth are not fully committed to their duties. (*)	2.55	.82	2.73	1.10
12) Youth are very excited about in their involvement with community projects.	3.27	1.42	4.27	.90
13) Youth are not concerned with community change. (*)	2.36	1.36	1.73	.65

*Note.* 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. \* Negative statement.

The adult responses are shown in Table 4.4. The table shows the item by item analysis for each statement with the average mean and standard deviation for all adult respondents. The data was once again reported on the five point Summated Rating Scale with the reported means being on that five point scale. The negative statement are not reverse coded, and they are marked with an asterisk (\*) to signify negative statements.

**Table 4-4.**  
**Item Responses Regarding Youth Involvement Perception of Adults, Pre and Post Youth Summit**

Statements	Adult ( <i>n</i> =10) Pre		Adult ( <i>n</i> =10) Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1) Youth take lots of initiative when working on community projects.	3.33	1.00	3.33	1.32
2) Youth very often are sitting around with nothing to do. (*)	3.1	1.10	2.9	1.29
3) Youth arrive to meetings/events on time	3.8	.79	3.38	.79
4) Youth are given few or no responsibilities for specific tasks or assignments. (*)	2.3	.95	2.2	1.03
5) Youth rely on themselves to make key decisions.	2.7	1.16	2.7	1.06
6) Youth have access to information that is needed to make decisions.	3.0	1.05	3.5	.97
7) Youth almost never discuss their concerns about group decisions. (*)	2.4	.97	2.2	.92
8) Youth almost always share ideas about things that matter to them.	3.4	1.17	3.7	1.16
9) Youth do not have an equal vote in decision-making process. (*)	3.0	1.15	3.11	1.67
10) Youth help one another learn/develop new skills.	3.9	.57	4.0	.67
11) Youth are not fully committed to their duties. (*)	2.7	.82	2.78	.83
12) Youth are very excited about in their involvement with community projects.	3.3	.82	3.9	.99
13) Youth are not concerned with community change. (*)	2.0	.67	1.7	.48

*Note.* 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. \* Negative statement.

### ***Adult Involvement in Community-Based Youth Programs***

The youth and adults rated the adult involvement on the five point Summated Rating Scale. The results of the responses youth pre and post summit perceptions are listed on Table 4-5, and the adult responses on pre and post youth summit perceptions are listed on Table 4-6. There were eight statements, with both positive and negative statements, denoted by an asterisk (\*), on adult involvement. The youth responses regarding adult involvement are shown in Table 4-5.

**Table 4-5.**  
**Item Responses Regarding Adult Involvement Perception of Youth Pre and Post Youth Summit**

Statements	Youth ( <i>n</i> =11) Pre		Youth ( <i>n</i> =11) Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
14) Adults Display a willingness to accept and nurture youth leadership.	3.27	.90	3.73	.79
15) Adults display tendency to want to guide youth.	3.73	1.27	4.27	.79
16) Adults almost always take over everything when working on project activities.	3.09	1.14	2.54	1.04
17) Adults learn new skills from one another.	3.64	.81	3.91	.70
18) Adults almost never take the ideas of youth seriously. (*)	3.1	.88	2.6	1.07
19) Adults encourage youth to come up with ideas.	3.36	1.03	4.0	1.18
20) Adults have little or no interest in being involved with community projects. (*)	2.27	.79	2.27	1.01
21) Adults are very concerned with community change.	4.09	.83	4.18	.60

*Note.* 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. \* Negative statement.

The adult responses are shown in Table 4-6. The negative statements were not reverse coded and are denoted by the asterisk (\*).

**Table 4-6.**  
**Adult Involvement Perception of Adults Pre and Post Youth Summit.**

Statements	Adult ( <i>n</i> =10) Pre		Adult ( <i>n</i> =10) Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
14) Adults Display a willingness to accept and nurture youth leadership.	3.6	.97	4.2	.42
15) Adults display tendency to want to guide youth.	4.2	.42	4.2	.42
16) Adults almost always take over everything when working on project activities.	3.6	.84	3.1	.88
17) Adults learn new skills from one another.	3.9	1.10	3.9	1.10
Table 4-6 ( <i>continued</i> ).				
18) Adults almost never take the ideas of youth seriously. (*)	2.6	1.07	2.2	.92
19) Adults encourage youth to come up with ideas.	4.0	.67	4.2	.63
20) Adults have little or no interest in being involved with community projects. (*)	1.9	.88	2	1.05
21) Adults are very concerned with community change.	3.9	1.10	4	.94

*Note.* 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. \* Negative statement.

### ***Youth-Adult Interaction in Community-Based Youth Programs***

The third and final section of the constructs was the Youth-Adult Interactions section. This section dealt with less about youth or adult involvement, but more on the interaction between the youth and adults, which is central to youth/adult partnerships. The respondents scored their perceptions on the same five point Summated Rating Scale as with the youth and



adult involvement constructs. The respondents answered seventeen statements on perceptions of youth-adult interactions pre and post Georgia Youth Summit.

Table 4-7 lists the mean and standard deviation for the pre and post summit youth-adult interaction perceptions for the youth respondents. The statements are mixed as well with positive and negative statements on youth-adult interaction. Negative statements are not reverse coded and are denoted with an asterisk on Table 4-7.

**Table 4-7.**  
**Youth-Adult Interaction Perception of Youth Pre and Post Youth Summit**

Statements	Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)		Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
22) Youth and adults get along well together.	3.18	0.87	3.91	0.7
23) Youth seem comfortable working with adults.	3.09	0.83	3.36	0.92
24) Adults seem comfortable working with youth.	3.55	0.93	3.82	0.75
25) Adults do not consult with youth on project activities. (*)	2.36	0.67	2.09	0.94
26) Adults provide direction and mentoring for youth.	3.82	0.87	4.36	0.5
27) Youth almost always go along with the decisions of adults.	2.73	1.1	3.09	0.83
28) Youth and adults very often agree on most decisions.	2.55	0.69	3.27	0.79
29) Youth rely on the experiences of adults when making decisions.	3.09	0.83	3.27	1.01
30) Youth make decisions based on their own experiences.	3.73	1.19	4	1.1
31) Youth and adults work separately on project tasks. (*)	2.45	0.82	2.27	1.1

Statements	Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)		Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
32) Youth and adults learn a lot from one another.	3.73	0.79	4.55	0.52
33) Youth and adults very frequently help one another develop new skills.	3.45	1.29	4.27	0.65
34) Adults are not at all considerate of youth opinions. (*)	2.64	1.03	2.36	1.03
35) Youth are not at all considerate of adults' opinions. (*)	2.27	1.01	2	0.89
36) Youth and adults almost always engage in respectful conversation.	3.18	1.17	3.73	0.79
37) Youth do not trust adults to handle power responsibly. (*)	2.36	0.81	2.64	1.03
38) Adults trust youth to handle power responsibly.	2.27	1.1	3	1

*Note.* 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. \* Negative statement.

The adult responses for youth-adult interaction are shown in Table 4-8. The mean and standard deviations for responses to each statement are listed on Table 4-8. The respondents again responded to statements on the five point Summated Rating Scale. The responses were both positive and negative, with negative statement not reverse coded and denoted with an asterisk (\*) on Table 4-8.

**Table 4-8.**  
**Youth-Adult Interaction Perception of Adults Pre and Post Youth Summit**

Statements	Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)		Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
22) Youth and adults get along well together.	3.70	0.95	4.00	0.67

Statements	Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)		Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
23) Youth seem comfortable working with adults.	3.20	1.23	3.80	1.03
24) Adults seem comfortable working with youth.	3.20	1.14	3.70	0.95
25) Adults do not consult with youth on project activities. (*)	2.70	1.25	2.10	0.74
26) Adults provide direction and mentoring for youth.	4.20	0.42	4.20	0.42
27) Youth almost always go along with the decisions of adults.	2.20	0.79	2.70	0.95
28) Youth and adults very often agree on most decisions.	2.30	0.67	2.90	0.74
29) Youth rely on the experiences of adults when making decisions.	3.20	0.92	3.70	1.06
30) Youth make decisions based on their own experiences.	4.00	0.47	3.90	0.32
31) Youth and adults work separately on project tasks. (*)	3.00	0.94	2.70	1.06
32) Youth and adults learn a lot from one another.	4.20	1.03	4.40	0.52
33) Youth and adults very frequently help one another develop new skills.	4.00	0.67	4.10	0.57
34) Adults are not at all considerate of youth opinions. (*)	2.50	1.58	2.30	1.57
35) Youth are not at all considerate of adults' opinions. (*)	2.60	1.58	2.40	1.51
36) Youth and adults almost always engage in respectful conversation	3.60	1.07	3.80	1.03
37) Youth do not trust adults to handle power responsibly (*)	2.50	1.08	2.60	1.26

Statements	Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)		Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)	
	Pre		Post	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
38) Adults trust youth to handle power responsibly	2.70	1.06	3.10	0.88

*Note.* 1 =Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree. \* Negative statement.

### **Analysis of Constructs With Respect to Population Demographics**

A statistical analysis was performed on the responses with SPSS. The analysis was conducted with respect to the demographics of the population. In the analysis the negative statements were reverse coded to give a mean and standard deviation for the entire construct section. The construct, youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction, were analyzed with regards to generational group, sex, experience working with youth-adult partnerships, racial classification, and community background. Youth comparison to adults was divided out into youth (*n*=11) and adults (*n*=10) for each construct, all other demographics were compared with the constructs consisting of all respondents (*n*=21).

#### ***Mean and Standard Deviations for Constructs***

The mean and standard deviation for each construct are listed in Table 4-9. The data in Table 4-9 is divided by youth (*n*=11), adults (*n*=10), and total respondents (*n*= 21). The constructs were subdivided into pre and post responses to the questions. Youth involvement construct consisted of 13 questions, adult involvement construct had eight questions, and the youth-adult interactions construct had 17 questions. The mean and standard deviation are broke out for pre and post perceptions. The mean is reported in a range of five to sixty-five for the youth involvement construct, five to forty for the adult construct, and five to eighty-five for the

youth-adult interaction construct. The standard deviation is based on the spread of their respected means and not in the five point scale as listed in item by item analysis section.

The data showed an increase in mean for each construct of post summit perception over pre summit perception for youth, adults and total respondents. All standard deviations had a decrease from pre summit to post summit perceptions, except for total respondent standard deviation for adult involvement and which was an increase in standard deviation. However, the data showed an increase in perception of each construct, youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction, in youth, adults and total respondents from pre summit to post summit perceptions. The standard deviations decreased, except for total respondents' standard deviation on adult involvement, youth respondents' standard deviation for adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction which rose in standard deviation.

**Table 4-9.**  
**Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction, as perceived by youth, adults and the entire total respondents.**

		Youth ( <i>n</i> =11)		Adult ( <i>n</i> =10)		Total ( <i>n</i> =21)	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Youth involvement	Pre	44.18	6.66	43.90	7.52	44.05	6.90
	Post	50.55	5.77	46.00	5.35	48.38	5.91
Adult involvement	Pre	27.64	4.30	29.50	3.87	28.52	4.11
	Post	30.55	5.18	31.20	3.43	30.86	4.34

		Youth (n=11)		Adult (n=10)		Total (n=21)	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Youth-adult interaction	Pre	56.27	7.59	57.20	10.89	56.71	9.08
	Post	63.27	7.94	62.20	7.50	62.76	7.56

*Note.* Scale of individual items ranged from 1 to 5. For youth involvement (13 items), the construct ranged from 13 to 65, adult involvement (8 items), the construct ranged from 8 to 40, and for youth-adult interaction (17 items), the construct ranged from 17 to 85.

### ***Comparison of Perception Changes of Youth and Adults for the Constructs***

An analysis was performed on SPSS for the constructs in regards to youth and adult perceptions pre summit and post summit (Table 4-10). The response rate for the youth was 11 and the response rate for adults was 10. The responses were assigned a mean and standard deviation for pre summit and post summit responses to the statements in the constructs. Negative statements were reversed coded to reflect the same as positive statements. The means are reported on Table 4-10 in a range of five to sixty-five for the youth involvement construct, five to forty for the adult construct, and five to eighty-five for the youth-adult interaction construct. Standard deviations for the responses follow are expressed in terms of the total numerical range and not the five point Summated Rating Scale. T-test, Degrees of Freedom, and Significance were assigned to each construct when comparing pre summit and post summit responses for youth and adults.

The results of the analysis are listed on Table 4-10. The data is listed by construct with respect to generational group with subdivisions for pre summit and post summit responses. The mean for pre summit and post summit responses for each construct, for youth and adults, was compared and saw an increase from pre to post. Standard deviation for the pre summit and post summit responses for each construct, for youth and adults, comparison of pre and post saw a

decrease, meaning narrowing of dispersion of responses, except for youth perception on adult involvement and youth perception on youth-adult interaction which saw an increase in standard deviation. The following comparisons showed a significant change in perception from pre summit to post summit perceptions : Youth perception of youth involvement ( $p=.002$ ), Youth perception of adult involvement ( $p=.027$ ), adult perception of adult involvement ( $p=.008$ ), youth perception of youth-adult interaction ( $p=.001$ ), and adult perception of youth adult interaction ( $p=.011$ ). Adult perception of youth involvement ( $p=.181$ ) did not show a significant change in perception.

**Table 4-10.**  
**Pre-Post Comparison of Perceptions of Youth and Adults on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction.**

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Youth involvement							
Youth	Pre	11	44.18	6.66	-4.14	10	.002
	Post	11	50.55	5.77	-----	-----	-----
Adults	Pre	10	43.90	7.52	-1.45	9	.181
	Post	10	46.00	5.35	-----	-----	-----
Adult involvement							
Youth	Pre	11	27.64	4.3	-2.59	10	.027
	Post	11	30.55	5.18	-----	-----	-----
Adult	Pre	10	29.50	3.87	-3.43	9	.008
	Post	10	31.20	3.43	-----	-----	-----
Youth-adult interaction							
Youth	Pre	11	56.27	7.59	-4.97	10	.001
	Post	11	63.27	7.94	-----	-----	-----

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Adult	Pre	10	57.20	10.89	-3.21	9	.011
	Post	10	62.20	7.50	-----	-----	-----

*Note.* Scale of individual items ranged from 1 to 5. For youth involvement (13 items), the construct ranged from 13 to 65, adult involvement (8 items), the construct ranged from 8 to 40, and for youth-adult interaction (17 items), the construct ranged from 17 to 85.

### ***Comparison of Perceptions of Females and Males for the Constructs***

An analysis was performed for each construct in regards to sex for pre summit and post summit responses (Table 4-11). The number of respondents for the males was three and for females were 18. The responses were assigned a mean and standard deviation for pre summit and post summit responses to the statements in the constructs by male and female respondents. Negative statements were reversed coded to reflect the same as positive statements. The means are reported on Table 4-11 in a range of thirteen to sixty-five for the youth involvement construct, eight to forty for the adult construct, and seventeen to eighty-five for the youth-adult interaction construct. Standard deviations for the responses follow are expressed in terms of the total numerical range and not the five point Summated Rating Scale. T-test, Degrees of Freedom, and Significance are shown for each construct when comparing female and male responses for pre summit and post summit perceptions. The comparisons were for female and males for pre summit perception and female to male for post summit perception in each construct.

The responses were analyzed and are listed in Table 4-11. The data is reported on Table 4-11 with regards to pre and post summit in each construct with subdivisions for female and male respondents. For youth involvement perception pre summit, females had the higher mean ( $M=44.5$ ) while males had the smaller standard deviation ( $SD=4.62$ ), there was no significant ( $p=.48$ ) perception difference between the two sexes. Youth involvement post summit had



females with the higher mean ( $M=48.61$ ) and smaller standard deviation ( $SD=5.38$ ), but there was no significant ( $p=.67$ ) difference between the two sexes. Adult involvement pre summit responses showed a larger mean ( $M=28.83$ ) for the females and smaller standard deviation ( $SD=1.53$ ) for the males, no significant ( $p=.41$ ) difference between the two sexes. Females had a higher mean ( $M=31.06$ ) for adult involvement post summit perception between the two sexes, but males has a smaller standard deviation ( $SD=3.06$ ), no significant ( $p=.62$ ) difference between the two sexes. Youth-adult interaction pre summit perception mean was higher in males ( $M=57.00$ ) and females had a smaller standard deviation ( $SD=8.76$ ), no significant ( $p=.96$ ) difference between sexes. In youth-adult interaction post perceptions males had the higher mean ( $M=65.00$ ), while females had the smaller standard deviation ( $SD=7.66$ ), no significant ( $p=.59$ ) difference between the sexes. The analysis showed there was not a significant difference between male and females, however, females tended to have higher means, while males had less dispersion and lower standard deviations.

**Table 4-11.**  
**Comparison of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Males and Females on Pre and Post Summit Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction.**

		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Youth involvement (overall)							
Pre	Female	18	44.50	7.21	.73	19	.48
	Male	3	41.33	4.62	-----	-----	-----
Post	Female	18	48.61	5.38	.43	19	.67
	Male	3	47.00	10.00	-----	-----	-----
Adult involvement (overall)							
Pre	Female	18	28.83	4.34	.84	19	.41
	Male	3	26.67	1.53	-----	-----	-----
Post	Female	18	31.06	4.56	.50	19	.62
	Male	3	29.67	3.06	-----	-----	-----

		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Youth-adult interaction (overall)							
Pre	Female	18	56.67	8.76	-.06	19	.96
	Male	3	57.00	13.11	-----	-----	-----
Post	Female	18	62.39	7.66	-.54	19	.59
	Male	3	65.00	8.00	-----	-----	-----

*Note.* Scale of individual items ranged from 1 to 5. For youth involvement (13 items), the construct ranged from 13 to 65, adult involvement (8 items), the construct ranged from 8 to 40, and for youth-adult interaction (17 items), the construct ranged from 17 to 85.

### ***Comparison of Perception of Experience Level for the Constructs***

The constructs of youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction were analyzed against experience level. Respondents stated in their demographic data if they were new or had experience with youth/adult partnerships. The data was analyzed evaluating pre summit and post summit perceptions in the constructs with subdivision to the experience level. The data in Table 4-12 shows the comparisons between novice ( $n=5$ ) and experienced ( $n=16$ ) for pre summit perceptions for each construct, and between novice ( $n=5$ ) and experienced ( $n=16$ ) for post summit perceptions for each construct. Table 4-12 illustrates the mean and standard deviation for the novice and experienced respondents in each construct, pre summit and post summit. The means are reported on Table 4-12 in a range of five to sixty-five for the youth involvement construct, five to forty for the adult construct, and five to eighty-five for the youth-adult interaction construct. The standard deviation is based on the spread of their respected means and not in the five point scale as listed in item by item analysis section. T-test, Degrees of Freedom, and Significance were assigned to each construct when comparing female and male responses for pre summit and post summit perceptions. Negative statements were reverse coded to reflect the same as positive statements.

The data analyzed is reported in Table 4-12. The data is listed in regards to each construct, pre summit and post summit perceptions, and experience level. The mean for pre summit youth involvement perception was higher ( $M=46.4$ ) in novice respondents, but the standard deviation was lower in experienced respondents ( $SD=5.03$ ), no significant ( $p=.4$ ) difference between experienced was found. Youth involvement post summit perception had novice with the highest mean with 50.80 and novice was lower standard deviation with 4.82, no significant ( $p=.31$ ) difference in experience was found. Novice had the higher mean ( $M=29.4$ ) and experience had the smaller standard deviation ( $SD=3.19$ ) for perception of adult involvement pre summit, no significant ( $p=.6$ ) difference was found between the experience levels. Novice had the higher mean ( $M=32.4$ ) and standard deviation ( $SD=4.22$ ) for post summit perception of adult involvement, no significant ( $p=.38$ ) difference between experience levels. For youth-adult interaction pre summit perceptions, novice had the higher mean ( $M=57.80$ ) and experienced respondents had a lower standard deviation with 8.83, no significant ( $p=.77$ ) difference between experience levels. For post summit perceptions of youth-adult interactions the mean ( $M=62.8$ ) was higher in novice respondents and standard deviation ( $SD=6.8$ ) was smaller in novice respondents. No significant ( $p=.99$ ) difference between experience level was shown. The data showed there was no significant difference between beginner and experienced respondents; however, novice had higher means, while experienced had smaller standard deviations which would show the experience level respondents are not dispersed in their answers and novice respondents.

**Table 4-12.**

**Comparison of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Novice and Experienced Respondents on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction.**

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Youth involvement (overall)							
Pre	Novice	5	46.40	11.59	.87	19	.40
	Experienced	16	43.31	5.03	-----	-----	-----
Post	Novice	5	50.80	4.82	1.05	19	.31
	Experienced	16	47.63	6.15	-----	-----	-----
Adult involvement (overall)							
Pre	Novice	5	29.40	6.69	.54	19	.60
	Experienced	16	28.25	3.19	-----	-----	-----
Post	Novice	5	32.40	4.22	.91	19	.38
	Experienced	16	30.38	4.40	-----	-----	-----
Youth-adult interaction (overall)							
Pre	Novice	5	57.80	10.85	.30	19	.77
	Experienced	16	56.38	8.83	-----	-----	-----
Post	Novice	5	62.80	6.80	.01	19	.99
	Experienced	16	62.75	7.99	-----	-----	-----

*Note.* Scale of individual items ranged from 1 to 5. For youth involvement (13 items), the construct ranged from 13 to 65, adult involvement (8 items), the construct ranged from 8 to 40, and for youth-adult interaction (17 items), the construct ranged from 17 to 85.

### ***Comparison of Perception of Racial Classification for the Constructs***

An ANOVA comparison was analyzed on the constructs of youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth adult interaction with racial classification. The data was analyzed with regards to the constructs with pre summit and post summit perceptions with subdivisions on race for comparison. Table 4-13 shows the response number, mean, and standard deviation for each race stated in the respondents, as well as f values, degrees of freedom, and significance were assigned for each pre summit and post summit perceptions in each construct. The number of respondents for each racial classification was Black/African American ( $n=4$ ), White/Caucasian

( $n=16$ ), and Hispanic or Latino ( $n=1$ ). The responses were assigned a mean and standard deviation for pre summit and post summit responses to the statements in the constructs. Negative statements were reversed coded to reflect the same as positive statements. The means are reported on Table 4-13 in a range of five to sixty-five for the youth involvement construct, five to forty for the adult construct, and five to eighty-five for the youth-adult interaction construct. Standard deviations for the responses follow are expressed in terms of the total numerical range and not the five point Summated Rating Scale. F score, Degrees of Freedom, and Significance were assigned to each construct when comparing pre summit and post summit responses for youth and adults. No standard deviations are stated for Hispanic or Latino with only one respondent.

The data that was analyzed is stated on Table 4-13. The data is listed in regards to each construct, pre summit and post summit perceptions, and racial classification. For pre summit and perception of youth involvement White/Caucasian respondents had the highest mean ( $M=44.69$ ) and lowest standard deviation ( $SD=6.18$ ). There was no significant ( $p=.49$ ) difference between the race of the respondents for pre summit perceptions of respondents. Post summit perceptions likewise showed involvement White/Caucasian respondents had the highest mean ( $M=49.0$ ) and lowest standard deviation ( $SD=5.56$ ). There was no significant ( $p=.14$ ) difference between the race of the respondents for post perceptions of youth involvement. The mean was highest in White/Caucasian respondents ( $M=29.38$ ) and standard deviation was lower in Black/African American respondents ( $SD=3.92$ ) for adult involvement pre summit perceptions, with no significant ( $p=.24$ ) difference between race of the respondents and pre summit perceptions on the respondents on adult involvement. For adult involvement post summit perception White/Caucasian respondents had the higher mean ( $M=31.31$ ) and Black/African American

respondents had a lower standard deviation ( $SD=2.58$ ), there was no significant ( $p=.60$ ) difference between the race of the respondents for post summit perceptions of adult involvement. The youth-adult interaction pre summit perception mean was higher in White/Caucasian ( $M=58.0$ ) and Black/African American had a lower standard deviation ( $SD=7.52$ ), there was no significant ( $p=.27$ ) difference between the race of the respondents for pre summit and post summit perceptions of youth-adult interactions. Post summit perception for youth-adult interaction Black/African American respondents had a higher mean ( $M=63.25$ ) and standard deviation ( $SD=7.76$ ), there was no significant ( $p=.76$ ) difference between the race of the respondents for pre summit and post summit perceptions on youth-adult interactions. Overall the White/Caucasian respondents had a higher mean in responses, while Black/African American respondents had lower standard deviation with less dispersion of responses as compared to the other racial classification responses. There was no significant difference between the respondents based on race between pre summit and post summit perception for the constructs. No standard deviation could be measured for Hispanic or Latino respondents due to one respondent being Hispanic or Latino.

**Table 4-13.**  
**ANOVA Comparisons of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined) Racial Classification on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction.**

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
Youth involvement (overall)							
Pre	Black/African American	4	43.50	10.12	.74	20	.49
	White/Caucasian	16	44.69	6.18	-----	-----	-----
	Hispanic or Latino	1	36.00	.	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	44.05	6.90	-----	-----	-----
Post	Black/African American	4	48.75	5.74	2.18	20	.14
	White/Caucasian	16	49.00	5.56	-----	-----	-----
	Hispanic or Latino	1	37.00	.	-----	-----	-----

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>
	Total	21	48.38	5.91	-----	-----	-----
Adult involvement (overall)							
Pre	Black/African American	4	26.00	3.92	1.55	20	.24
	White/Caucasian	16	29.38	4.01	-----	-----	-----
	Hispanic or Latino	1	25.00	.	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	28.52	4.11	-----	-----	-----
Post	Black/African American	4	30.00	2.58	.54	20	.60
	White/Caucasian	16	31.31	4.73	-----	-----	-----
	Hispanic or Latino	1	27.00	.	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	30.86	4.34	-----	-----	-----
Youth-adult interaction (overall)							
Pre	Black/African American	4	55.00	7.62	1.43	20	.27
	White/Caucasian	16	58.00	9.12	-----	-----	-----
	Hispanic or Latino	1	43.00	.	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	56.71	9.08	-----	-----	-----
Post	Black/African American	4	63.25	7.76	.29	20	.76
	White/Caucasian	16	63.00	7.86	-----	-----	-----
	Hispanic or Latino	1	57.00	.	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	62.76	7.56	-----	-----	-----

*Note.* Scale of individual items ranged from 1 to 5. For youth involvement (13 items), the construct ranged from 13 to 65, adult involvement (8 items), the construct ranged from 8 to 40, and for youth-adult interaction (17 items), the construct ranged from 17 to 85.

### ***Comparison of Perception of Community Background for the Constructs***

An ANOVA comparison was performed to analyze the perceptions of respondents with respect to community background. Analysis was performed comparing background of respondents in pre summit and post summit perceptions in each construct. Table 4-14 illustrates this data with construct divided out into pre summit and post summit perceptions with subdivision on community background. The community background, or community classification, was divided as rural (farm), rural (no farm), suburban, urban, and other. The total response pool was 21 respondents, with rural (farm) consisting of five respondent, rural (no farm) consisting of five respondents, suburban consisting of four respondents, urban consisting

of four respondents, and other consisting of three respondents. The responses were assigned a mean and standard deviation for pre summit and post summit responses to the statements in the constructs. Negative statements were reversed coded to reflect the same as positive statements. The means are reported on Table 4-14 in a range of five to sixty-five for the youth involvement construct, five to forty for the adult construct, and five to eighty-five for the youth-adult interaction construct. Standard deviations for the responses follow are expressed in terms of the total numerical range and not the five point Summated Rating Scale. F score, Degrees of Freedom, and Significance were assigned to each construct when comparing pre summit and post summit responses for youth and adults.

The data that was analyzed is stated on Table 4-14. The data is listed in regards to each construct, pre summit and post summit perceptions, and racial classification. For youth involvement suburban respondents had the higher mean ( $M=49.75$ ). No significant ( $p=.212$ ) difference was found between community groupings and pre youth summit perceptions of youth involvement. Post youth summit had rural (no farm) with the highest mean ( $M=50.80$ ). There was no significant ( $p=.771$ ) difference in community groups in respect to post youth summit perceptions of youth involvement. Suburban respondents had this highest mean ( $M=30.75$ ) for pre summit perceptions of adult involvement, and rural (farm) had the lower standard deviation ( $SD=2.7$ ). No significant ( $p=.407$ ) difference was found between community groupings and pre youth summit perceptions of adult involvement. For adult involvement post summit perceptions suburban respondents had the higher mean ( $M=33.5$ ) and rural (no farm) had the lower standard deviation ( $SD=1.58$ ). No significant ( $p=.252$ ) difference was found between community groupings and post youth summit perceptions of adult involvement. Youth-adult interaction pre summit perceptions of respondents classifying as other had a higher mean ( $M=67.0$ ) and post



summit youth-adult interactions respondents classifying as other again had the higher mean ( $M=70.0$ ). Standard deviation for youth adult interaction was higher in pre summit perceptions in rural (no farm) respondents ( $SD=5.31$ ), and in post summit perception urban respondents had a lower standard deviation ( $SD=4.5$ ). There was a significant difference between community groups in pre summit perceptions ( $p=.026$ ) and post summit perceptions ( $p=.033$ ) for youth-adult interactions. The data showed a different community groups having higher standard deviations and means. Suburban had higher means in pre summit and post summit adult involvement perception and pre summit youth perceptions, while respondents classifying themselves as other had higher means on youth-adult interaction. Rural (farm) and rural (no farm), and other had smaller standard deviations, which showed less dispersion of responses by the community groups. There was significant difference in community groups in perceptions of youth-adult interactions pre summit and post summit. However, groupings were left with small respondents, so limited interpretation of the data can be made.

**Table 4-14.**  
**ANOVA Comparisons of Perceptions of Overall (Youth and Adults Combined)**  
**Background/Area Classification on Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-**  
**Adult Interaction.**

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Youth involvement (overall)							
Pre	Rural (farm)	5	40.40	2.07	1.64	20	.212
	Rural (no farm)	5	46.20	6.76	-----	-----	-----
	Suburban	4	49.75	8.66	-----	-----	-----
	Urban	4	40.25	9.11	-----	-----	-----
	Other	3	44.00	1.00	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	44.05	6.90	-----	-----	-----
Post	Rural (farm)	5	47.20	6.30	.45	20	.771
	Rural (no farm)	5	50.80	5.45	-----	-----	-----
	Suburban	4	50.00	7.30	-----	-----	-----
	Urban	4	46.25	7.93	-----	-----	-----
	Other	3	47.00	1.00	-----	-----	-----

		<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
	Total	21	48.38	5.91	-----	-----	-----
Adult involvement (overall)							
Pre	Rural (farm)	5	26.40	2.70	1.06	20	.407
	Rural (no farm)	5	29.80	2.77	-----	-----	-----
	Suburban	4	30.75	4.35	-----	-----	-----
	Urban	4	26.50	5.97	-----	-----	-----
	Other	3	29.67	4.62	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	28.52	4.11	-----	-----	-----
Post	Rural (farm)	5	28.00	5.83	1.49	20	.252
	Rural (no farm)	5	33.00	1.58	-----	-----	-----
	Suburban	4	33.50	4.73	-----	-----	-----
	Urban	4	29.25	3.30	-----	-----	-----
	Other	3	30.67	3.79	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	30.86	4.34	-----	-----	-----
Youth-adult interaction (overall)							
Pre	Rural (farm)	5	51.20	5.31	3.67	20	.026
	Rural (no farm)	5	55.60	5.55	-----	-----	-----
	Suburban	4	63.25	7.18	-----	-----	-----
	Urban	4	50.75	8.58	-----	-----	-----
	Other	3	67.00	11.14	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	56.71	9.08	-----	-----	-----
Post	Rural (farm)	5	56.80	4.71	3.45	20	.033
	Rural (no farm)	5	62.40	6.15	-----	-----	-----
	Suburban	4	68.75	7.18	-----	-----	-----
	Urban	4	59.25	4.50	-----	-----	-----
	Other	3	70.00	8.89	-----	-----	-----
	Total	21	62.76	7.56	-----	-----	-----

*Note.* Scale of individual items ranged from 1 to 5. For youth involvement (13 items), the construct ranged from 13 to 65, adult involvement (8 items), the construct ranged from 8 to 40, and for youth-adult interaction (17 items), the construct ranged from 17 to 85.

### Open-Ended Response Questions

The youth and adults were posed two open-ended response questions. The questions were intended to allow youth and adults to express their feeling and perceptions in a qualitative response. This allowed for youth and adults to state the way they felt about youth/adult partnerships. The qualitative data was evaluated by the researcher, and Table 4-15 shows the

results on these questions, grouped by theme in a domain analysis. The researcher looked at the results for themes, such as respect, communication, etc., in the responses by the respondents. The themes were derived from responses after review off all responses to the qualitative questions. Themes were combined and multiple listings are stated in Table 4-15. The questions were: 1) What are, in your opinion, the most important characteristics of successful youth/adult partnerships? 2) How can youth/adult partnerships be enhanced?

**Table 4-15.**  
**Responses to Open-Ended Qualitative Questions**

Question 1	Question 2
(3 responses) Listening to one another	Gain appreciation of the opposite generational group
(2 responses) Following through with work/responsibility	(4 responses) More communication
(3 responses) Compassion and Understanding	(2 responses) Proper planning and preparation
(2 responses) Value youth as capable part of youth/adult partnerships	(4 responses) Build respect between youth and adults
(4 responses) Open communication	(2 responses) Adults promote young peoples development
(4 responses) Respect	(2 responses) Listening to one another
(8 responses) Working together/cooperation	Build cooperation
Honesty	(4 responses) More experience between youth and adults
(4 responses) Open-minded	Understanding how youth/adult partnerships work
(2 responses) Shared leadership	
Creativity	
Team Work	

*Note.* Question 1 related to the question on opinion on important characteristics of youth/adult partnership and Question 2 related to enhancing youth adult partnership.

The responses were varied among the youth and adults. For the question on opinion of important characteristics of successful youth/adult partnerships, cooperation and working together received the most responses ( $n=8$ ). Overall cooperation is an important part of the youth/adult partnership to the respondents. Likewise, the youth and adults felt respect ( $n=4$ ), communication ( $n=4$ ), and experience ( $n=4$ ) were essential in enhancing youth/adult partnerships. Cooperation was not the most listed theme by youth and adults for enhancing youth/adult partnerships; however, essential elements of cooperation, respect, communication, and experience were listed more. Experience, communication, and respect are a foundation for sound cooperation, which shows youth and adults feel solid foundations need to be created to enhance youth/adult partnerships to have sound cooperation in successful youth/adult partnerships.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Introduction**

As youth/ adult partnerships become a central, if not the central component of youth development, care must be taken to ensure this partnership is done right. A method to evaluate this, which this study utilized, gauges the perceptions of youth and adults on their feelings in their local communities. Since 4-H is built on its strength as a grass roots organization, the youth/adult partnerships must be reaching their potential on the local level. There may be evidence that these partnerships are valid and necessary in modern youth development programs, but they are only as effective as their local implementation.

Using *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* (Jones & Perkins, 2005; Jones & Perkins 2006), the researcher was to gauge perceptions of youth and adults. The sample population came from the local Georgia Youth Summit Teams. This chapter will summarize and review the research purpose, methods, findings, as well as provide conclusions and recommendations.

#### **Purpose and Objectives of Study**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the perceptions of youth and adults in youth/adult partnerships in their local communities. This study was not only designed to gauge the partnership in the Youth Summit Team, but for youth and adults to gauge all youth and adults

participating in youth/adult partnerships in youth development programs in their local communities. By collecting data on demographics, youth involvement in community-based youth programs, adult involvement in community-based youth programs, and youth and adult interactions in the community-based youth programs, the researcher was able to provide data to use in evaluating perceptions of youth and adults in youth/adult partnerships in local communities.

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Describe selected background demographic characteristics, including sex, age, racial classification, background/area, location of respondents, participation level in the Georgia Youth Summit, youth development organizations involved with, previous experience working with youth/adult partnerships;
2. Describe the perception of the level of youth involvement in local youth development programs;
3. Describe the perception of the level of adult involvement in local youth development programs;
4. Describe the perception of the level of youth-adult interaction in local youth development programs.
5. Compare perceptions based on demographics for respondents.

## **Review of Methods**

125 youth and adult delegates to the Georgia Youth Summit volunteered to participate in the research. The group consisted of 25 Georgia Youth Summit teams, with an overall population of 25 adults and 100 youth. A total of 21 responses were received, or 16.8 %, with 11 responses from youth, or 11 %, and 10 % were received from adult delegates, or 40 %. A cross-sectional mixed methods, both quantitative and qualitative, survey examined the perceptions of youth and adults about youth/adult partnerships in their local communities, with emphasis given to youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction. The surveys were administered after the completion on the Georgia Youth Summit by mail and were returned over a four month period.

The cross-sectional survey, titled *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale* (Jones & Perkins 2005; Jones and Perkins, 2006), examined the perceptions of youth and adults on youth/adult partnerships in their local communities. (Appendix E). Respondents were provided 38 statements related to youth/adult partnerships, which included 13 statements on youth involvement, eight statements on adult involvement, and 17 statements on youth-adult interactions. The survey also had two qualitative response questions on perceptions.

The returned surveys were examined for completeness and stored. Responses were coded and analyzed to determine the responses to each question included in the survey. The quantitative responses were then analyzed, utilizing descriptive statistics through SPSS. The qualitative responses were analyzed by the researcher to gather themes of the responses and were computed and assigned numbers based on similarity of responses.

## **Summary of Findings**

The results of this study were consistent with the finding of Jones & Perkins, which showed positive views from youth and adults on youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interaction (2006). The significance (Table 4-10) showed there was significant perception change of youth and adults from pre summit to post summit perceptions except for adults' views on youth involvement. However, unlike Jones & Perkins (2006), perceptions were gauged retrospectively, and a component of perception changed was examined for youth and adults after their Georgia Youth Summit experience.

### ***Demographic Findings***

The results from the survey's demographics were utilized to polarize the responses of youth and adults. The demographic data was also utilized to understand the population background and dynamics. Of the 21 respondent, 14% ( $n=3$ ) were male and 86% ( $n=18$ ) were female. The adult responses ( $n=10$ ) consisted of 10% ( $n=1$ ) male and 90% ( $n=9$ ) female. The youth responses ( $n=11$ ) were 20% male ( $n=2$ ) and 82% female ( $n=9$ ).

Of the respondents the majority of respondents were either: 15-16 years old, 48%, and 31 years and older, 38%. This was in line with Jones & Perkins (2006) study which had similar age percentages. However, the response percentages for age, 53% total youth and 47% total adults, were not in similar to the delegate percentage of the Georgia Youth Summit of 71% youth and 29% adults (Georgia Youth Summit Executive Report, n.d.). The overall racial demographic, for the respondents, was 76% white/Caucasian, 19% black/African American, and 5% Hispanic or Latino. The youth racial classification was 73% white/Caucasian and 27% black/African



American, and the adult racial classification was 80% white/Caucasian, 10% black/African American, and 10% Hispanic or Latino.

When looking at background/area for the respondents, 62% of the overall population sample was rural and small towns while 38% of the population was from urban/suburban areas. The youth dynamic was 63% rural/small town areas and 36% urban/rural areas, while adults were 60% rural/small town areas and 40% urban/suburban areas. While there were more population from rural and small towns, which contradicts the population of Georgia centered larger in urban/suburban area, this is on key with county population classification. Georgia has more rural counties, and with suggested group size of 4 youth and 1 adult from all counties, this proportion is in line with dynamics of percentage of rural counties to urban/suburban counties, attending the Georgia Youth Summit, instead of population location. A larger percentage of the respondents, 53% came from southern counties in Georgia. The urban/suburban areas are mostly located in the northern counties of Georgia; therefore largest response pool came from southern counties.

There was a wide range of youth programs participated in. However, all respondents were involved with 4-H, which is not surprising since Georgia 4-H is the host organization and Rock Eagle 4-H Center is the location of the Georgia Youth Summit. The students are selected through their local Cooperative Extension Offices, so a 100% involvement is 4-H is to be expected. The other clubs listed for involvement also fit in line with the Georgia Youth Summit Executive Report's youth development organization list (Georgia Youth Summit Executive Report, n.d.).

Of the respondents overall 76% had previous experience with youth/adult partnerships, while 24% did not. Looking at generational grouping, 64% of youth had experience while 36% did not, and 90% of adults had experience while 10% did not. This shows there was some level of youth/adult partnerships prior to the Georgia Youth Summit.

The experience of youth and adults with youth development organizations and youth/adult partnerships was notable. While the population sample from returned respondents was low, the dynamics of the population had a level of diversification.

### ***Youth Involvement, Adult Involvement, and Youth-Adult Interaction Findings***

The youth involvement found a greater positive feeling of youth about youth involvement, as compared to the adults. The means for the mean response score for the youth was higher. The perceptions of the youth had a change between pre summit and post summit perspectives, based on the significance score of .002. The adults had no significant change in their perceptions from pre summit to post summit perceptions on youth involvement. For adult involvement adults had a higher mean for their responses, which showed a higher perception for the adults over the youth for adult involvement. There was a significant change in perception for both youth and adults in perceptions pre youth summit and post youth summit. For youth-adult interaction adults had a higher mean for responses on pre summit perception of youth-adult interaction, however, their standard deviation was highest of all answer sets, and likewise the youth had a higher mean for post summit perceptions on youth-adult interactions. Both showed alternating high perception level pre summit and post summit on youth-adult interactions. There was a significant change for both youth and adults on youth-adult interactions from pre summit perceptions to post summit perceptions.

Overall the youth had positive perceptions of youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interactions, with significant changes in perception as a result of Youth Summit experience. These changes showed that while a majority of the youth respondents had previous experience with youth/adult partnerships there was perception change, which would correlate to their awareness gained through the Georgia Youth Summit. This shows, within the sample population, there was positive learning on youth/adult partnerships by the youth.

The adults had positive perceptions on the three constructs, but showed no significant change in perception on youth involvement. The adult respondents had a significant change on perceptions from pre summit perception to post summit perceptions on adult involvement and youth-adult interaction as a result of their involvement in the Georgia Youth Summit.

The responses for the surveys returned were analyzed against the demographic data of the responses pool. The evaluation was to see if demographics played a role in perceptions of youth and adults on the three constructs.

The responses for males and females were compared with pre youth summit and post youth summit perceptions for the three constructs of the study. Females had higher means for youth and adult involvement, while males had high means for youth-adult interactions. There was no significant difference for the two sexes for any perceptions. No conclusion can be drawn that females significantly think better of youth and adult involvement or males think more significant of youth-adult interaction. The two sexes were closely aligned, with the only difference being a small range in means for the two sexes.

As with sex, the comparison of novice and experienced respondents on youth/adult partnerships to pre youth summit and post youth summit perceptions showed not significant

difference. The novice respondents had the higher mean when comparing the range between novice and experienced respondent perceptions for pre and post perceptions on the three construct, however there was no significant difference. The data showed that experience level for the response pooled played little effect on the perceptions of the respondents.

In terms of perceptions pre youth summit and post youth summit, race played little effect on the perceptions. While White/Caucasian and Black/African American respondents showed higher means when comparing the range of the three race classifications given, there was no significant difference. Therefore, in terms of perception for this response pool, race had little effect on the responses.

The demographic of community background, or community classification, was the only demographic outside of generational grouping that saw a significant difference. The means for the pre youth summit and post youth summit perceptions ranged, and different community grouping had higher means. Suburban and other (which was most classified as small town) showed greater means, with suburban having higher means in pre youth summit perceptions of youth involvement, pre youth and post youth summit perceptions of adult involvement, and the respondents classifying as other had higher means in youth-adult interaction. However, there was no significant difference in the community groupings for adults and youth involvement, but there was significant difference between community groups for youth-adult interaction. Background/area and structure for the response pool showed to have a level of significance for a difference in perceptions of the respondents on youth-adult interactions.

### ***Qualitative Response Summary***

While the Summated Rating Scale based quantitative analysis showed the perceptions of youth and adults to statements on youth involvement, adult involvement, and youth-adult interactions, which are both positive and negative factors affecting youth/adult partnerships, that were selected by Jones and Perkins (2005; 2006), there was no chance for youth and adults to respond descriptively to their perceptions on *The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale*. The researcher added two qualitative analysis to allow for independent thought and contribution from respondents. The respondents did not all state the same reasons, but many stated reasons behind good structure and enhancement of youth/adult partnerships were interrelated. The researcher evaluated each of the responses and looked for interrelating themes. The themes that arose were placed together, such as respect or communication, and number of times each theme was listed was noted.

The majority of respondents felt: 1) good cooperation was needed, or 2) they felt that essential elements of cooperation like communication, respect, compassion were vital to successful youth/adult partnership. Respondents also felt, as a majority, that good foundation was key to enhancing youth/adult partnerships, while good cooperation was not listed as much, the essential elements were. The researcher analyzed this as meaning the youth and adults felt that a strong foundation must be made, in design and enhancement, before good cooperation can begin. The qualitative analysis in the end showed strong interrelation between the beliefs of the respondents on successful youth/adult partnerships and enhancing youth/adult partnerships.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Results of this study show that in Georgia, youth and adults showed a perception that youth/adult partnerships are a positive venture in youth programming in their local communities. Youth/adult partnerships are thriving in the local communities, and through the respondent population, achieving the push of Georgia 4-H in incorporating youth/adult partnerships on the grass root level. This study also found that in respondents, the youth and adults showed a level of perception change on youth/adult partnerships, which can be attributed to their participation in the Georgia Youth Summit. This change gives some proof, in the respondent pool, that the Youth Summit is achieving its aim at educating youth/adult partnerships for civic engagement, and that the Summit may be improving perceptions of youth regarding youth-adult partnerships.

The assumption and generalization of these finding past the response population would be cautioned against by the researcher. With a response rate (16.8%), group volunteerism instead of selection for the survey pool, would limit the ability to generalize this past the response pool to the overall youth summit population, Georgia 4-H, or to other youth and adults in Georgia. However, with future analysis on youth summit teams and other youth/adult partnerships in Georgia 4-H, the data of this study can be utilized to provide insight for a need for more training and the level of trainings youth and adults need in youth/adult partnerships.

With little research into youth/adult partnership, this study intended to show if there were partnerships being implemented in Georgia, through the perceptions of the respondents. While the theory is in practice, there has been little evaluation in Georgia. This study was a step into evaluating practice of youth/adult partnerships in Georgia, specifically to Georgia 4-H. Further and future evaluations are needed to see if youth/adult partnerships are actively, correctly, and

positively being implemented into local communities. Also, evaluations of teams in future Georgia Youth Summits are needed to gauge the perception level of youth and adults on youth/adult partnerships in their community. With different participants in each summit, future analysis would lead to more overall diversified response pool.

Further analysis is also needed to see the effectiveness of the youth/adult partnerships training at the Georgia Youth Summit. With a limited pool, there is not an accurate sampling of the population. Future Georgia Youth Summits should utilize pre and post summit evaluations to gauge the level of perception change to see if data from this study is supported or rejected by larger and more diverse respondent pools.

## REFERENCES

- 4-H History Timeline (n.d.). Retrived March 14, 2009, from [http://4-h.org/b/uploads/4h\\_timelinepdf.pdf](http://4-h.org/b/uploads/4h_timelinepdf.pdf)
- Anderson, K. S. (August, 2008). Predictors and program outcomes of empowering practices of FFA chapter advisors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia. Retrieved April 24, 2009, from [http://dbs.galib.uga.edu/cgi-bin/ultimate.cgi?dbs=getd&userid=galileo&serverno=8&instcode=uga1&\\_cc=1](http://dbs.galib.uga.edu/cgi-bin/ultimate.cgi?dbs=getd&userid=galileo&serverno=8&instcode=uga1&_cc=1)
- Bowen, K. (2008, July). Volunteers needed for 2008 Georgia Youth Leadership Summit. Retrieved February 16, 2009, from <http://www.accg.org/content.asp?ContentId=906>
- Buckley, J. (2008, July). Georgia Youth Summit teaches civic engagements. *Georgia County Government*, 35-37.
- Camino, L (2000a). Putting youth-adult partnerships to work for community change. *CYD Journal*, 1(4), 27-31.
- Camino, L. (2000b). Youth-adult partnerships: entering new territory in community work and research. *Applied developmental Science*, 4(Suppl.1), 11-20.
- Camino, L. (2005). Pitfalls and promising practices of youth-adult partnerships: an evaluator's reflections. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1), 75-85.



- Camino, L., Zeldin, S. (2002) From periphery to center: pathways for youth civic engagement in the day-to-day life of communities. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 213-220.
- Denner, J., Meyer, B., & Bean, S. (2005). Young women's leadership alliance: youth-adult partnerships in an all-female after-school program. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1), 87-100.
- Einspruch, E., & Wunrow, J. (2002). Assessing youth/adult partnerships: the seven circles (AK) experience. *Journal of Drug Education*, 32(1), 1-12.
- Essential Elements of 4-H (n.d.). Retrived March 24, 2009, from <http://www.georgia4h.org/main/Headlines/EssentialElements4.pdf>
- Glover, S. & Herrington-Jackson, S. (1998). Listen up! Hear the voice of our youth! In Warkentin, R. & Rea, D. (Eds.). *Youth-Adult Partnerships Unity In Diversity* (pp.22-26). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Georgia 4-H History* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). (2009). The dunning company publishers.
- Georgia Youth Summit (n.d.). Retrived August 9, 2008, from <http://www.georgiayouthsummit.org/default.htm>
- Georgia Youth Summit Executive Report (n.d.). Retrieved April 3, 2009, from <http://www.georgiayouthsummit.org/pdfs/2008%20Georgia%20Youth%20Summit%20Executive%20Report.pdf>
- Ginwright, S. A. (2005). On urban ground: understanding african-american intergenerational partnerships in urban communities. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1) 101-110.

- Jones, K. R. (2004). An assessment of perceptions and experiences in community-based youth-adult relationships. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Jones, K. (2005, April). Positive youth development. Retrieved March 25, 2009, from University of Kentucky, College of Agriculture Web site:  
<http://www.uky.edu/Ag/CLD/YD/Pubs/PosYthDev.pdf>
- Jones, K. & Perkins, D. (2005, October). Determining the quality of youth-adult relationships within community-based youth programs. *Journal of Extension*, 43(5), 1-14. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2005october/a5.shtml>.
- Jones, K. & Perkins, D. (2006). Youth and adult perceptions of their relationships within community-based youth programs. *Youth & Society*, 38(1), 90-109
- Larson, R., Walker, K., Pearce, N. (2005). A comparison of youth-driven and adult-driven youth programs: balancing inputs from youth and adults. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1) 57-74.
- Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Phelps, E. (2008, May). The positive development of youth. National 4-H Council. Retrieved March 23, 2009, from  
<http://www.fourhcouncil.edu/largedocs/4HStudyAnnualReport.pdf>
- Libby, M., Rosen, M., & Sedonean, M. (2005). Building youth-adult partnerships for community change: lessons from the youth leadership institute. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1) 111-120.

- Mitra, D. L. (2007). The role of administrators in enabling youth-adult partnerships in schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 91(3), 237-56
- Mitra, D. (2009). Strengthening student voice initiatives in high schools: an examination of the supports needed for school-based youth-adult partnerships. *Youth & Society*, 40(3), 311-335
- National Network for Youth: guiding principles (n.d.). Retrieved February 26, 2007, from [http://www.nn4youth.org/site/PageServer?pagename=who\\_principles](http://www.nn4youth.org/site/PageServer?pagename=who_principles)
- National 4-H Council (2007). Engaging youth serving communities, final report.
- Priest, K. L. (2008). The learning activities on the career decision self-efficacy of high school seniors in agricultural education. Unpublished masters thesis, The University of Georgia.
- Rasmussen, M (2003, October). Adult attitudes about youth participation in community organizations. *Journal of Extension*, 41(5), 1-6. Retrieved February 26, 2007, from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2003october/rb5.shtml>.
- Rose-Krasnor, L. (2009). Future directions in youth involvement research. *Social Development*, 18(2), 497-509.
- Russell, S. T., Polen, N & Tepper, K.H. (June 12, 2007). What are youth-adult partnerships?. Retrieved March 30, 2008, from <http://cals-cf.calsnet.arizona.edu/fcs/bpy/content.cfm?content=YAPartners>
- Schulman, S. (2006). Terms of engagement: aligning youth, adults, and organizations toward social change. *Journal of Public Health Management & Practice*, 12, S26-S31

- Warkentin, R. & Rea, D. (1998). Diversity as strength in partnerships: collective responses to complex problems. In Warkentin, R. & Rea, D. (Eds.). *Youth-Adult Partnerships Unity In Diversity* (pp.xii-xx). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Williamson, E. M. (1998). The road 'less traveled by': collaborating with teens for community change. In Warkentin, R. & Rea, D. (Eds.). *Youth-Adult Partnerships Unity In Diversity* (pp.27-31). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Youth as equal partners in decision making (2003). *The Educational Digest*, 68(7) 58-62.
- Youth-adult partnerships: a training manual*. (2003). The Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development.
- Zeldin, S. (2000). Integrating research and practice to understand and strengthen communities for adolescent development: an introduction to the special issue and current issues. *Applied Developmental Science*, 4(Suppl.1), 2-10.
- Zeldin, S. (2002). Sense of community and positive adult beliefs toward adolescents and youth policy in urban neighborhoods and small cities. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 31(5), 331-342.
- Zeldin, S. (2004a). Youth as agents of adult and community development: mapping the processes and outcomes of youth engaged in organizational governance. *Applied Developmental Science*, 8(2), 75-90.
- Zeldin, S. (2004b). Preventing youth violence through the promotion of community engagement and membership. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(5) 623-641.

- Zeldin, S., Camino, L., Mook, C. (2005). The adoption of innovation in youth organizations: creating the condition for youth-adult partnerships. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1) 121-135.
- Zeldin, S., Larson, R., Camino, L., O'Connor, C. (2005). Intergenerational relationships and partnerships in community programs: purpose, practice, and directions for research. . *Journal of Community Psychology*, 33(1) 1-10.
- Zeldin, S., Macneil, C. (2006). Lessons from the field: engaging youth and adults as partners in organizational governance. *National Civic Review*, 95(1), 7-14
- Zeldin, S. & Petrokubi, J (2006). Understanding innovation: youth-adult partnerships in decision making. *The Prevention Researcher*, 13(1), 11-15.
- Zeldin, S., Petrokubi, J., MacNeil, C. (2008). Youth-adult partnerships in decision making: disseminating and implementing an innovative idea into established organizations and communities. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(3), 262-277.
- Zeldin, S., Topitzes, D. (2002). Neighborhood experiences, community connection, and positive beliefs about adolescents among urban adults and youth. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(6), 647-669.

## APPENDIX A

### COVER LETTER

Dear County Extension Agent/Volunteer,

I (Robbie Jones) am conducting a research project to complete my thesis in the Master of Agricultural Leadership (ALEC-UGA). My thesis is titled “An Evaluation of Youth/Adult Partnerships in Georgia Youth Summit Teams.” This project will measure the perceptions of youth and adults about youth and adult partnerships in their communities, and will help us better plan for future youth/adult partnership endeavors. The respondents for this research project will be the youth and adults serving on the Youth Summit teams for the 2008 Georgia Youth Summit. We would like counties to participate in this study. Your county was selected from the adults expressing interest in being part of the project during the youth summit.

Attached to this letter you will find the adult consent, parental consent form, a youth consent/information form, and the survey. With this e-mail, I am asking for your help to reach the parents of youth participating in the Georgia Youth Summit, to give them understanding that this project is related to the education the youth received at the youth summit, and ask them to give permission for their youth to respond to the survey.

**Please have the parents sign (or deny) the parental consent form, and ask them to return it to the researchers. If they consent, we will ask that the youth to complete the youth consent and survey and return in the pre-addressed/pre-stamped envelope.**

This project will be taking part in connection with the Georgia Youth Summit. However, this is not a direct part of the summit, and is not a requirement for participants to participate in, in order to be delegates at the summit. Youth and adults choosing to participate in this study may do so, and return their forms to myself or my advisor Dr. Maria Navarro by mail at. If they choose to not participate, or choose to not answer all questions, this is their free will and choice.

As their 4-H leader, you may encourage them to participate, but please in no way make this a requirement or cause undue pressure for them to participate. Also, their survey should remain confidential. Dr. Navarro and I will be the only ones to review their surveys.

If you should have any questions please feel free to contact me at [jonesr@uga.edu](mailto:jonesr@uga.edu) or 912-449-2034, or Dr. Maria Navarro at the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication, at [mnavarro@uga.edu](mailto:mnavarro@uga.edu) or 706-583-0225.

Thank you for your help,

Robbie Jones and Maria Navarro

Robbie Jones

Pierce County Extension Agent

Maria Navarro

ALEC-UGA Assistant Professor

**APPENDIX B**  
**MINOR ASSENT FORM**

Dear Participant,

You are invited to participate in my research project titled, "An Evaluation of Youth/Adult Partnerships in Georgia Youth Summit Teams." Through this project I am learning about the perceptions of youth and adults towards youth and adult partnerships in their communities.

If you decide to be part of this, you will agree to take part in a survey which allows you to rate your feelings. This survey will take 20 minutes for you to complete. Your participation in this project will not affect your status as a delegate for the Georgia Youth Summit. I will not use your name on any papers that I write about this project. However, because of your participation you may provide insight into the feelings youth have about youth and adult partnerships. I hope to learn something about the current perceptions, and this should help with showing if a need for more youth and adult partnership training is needed.

If you want to stop participating in this project, you are free to do so at any time. You can also choose not to answer questions that you don't want to answer.

If you have any questions or concerns you can always ask me or call my teacher, Dr. Maria Navarro at the following number: 706-542-3898.

Sincerely,



Robbie Jones  
Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication  
University of Georgia  
Telephone: 912-449-2034  
Email: [jonesr@uga.edu](mailto:jonesr@uga.edu)

I understand the project described above. My questions have been answered and I agree to participate in this project. I have received a copy of this form.



---

Signature of the Participant/Date

**Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.**

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address [IRB@uga.edu](mailto:IRB@uga.edu)

## APPENDIX C

### PARENTAL CONSENT FORM

I agree to allow my child, \_\_\_\_\_, to take part in a research study titled, “An Evaluation of Youth/Adult Partnerships in Georgia Youth Summit Teams,” which is being conducted by Mr. Robbie Jones, Pierce County Extension Agent and graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication of the University of Georgia (912-449-2044) and Dr. Maria Navarro, from the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication of the University of Georgia (706-5830225).

- As a participant of the study, my child will be asked to complete a survey, and the completion of the survey should take about 30 minutes (see survey attached, for your information), upon completion surveys and consent forms will be mailed back to the researchers.
- I do not have to allow my child to be in this study if I do not want to. My child can refuse to participate or stop taking part at any time without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which she/he is otherwise entitled. I can ask to have the information related to my child returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.
- The reason for the study is to find out the perceptions of youth and adults about youth and adult partnerships in their communities, and whether or not the Georgia Youth Summit has influenced these perceptions.
- There are no direct benefits to my child as a participant. However, by participating my child’s answers may help researchers gain a better understanding the perceptions of youth and adults towards youth and adult partnerships taking place in their communities.
- My child can quit at any time. My child’s participation in the Georgia Youth Summit will not be dependent upon my response to the parental consent form or my child’s decision regarding the survey.
- No discomforts or stresses are expected.
- No risks are expected.
- Any individually-identifiable information collected about my child will be held confidential unless otherwise required by law. Your child will not sign nor put his/her name in the survey. Consent and assent forms will be kept separately from the questionnaire. All data will be kept in a secured location.

The researcher, Mr. Robbie Jones, will answer any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: 912-449-2034. I may also contact the professor supervising the research, Dr. Maria Navarro, Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication, at the University of Georgia (706-582-0225, [mnavarro@uga.edu](mailto:mnavarro@uga.edu), 105 Four Towers Building, ALEC-UGA, Athens, GA 30602-4355)

I understand the study procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to allow my child to take part in this study. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.



Robbie Jones

Name of Researcher

Signature

Date

Telephone: 912-449-2034

Email: [jonesr@uga.edu](mailto:jonesr@uga.edu)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Child

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Parent/Guardian

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.

Additional questions or problems regarding your child's rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address [IRB@uga.edu](mailto:IRB@uga.edu)

## APPENDIX D

### ADULT CONSENT FORM

I, \_\_\_\_\_, agree to participate in a research study titled "An Evaluation of Youth/Adult Partnerships in Georgia Youth Summit Teams " which is being conducted by Mr. Robbie Jones, from the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication at the University of Georgia (706-542-3898) under the direction of Dr. Maria Navarro, from the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication at the University of Georgia (706-542-3898). I understand that my participation is voluntary. I can refuse to participate or stop taking part without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I can ask to have all of the information about me returned to me, removed from the research records, or destroyed.

The reason for the study is to find out the perceptions of youth and adults about youth and adult partnerships in their communities. As a participant of the study, I will be asked to complete a questionnaire which should take about 20 minutes to complete.

There are no direct benefits to me as a participant. However, by participating my answers may help researchers gain a better understanding the perceptions of adults towards youth and adult partnerships taking place in communities.

No discomforts or stresses are expected. I can quit at any time. My participation in the Georgia Youth Summit will not be dependent upon completing the survey.

No risk is expected

No individually-identifiable information about me, or provided by me during the research, may be shared with others without my written permission.

The researcher will answer any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at: 912-449-2034. I may also contact the professor supervising the research, Dr. Maria Navarro, Department of Agricultural Leadership, at 706-542-3898.

I understand that I am agreeing by my signature on this form to take part in this research project and understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form for my records.

Robbie Jones

Name of Researcher

912-449-2034

[jonesr@uga.edu](mailto:jonesr@uga.edu)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

---

Name of Participant

---

Signature

---

Date

**Please sign both copies, keep one and return one to the researcher.**

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to  
The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies  
Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address  
IRB@uga.edu

## APPENDIX E

### YOUTH AND ADULT RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN COMMUNITY-BASED YOUTH PROGRAMS INVOLVEMENT AND INTERACTION RATING SCALE<sup>1</sup>

**Do not write your name. All individual responses will be kept strictly confidential.**

This scale gives you a chance to express your feelings about working with youth and adults on your community project(s).

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement below by circling the appropriate letters in each of the two columns to the right of each statement. The first column, **“Before the Summit,”** corresponds with your feelings BEFORE the Youth Summit, while the second column, **“After the Summit,”** corresponds to your feelings AFTER the Youth Summit.

SD = Strongly Disagree

D = Disagree

N = Neutral

A = Agree

SA = Strongly Agree

	Before the Summit	After the Summit
<b>Youth Involvement in community-based youth programs</b>		
1. Youth take lots of initiative when working on community projects.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
2. Youth very often are sitting around with nothing to do.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
3. Youth arrive to meetings/events on time.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
4. Youth are given few or no responsibilities for specific tasks or assignments.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
5. Youth rely on themselves to make key decisions.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
6. Youth have full access to information that is needed to make decisions.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA

<sup>1</sup>Modified from: Jones, K. R. & Perkins, D. F. Determining the quality of youth-adult relationships within community-based youth programs. Journal of Extension, 43(5). Available online at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2005october/a5.shtml>

7. Youth almost never discuss their concerns about group decisions.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
8. Youth almost always share ideas about things that matter to them.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
9. Youth do not have an equal vote in the decision-making process.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
10. Youth help one another learn/develop new skills.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
11. Youth are not fully committed to their duties.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
12. Youth are very excited about in their involvement with community projects.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
13. Youth are not concerned with community change.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
<b>Adult Involvement in community-based youth programs</b>										
14. Adults display a willingness to accept and nurture youth leadership.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
15. Adults display a tendency to want to guide youth.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
16. Adults almost always take over everything when working on project activities.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
17. Adults learn new skills from one another.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
18. Adults almost never take the ideas of youth seriously.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
19. Adults encourage youth to come up with ideas.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
20. Adults have little or no interest in being involved with community projects.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
21. Adults are very concerned with community change.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
<b>Youth-Adult Interaction in community-based youth programs</b>										
22. Youth and adults get along well together.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
23. Youth seem comfortable working with adults.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
24. Adults seem comfortable working with youth.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
25. Adults do not consult with youth on project activities.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
26. Adults provide direction and mentoring for youth.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
27. Youth almost always go along with the decisions of adults.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
28. Youth and adults very often agree on most decisions.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA

29. Youth rely on the experiences of adults when making decisions.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
30. Youth make decisions based on their own experiences.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
31. Youth and adults work separately on project tasks.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
32. Youth and adults learn a lot from one another.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
33. Youth and adults very frequently help one another develop new skills.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
34. Adults are not at all considerate of youth opinions.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
35. Youth are not at all considerate of adults opinions.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
36. Youth and adults almost always engage in respectful conversations.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
37. Youth do not trust adults to handle power responsibly.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA
38. Adults trust youth to handle power responsibly.	SD	D	N	A	SA	SD	D	N	A	SA

**39. What are, in your opinion, the most important characteristics of successful youth/adult partnerships?**

**40. How can youth/adult partnerships be enhanced?**



**41. What is your county?**

**42. Which of the following are you?:**

- ☐ A Youth Participant in a youth/adult partnership
- ☐ An Adult Participant in a youth/adult partnership
- ☐ A Georgia Youth Summit Facilitator
- ☐ Other (please explain):

**43. Is this the first time you participate in a program that involves youth and adults working together?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If not, please explain what other programs or projects have you worked on that involved youth and adults working together

**44. What is your sex?**

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

**45. What is your age group?:**

- ☐ Less than 15
- ☐ 15-16
- ☐ 17-18
- ☐ 19-21
- ☐ 22-25
- ☐ 26-30
- ☐ 31 and over

**46. Please indicate all organizations in which you participate or have participated:**

- ☐ 4-H
- ☐ FFA
- ☐ Boys & Girls Club
- ☐ Y Club
- ☐ Church group
- ☐ Other (please list):

**47. How do you describe yourself? (You may check all that apply):**

- ☐ Asian / Asian American
- ☐ Black / African American
- ☐ White / Caucasian
- ☐ Native American
- ☐ Hispanic or Latino
- ☐ Other . . . .

**48. Please indicate what best describes your background and the area in which you live:**

- ☐ Rural (with farm)
- ☐ Rural (no farm)
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Urban/city
- ☐ Other (please specify):

**Thank you for your time and for your willingness to participate!**

**For additional comments or questions, feel free to e-mail [jonesr@uga.edu](mailto:jonesr@uga.edu) or [mnavarro@uga.edu](mailto:mnavarro@uga.edu)**

**Mail to: Dr. Maria Navarro, 105 Four Towers Building, ALEC-UGA, Athens, GA 30604355**

## APPENDIX F

**GEORGIA 4-H DISTRICT MAP, AS NOTED BY THE DISTRICTING OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAM.**

