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INTRODUCTION

Through youth, society sees opportunity to improve the future, but adults occasionally stand in the way of their development by failing to recognize them as partners in solving today's problems. This is especially true of problems that affect youth. When youth are partners in solving problems, they develop skills for the future so that they can contribute to society, rather than drain community resources by requiring costly social services. When adults and youth work as partners in the community, youth will develop skills in decision-making, citizenship, leadership, coping with change, and learning how to learn. To develop a partnership, adults need to consider doing things with youth rather than doing things to youth and doing things for youth.

Historically, adults have participated with youth, rather than having done things to youth and for youth. When the United States of America was an agrarian and developing nation, youth were constructively involved in the life of the community. They took part in developing the nation.

For centuries, people were reared in the lifestyle and traditions of their parents. They developed the skill to function effectively within this lifestyle and maintain relatively stable families. After World War II, thousands of families moved to urban areas.

The smaller, more stable population settings had offered opportunities for children to learn life skills through on-the-job training because they were needed to help the family function and survive (Glenn and Nelsen, 1987, p. 12).
However, in today's society, the composition of the nuclear family is changing (Shirer and Sternweis, 1990). Parents shield their children from responsibility. Instead of being seen as contributing to their families, young people are more often seen as a burden to the family.

In neighborhoods across the nation, children are not viewed as a community responsibility. Contemporary perceptions of childhood are united in their images of failure to acknowledge the potential of young people to contribute to the social order. The potential of young people is an untapped natural resource. Not involving young people in deciding about problems in their communities and their nation is a waste. Youth are energetic, intelligent, imaginative, and talented. Society needs these attributes of our young people to solve the prevalent problems.

Some communities and young people have experienced the power that surges when adults and youth develop a partnership for progress. Research documents that adolescents can accomplish much more than is usually assumed by participating in actual programs in which they assume roles as community problem solvers (Schine and Harrington, 1982). Youth offer skills in decision-making and develop these skills further during involvement in substantive roles in community programs.

Some question whether youth express an interest in being involved in their communities. Those who have examined motivation for involvement in social action have found that individuals with an
internal sense of control are more likely to express interest and become involved than persons with an external locus of control. Structuring environments that will foster realistic internal perceptions of control is sound. This will help young people recognize that they have significant ability to affect what happens to them in their lives.

The literature suggests areas of further study (Schine and others, 1981). Society can only benefit by learning more about the youth audience and their perception of their part in solving community problems.

Adults need to proactively deal with young people in ways that cause them to believe that they are a partner or a resource rather than an object or recipient of activities. Youth need the opportunity to participate and serve in meaningful roles in their communities. Experience-based educational programs can be effective in promoting personal, social, and intellectual development and assisting youth in becoming involved in these roles. Participating is a way for youth to be involved rather than isolated and alienated from socially productive community action. Adults need to reexamine the role of youth in society and recognize their eagerness to be a part of the solution rather than the problem.

The purpose of this study was to provide research-based information to assess locus of control influences on decisions as expressed by Iowa youth.
Objectives

1. Determine the control that youth think they have over their lives.
2. Assess youth's perception of their input into making decisions and being involved in the community.
3. Analyze the relationships of selected factors to locus of control.
4. Establish implications for agricultural and extension education programs to assist youth in meeting their needs.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The primary objective of this investigation was to review research related to the study and associated literature that included opinions of the authors. An extensive review of the literature identified only a few studies concerning the locus of control influences on decisions by youth. The review of literature revealed reports on the roles of youth in society. Several reports were about specific programs that involved youth in their communities.

For the purpose of organization, the review of research and literature has been divided into the following sections: (1) The Role of Youth in Society; (2) The Needs of Society; (3) Community Participation; (4) The Needs of Youth; (5) The Youth as Resources Concept; (6) Youth as Decision-Makers; (7) Locus of Control and Youth Decision-Making; and (8) Summary of the Literature.

The Role of Youth in Society

Konopka (1973) described adolescents as persons with participatory and responsible roles to play in democracy. She said the extent to which the adolescent experiences responsible participation determines and maximizes human development.

The industrialized, technological age changed the role of youth in society from the agrarian and early industrial society when unskilled youth laborers played a productive role. As the economy required less unskilled labor, the role of schooling greatly expanded to occupy young
people before society made room for them as workers. Dollar (1975) said that adults ask adolescents to wait to contribute to society and place them in a holding pattern that antagonizes a basic need to contribute.

Dewey (1916) noted that society puts a premium on shillyshallying and procrastination. He observed that children are looked upon as candidates and placed on the waiting list. They are not regarded as social members in full and regular standing.

Kurth-Schai (1988) characterized the three most prevalent views of youth in society. Children as victims of adult society are at one end of the continuum, and children as threats to adult society are at the other, separated by children as learners of adult society at the midpoint. Thinking of children as threats ignores their potential as catalysts for positive social change. Children have no social power when their capacity to contribute is underestimated. Youth are not expected to contribute to the welfare of the family or the community. They are excluded from active and meaningful participation in human society.

Kohler (1982) noted that society expects responsible adults, but gives adolescents little practice in being responsible, caring, participating members of society.

John Dewey wrote (1938, p. 51):

The ideal of using the present simply to get ready for the future contradicts itself. It omits, and even shuts out, the very conditions by which a person can be prepared for his future. We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future. This is the only preparation which in the long run amounts to anything.
Konopka (1973) agreed that adolescents are growing, developing persons, not pre-adults, pre-parents, or pre-workers, but human beings participating in the activities of the world around them.

The Needs of Society

Schine and Harrington (1982) suggested that communities cannot ignore the untapped resources of this segment of the population, because the rewards from youth participation are worth the efforts.

Kohler (1982) indicated that adults should allow themselves to need young people and their contributions and to acknowledge that they deserve a significant place in society. America would see signs of success—confident young people with self-esteem who take initiative because they believe their participation matters in making a difference in the transition to adulthood.

As Dollar (1975) pointed out, a democracy requires the responsible participation of its citizens. As contributions from young people become accepted, the community will begin to recognize the importance of youth as a resource.

Community Participation

Kurth-Schai (1988) suggested that associated with lack of participation for youth comes rigid and simplistic relational strategies, psychological dependence on external sources for personal validation, and the expressions of self-destructive and anti-social behaviors. (Among such behaviors are depression, promiscuity, premature parenting,
suicide, delinquency, and drug abuse.) If children are denied their potential to contribute to society, then children's ability to develop a strong sense of self-worth is limited.

Hedin and Eisikovits (1982) reviewed programs where youth participants were involved in efforts to influence public decision-making and study their communities firsthand. When youth were involved in meaningful tasks cooperatively with adults, youth were willing to make twice the required time commitment. Community participation had a positive effect on students' evaluations of the people and places with whom they had been interacting. The researchers observed that direct experience in community served both as a source of knowledge and a process of knowing. Subjects showed the greatest increase in intellectual development where problem-solving was the specific focus of accompanying seminar sessions so that experience and reflection were balanced. Hedin and Eisikovits (1982) concluded that the capacities of young adolescents can be channeled into socially constructive and personally beneficial programs.

The Needs of Youth

Konopka (1973) provided an eight-point list of opportunities that should be provided to young people. The list included opportunities to participate as citizens—as responsible members of society—and to gain decision-making experience.

Dollar (1975) reported opportunities for young people according to the National Commission on Resources for Youth, Inc. They included the
opportunity to make decisions with consequences for others; to make decisions affecting oneself, and thus to experience greater sense of control over one's life; to experience the consequences of one's own actions, including failure, and be accountable for them.

Hedin and Eisikovits (1982) listed the following needs of adolescents: develop and express idealism; release creative energy; broaden activities and associations; select internal standards of judgment; realize responsibility and express commitment; be involved in responsible tasks on behalf of others.

Synthesizing the results of numerous sociological and psychological research, Kurth-Schai (1988) indicated that youth need to develop a strong sense of self-worth and social commitment if they are to adapt and flourish. Heightened self-esteem, enhanced moral development, increased political activism, and the ability to create and maintain complex social relationships results when youth participate in socially and/or economically useful tasks. She concluded that youth want to contribute to society, and they believe they have the ability to contribute.

Schine and others (1981) suggested that among the needs of youth ages 10-14 are a new testing ground for themselves as social beings, freedom to take part in the world of adults, to know that they can speak and be heard, that they can make a difference, to test a developing morality and value structure in authentic situations, to share in making decisions within appropriate parameters, and support and sensitive guidance from adults who appreciate their problems and their promise.
Youth as Resources Concept

O'Neil and Calhoun (1985) suggested that the National Commission on Resources for Youth (NCRY) developed the Youth Participation model in the late 1960s. Known as a benchmark for constructive engagement of youth with community, it dealt with process rather than content. Four major components made up the process. They are (p. 36):

- Action in the community that meets a real need, opportunities to work in a collaborative relationship with peers and adults, a share in planning and in making decisions, and reflection.

Schine and others (1981) believed that youth participation involves performing a service, or creating or accomplishing something which is significant to others to build the young adolescent's sense of competence and self-esteem. Youth participation helps young people learn to live in a democracy. They wrote (p. 7):

- Most youth-serving agencies have considered it their mission to do things to or for their clients, rather than encouraging them to develop their ability to help themselves.

Lofquist (1989) presented three ways that people view and treat others in relationships: as objects, recipients, or resources. He applied the three-way spectrum to any age and situation when one encounters another person or group. He found that local, state, and national cultures perceive that young people are objects in the eyes of adults. Yet, the same respondents replied to qualitative inquiries that they thought that, in a democratic society, youth as resources was the ideal. Lofquist's theory of youth development called for adults to view and respect young
people as resources from the time of their birth in order to create organizational and youth opportunity system cultures that promote the well-being of young people. He said that in a democratic society, young people have a right and a responsibility to participate in decisions that affect them. Lofquist suggested that adults influence young people by showing respect and modeling the capacity to share in a participatory approach to decision-making.

Kurth-Schai (1988) concluded that the roles of youth in society need to be reconceptualized on the basis of expectations that are both realistic and non-limiting so that steps can be taken to involve young people in the processes of social design and civic action. She further concluded that opportunities be provided to children so they can participate actively in guiding the development of human society, which would result in two-way benefit—providing hope for the future of all people and providing hope for the future of children.

**Youth as Decision-Makers**

Mann et al. (1989) identified the ability to make sensible decisions as one of the key characteristics of mature adolescents. Decision control, or the willingness to choose, precedes mature competent decision-making. Decision control is related to internal locus of control (Lefcourt, 1982; Rotter, 1966). Mann et al. (1989) found that self-esteem as a decision-maker increases with age. Low confidence in ability to make decisions may stem from the limited opportunities for adolescents to participate in decisions that affect them. Social and legal forces
constrain the development of decision-making competence so adolescents may sometimes show less competence in decision-making than their real potential and capability. The researchers recommend that decision-making should be taught in junior high school, when vital choices are already being made.

Dollar (1975) noted that conclusions reached during this period, and the decisions that are based on them, may well last a lifetime.

Klayman's 1985 study of 48 12-year-olds in St. Paul, Minnesota, indicated that, by age 12, children understand many of the basic concepts of strategic decision-making, such as compensation (trade-offs) and elimination (choosing) and, like adults, they modify their strategies appropriately in response to complexity.

In "Report on the Nationwide Project Making the Grade: A Report Card on American Youth" (Reingold, 1990), one of the eight specific recommendations that emerged from Town Summit Meetings focused on building self-esteem. Respondents emphasized a need for involving youth in decision-making. They called for providing substantive roles for youth in community programs.

"The Troubled Journey: A Portrait of 6th-12th Grade Youth" (Search . . . , 1990) found that 68 percent of the respondents reported, "I am good at making decisions." They were recorded as possessing the asset called decision-making skills. Most respondents also expressed interest in improving their decision-making skills. In The Troubled Journey, 46,779 public school children between the sixth and twelfth grades from 111 communities in 25 states were surveyed in 1990.
Schvaneveldt and Adams (1983) concluded that the average adolescent is ill-prepared to strike out into the tumultuous world of decisions. In summarizing numerous studies on adolescents and decision-making, they reported that adolescents need direction and opportunity in the decision-making process. Skill in decision-making is developed as one matures and is actively involved in society.

Schvaneveldt and Adams stated that (p. 103):

It is perhaps the struggle toward, rather than the achievement of, that makes decision-making such a fascinating arena of social and developmental behavior for adolescents.

Kohler (1982) noted that the National Commission on Resources for Youth had thousands of projects on record that document that young people have made decisions and taken action resulting in significant improvements in their communities. By analyzing these successful projects, several common features became apparent. First was that adolescents made decisions. Second, young people were involved in work with adults skilled as facilitators. Third, the activity served a real need in their community. Fourth, the schedules included time for youth to reflect on their involvement and learn the skills they needed to continue. Projects such as this taught them to make decisions and carry them out. Kohler indicated that adults must have confidence in youth and refrain from dominating and intervening, to become an advocate, to search out the unresolved community problems, and to involve youth so more adults can see youth as a resource rather than a problem.
Locus of Control and Youth Decision-Making

Few research reports were found that specifically covered locus of control and youth decision-making or community involvement even though the locus of control construct has remained an active research topic for more than two decades after Rotter identified it in 1966.

Wildstein and Thompson (1989) studied 144 Atlanta fifth graders and found that the external scorers' mean was significantly lower than that of internal scorers on verbal problem-solving.

Krampen (1989) studied 127 German adolescents (ages 11-13 years) to consider the development of three dimensions of locus of control orientation, perceived internal, powerful others, and chance control. He determined that development of locus of control orientations could be confirmed with longitudinal data for late childhood and early adolescence.

From the Omizo and Omizo (1988) study, it appeared that participation builds self-esteem and an internal locus of control. The researchers involved 60 Hawaiian seventh and eighth graders ages 11 to 14 years from divorced families in experimental and control groups to investigate the effect of participation in the 10 group sessions on children's self-esteem and locus of control orientations. They found that the adolescents in the treatment group had higher levels of self-esteem and possessed a more internal perception of locus of control than did those in the control group.

Mantzicopoulos (1990) studied 120 California children in fourth, fifth, and sixth grades to examine the characteristics of four groups of
children employing positive, defensive, self-blame, or mixed strategies to cope with failure experiences in school. They found that successful outcomes were associated with positive coping efforts. Children who employed positive coping strategies tended to have an internal locus of control, motivation toward mastery, and higher achievement.

Eberhart and Keith (1989) examined the causal relation of the correlation between self-concept and locus of control by drawing more than 28,000 high school sophomores and 11,000 seniors from the 1980 and 1982 longitudinal study by the National Center for Education Statistics' High School and Beyond. Eberhart and Keith reported that many research studies have found that self-concept and locus of control were positively correlated. Noting the similarities between locus of control and self-concept theories, they wrote it would be expected that those who feel in control of their lives also would feel positive about themselves and vice versa. The Eberhart and Keith results suggested that locus of control and self-concept may be related causally, but in a complex fashion and one that may change with maturation.

Fertman and Chubb (1990) assessed the outcomes of a personal empowerment program. The sample consisted of 25 male and 27 female ninth graders. Participants in the experimental group had mid-range total activity scores on the pretest that covered three variables: participation levels in community and school activities, self-esteem, and locus of control. Their findings revealed that participation in activities, at least by adolescents with moderate activity involvement, could be affected, even through a fairly simple intervention, at a time when
adolescents may disengage from their activities even though it is important to maintain adolescents' involvement in activities to help them learn and practice the skills they need as adults.

Ross and Mirowsky (1989) wrote that the sense of controlling one's own life, rather than being at the mercy of powerful others and outside forces, encourages active problem-solving. Persons who feel in control of their lives are more likely to attempt to solve problems. Mirowsky and Ross (1990) suggested that control theory states that active, effective problem-solving builds well-being and that feeling responsible for the conditions and events of one's life is universally beneficial. In the short run, an internal locus of control activates a person to solve problems, to limit undesirable consequences, and to avoid them in the future. In the long run, a personal history of meeting and solving problems improves one's conditions, skills, and self-assurance.

Werner and Smith (1989) reported their longitudinal study of youth who grew up in chronic poverty and stressful living conditions. They found that resilient youth (those with a more internal locus of control, a more positive self-concept, and a more nurturant, responsible, and achievement-oriented attitude toward life) reported having a greater number of informal supports than did the youth with serious coping problems.

Ortman (1988) conducted a semi-structured interview with eight female and eight male freshmen and seniors from a middle-class high school in suburban Virginia to distinguish between perceptions of control and responsibility in adolescents. Feelings of responsibility and control
were highly correlated for this group. Ortman reported that the teenagers agreed that having control and being responsible were both desirable states.

Summary of the Literature
The review of literature indicated that the current role of youth in American society hampers development. The needs of society and the needs of youth can be met by youth participation in the community when youth are respected as resources. Youth are eager for a part in making decisions that affect them. Making decisions enhances self-concept and development of an internal locus of control.
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The central purpose of this study was to provide research-based information to assess locus of control influences on decisions as expressed by Iowa youth. A review of the literature revealed that no previous research had been published concerning locus of control influences on decisions as expressed by Iowa youth.

The researcher, in cooperation with extension state and area youth development specialists and an Iowa State University Department of Sociology and Anthropology faculty member, designed the study known as the Iowa Youth Poll. The researcher analyzed a portion of the data obtained from the Iowa Youth Poll which was sponsored by Iowa State University Extension 4-H and Youth Program and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

This chapter is presented under six major subheadings: Definition of Terms, Development of Instrument, Selection of Sample, Collection of Data, Coding of Instrument, and Analysis of Data.

Definition of Terms

Adolescence: Biologically, the lifespan between the obvious onset of puberty and the completion of bone growth; a segment of continuing human development; the second decade of life.

Decision-making: Choosing among alternative courses of action; a process that results in decisions that influence people's behavior.
Locus of control: A construct that concerns the origin of control for an individual's behavior. Behavior that an individual perceives to be controlled by outside forces or fate is said to originate from an external locus of control. Behavior that an individual perceives to originate from within oneself is said to originate from an internal locus of control.

Youth: People 13 to 18 years old.

Development of Instrument

The instrument was developed by Dr. Martin G. Miller of the Iowa State University Department of Sociology and Anthropology following consultation with youth development specialists on the state and area staff of the Iowa State University Extension 4-H and Youth Program and input from advisory groups around Iowa including the Juvenile Justice Advisory Council Prevention Committee. Dr. Miller's research team of undergraduate and graduate research assistants provided support in instrument design, interviewing, and coding. The researcher consulted with Dr. Miller as the study was planned and conducted.

The instrument consisted of questions to assess the behaviors, needs, and desires of Iowa youth. It documented their feelings, concerns, and perceptions about societal problems and solutions. The questions dealt with problems that faced Iowa youth 13 to 18 years of age and their lifestyle (Miller, 1990). The instrument was designed to be administered over the telephone. The Sociology Research Laboratory consulted with the research team on formatting and sequencing of questions as well as the overall length of the instrument. Use of a
telephone interviewing approach limited the total number of questions which could be asked to approximately 150 items.

The instrument consisted of 162 possible questions. (The number of the last item in Appendix C is 163; no item 35 exists so the instrument had 162 possible questions.) The actual number of questions asked was about 150 according to the computerized skip pattern that took effect as answers to questions were entered into the computer during the interview. Piloting narrowed the initial instrument from 177 questions to 162 questions. A copy of the screening instrument appears in Appendix A. A copy of the survey instrument appears in Appendix C. Questions 1, 4, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 155, and 158 provided the necessary data for this study.

Selection of Sample

The sample for the Iowa Youth Poll was selected using a two-stage procedure. Initially, a stratified random sample of Iowa households with telephones was selected. This sample was generated from a list of all known working household, nonbusiness telephone numbers in the state of Iowa. This listing, purchased from a national social science survey sampling organization which maintains computer files of working telephone numbers, was stratified by county. The list was grouped into replicates of size 200. Each replicate provided a stratified sample across counties in the state of Iowa. Numbers were allocated for calling in
replicates, thus assuring that the final sample would be distributed throughout the state.

Within households, the interviewer requested to speak to one of the heads of the household. The adult respondent was asked to indicate if there were any youth aged 13 to 18 living in the house. If not, the screening call was terminated. If there were one or more youth in this age range, the interviewer provided additional information on the purpose of the survey and requested permission to have a letter sent to the youth in the household providing more information on the survey and asking for the youth's participation. If the parent agreed to have this letter sent, the sex, age, and first name of each eligible child and the household address was requested. If there was more than one eligible youth, the one to be contacted was selected using a simple random selection procedure.

An initial pool of 1,000 numbers was selected for the household screening. This number was later supplemented with an additional 230 numbers. Just over 100 of these additional numbers were from a matched sample of numbers contacted in Fall 1989 Iowa State Social Indicators Survey led by principal investigator Dr. Danny R. Hoyt of the Iowa State University Department of Sociology and Anthropology. This sample was added to permit the comparison of responses from youth with responses from their parents.

A total of 369 households contacted were not eligible to be included in the sample because there were no youth in the sample age ranges. Another 31 household telephone numbers were found to be
invalid or disconnected. Of the total (840) potentially eligible households contacted, 146 refused to participate. Many of the refusals were obtained when the household composition questions were asked. It is estimated that no more than 50 percent of these refusal households actually contained youth in the sample target age range. Another 82 of the potentially eligible households could not be successfully contacted during the screening period. Based upon prior telephone survey experiments in Iowa, some proportion of these non-contacts were likely to be numbers which are not assigned. A total of 612 successful screening contacts were completed in February and March 1990, representing a response rate of 72.5 percent for the household screening.

Collection of Data

Following screening of potentially eligible households, letters were mailed to each of the selected youth providing a description of the survey and information on informed consent rights. The subsequent interview call was placed within one week of the mailing of the letter. At this stage, 12 of the selected youth were determined to be noneligible when contacted (either too young or old). Of the remaining 590 youth, 20 could not be successfully contacted for an interview and another 25 refused to be interviewed. A total 545 completed interviews was obtained from the eligible youth.

The instrument was administered via telephone rather than mail because of a higher response rate via telephone, and interaction with a telephone interviewer permitted clarification of the questions.
Interviewer training was required even though most of the interviewers had prior Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) experience. Training involved a three-stage process. First, interviewers attended a four-hour session on basic interviewing procedures. They received a copy of the 14-page single-spaced training manual. Second, interviewers were given an in-depth explanation of the survey instrument including question-by-question objectives. They received the 14-question screening instrument and the 162-item questionnaire so they could practice reading the questions to gain experience in appropriate inflection and rate of speech before they began administering the instrument. The first and second stages of training emphasized that precise interviewing procedures were critical to ensure full and accurate data collection and that reliability of the data gathered was determined by the manner in which interviewers carried out their assignments, asked the questions, and recorded information.

Topics of the first and second stages of the training included an introduction to survey research, the role of the interviewer, and ethical issues. The next section on interviewing techniques covered general interview instruction, interview procedures, the importance of standard questions, interviewer preparation, initial contact and introduction, asking the question in exactly the same way so results obtained do not vary depending on which interviewer took the interview, pace for reading questions, inflection in reading questions, clarification and definitions for respondent, use of probes, and feedback.
The third stage of the training prepared interviewers to use the telephone interviewing equipment.

Upon completion of the initial pilot of the instrument, all of the telephone interviews were completed using the centralized Ci2 CATI system installed in the Sociology Research Laboratory at Iowa State University. The CATI system is particularly effective in elimination of skip-pattern errors often found in complex survey designs (Frey, 1989; Miller, 1990).

The questionnaire was programmed into the CATI system for use in each of the eight interviewing stations. During each interview, the questionnaire was displayed on a computer terminal. The interviewee’s response to each question was directly typed into a computer program that was saved onto a computer disk. When all the interviews were completed, the CATI data were merged into two files, one for closed-ended responses and another for open-ended responses. The open-ended responses were then converted for input into a recently developed computer-based content analysis program. Upon completion of the coding of these responses, the data were merged back into the file containing the closed-ended responses. The initial data files were constructed in SPSS/PC+ and SPSS-X format.

When the call was made within one week of the mailing, the interviewer requested the selected youth. Prior to requesting participation, a statement about the purpose and use of the survey and informed consent procedures were read to the respondent. (The informed consent procedures had been previously reviewed and approved
by the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee.) The interview was then conducted with all youth who agreed to be interviewed. The interviewing was completed in April 1990. The average time needed to complete an interview was approximately 18.5 minutes.

If the selected youth was not at home on the initial contact, or if no contact was established on the initial attempt, then a minimum of six additional contacts were attempted. In some cases, more than 10 callbacks were needed to reach difficult-to-locate respondents. In the case of numbers where no one answered, subsequent attempts were rotated through different days and times of day to maximize the possibility of catching someone at home. Attempts to reach initial no contact households also were stretched over a minimum of two weeks to allow for the possibility of persons being temporarily away from home on business or vacation.

Coding of Instrument

No information linking the respondent's name, telephone number, or address was coded into the computer files. The cover sheets containing that information were separated from the questionnaire as soon as the interview was edited by the supervisor. The cover sheets were placed in a special, secure file accessible only to the principal investigator. The interviews were identified only by numbers. This procedure was followed to allow some of the sample to be interviewed in the future to collect longitudinal data.
Analysis of Data

The data collected in the Iowa Youth Poll were coded as they were collected during the interview. The data were analyzed using the statistical treatments included in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-X) (SPSS-X User's Guide, 1988). The alpha for all tests was set at the .05 level. The following statistical procedures were used:

Procedure RELIABILITY was used to calculate the coefficient of internal consistency for the locus of control items.

The SUM function was used to calculate each respondent’s cumulative locus of control score according to the Mirowsky and Ross (1990) method.

Procedure FREQUENCIES was used to compute frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations for the descriptive data of the respondent groups. These distributions were used to describe the data.

Procedure T-TEST was used to compute the t-values and probabilities when comparing mean scores of the respondent groups. Items with a t-value probability of .05 or less were determined to be significant.

Procedure ONEWAY was used to produce a one-way analysis of variance to determine if a significant difference existed among groups for locus of control, decisions, residence, and grade. If a significant difference was found, an appropriate post hoc test was used to determine where the differences existed.
Procedure CROSSTABS with Chi-square was used to compare the observed frequency of community participation by participants with those statistically expected.
FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to provide research-based information to assess locus of control influences on decisions as expressed by Iowa youth. Data collected as part of the Iowa Youth Poll were analyzed to satisfy the objectives presented in the introductory chapter of this publication. Responses from participants were grouped and appropriate statistical analysis completed for each variable.

Results of data analysis are presented in the following order:
Descriptive Analysis of Iowa Youth Poll Participants, Control that Youth Think They have Over Their Lives, Analysis of Youth's Perception of Their Input to Decisions, Analysis of Youth's Perception of Their Community Involvement, Analysis of the Relationships of Locus of Control Score to Decision-Making and Community Involvement, and Summary of Major Findings.

Descriptive Analysis of Iowa Youth Poll Participants

The 545 subjects in the Iowa Youth Poll were teens from across the state. The random sample of youth ages 13 to 18 included students who were accessible at their home by telephone for the 18.5 minute-average interview. Table 1 reveals that the sample included 55 percent males and 45 percent females. They were in grades six to 12. The largest proportion (21 percent) of respondents was in eighth grade; the smallest was in sixth grade. Most of the sample (75 percent) lived in towns or cities; the least number (11 percent) lived outside of town, but not on a farm. The findings from the random sample were comparable to Iowa census data.
Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants (N = 545)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of town, not farm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or city</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control that Youth Think They have Over Their Lives

Eight items on the survey questionnaire measured locus of control (items 112 to 119 in Appendix C). Four of the items measured internal locus of control, and an equal number assessed external locus of control. The scale included responses that ranged from one to five. The scale used positive numbers for the internal measures and negative numbers for the
external measures. Table 2 reports means and standard deviations for the eight items that measured locus of control.

Participants scored high on the internal measures, as the grand mean of 3.92 reveals. The scores for three items clustered near the mean, as the standard deviations indicate. The scores for the fourth internal item were more dispersed. For this item, the standard deviation was 1.09, and the mean was 3.31.

For the measures of external locus of control, a grand mean of -2.49 was observed, indicating that the average answer on all four items was between disagree and neutral on the five-point interval scale. The external mean scores were more dispersed around the means than the internal mean scores, as was observed when comparing the standard deviations in Table 2.

Six items on the questionnaire related to decision-making (items 50 to 54 and 158 in Appendix C). Table 3 reports the means and standard deviations as being quite consistent for the five items. Respondents perceived the input to be about right for school, sport, and family decisions, but they came close to saying that they had too little input into community decisions, as reflected by a mean of 1.26. The sixth item used a five-point scale, and respondents were neutral toward the community's interest in youth (mean = 2.74).

The teens' perceptions of community involvement were gathered from eight items that relate to the topics of drinking and drug use. (See items 84 to 91 in Appendix C.) Data in Table 4 reveals that Iowa youth perceived drinking was more of a problem than drug use for people their ages in their communities. Three-fourths of the respondents replied that
Table 2. Means and standard deviations for items that measure locus of control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal locus of control&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for my own successes.</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do just about anything that I really set my mind to.</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am responsible for my failures.</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My bad luck is the result of mistakes that I have made.</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of means</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External locus of control&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The really good things that happen to me are mostly luck.</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my problems are due to bad breaks.</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have little control over the bad things that happen to me.</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There's no sense planning a lot, if something good is going to happen, it will.</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean of means</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Scale  
+1 = strongly disagree  
+2 = disagree  
+3 = neither  
+4 = agree  
+5 = strongly agree  

<sup>b</sup>Scale  
-1 = strongly disagree  
-2 = disagree  
-3 = neither  
-4 = agree  
-5 = strongly agree
Table 3. Means and standard deviations for items that measure decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have in the scheduling of your school classes?</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about your class subjects?</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about what happens on your sports teams?</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your family?</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your local community?</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your community's interest in youth?</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Scale

1 = Too little  
2 = About right  
3 = Too much

*b* Scale

1 = Very satisfied  
2 = Satisfied  
3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied  
4 = Very dissatisfied  
5 = Dissatisfied

drinking was a problem, and half considered drug use to be a problem. The respondents felt that they were about equally involved in planning programs against drinking and using drugs and equally willing to become involved in planning such programs. They saw less opportunity to be involved in planning programs against drug use.
Table 4. Participant responses to community involvement items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community involvement item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related to drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that drinking is a problem for kids in your community?</td>
<td>N 407</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related to drug use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the use of drugs by kids is a problem in your community?</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing values for community involvement items ranged from 3 to 115.
Analysis of Youth's Perception of Their Input to Decisions

Table 5 presents the results of the SPSS-X t-test, which examined whether differences exist between females and males on the perception of their input into decisions that affect them. No statistically significant differences were detected between the means for males and females on the first five items, which were measured on a three-point scale. The sixth decision-making item, measured on a five-point scale, revealed a statistically significant difference between gender means. Females appeared to be more dissatisfied with their community's interest in youth than were males.

The responses to the Iowa Youth Poll also were analyzed by grade of the participant. The analysis of variance on means grouping the data by respondent's grade level is presented in Table 6. The responses were indistinguishable by grade for three items: input to decisions about class subjects, sport teams, and family matters. Three items revealed statistically significant differences among means for responses to items related to input to decisions on scheduling school classes, decisions by the local community, and level of satisfaction with the community's interest in youth.

To determine which grades had means with statistically significant differences, Duncan's multiple range test was employed. The post hoc analysis indicated that the means for ninth, eleventh, and twelfth graders were significantly different from the seventh and eighth graders' means. The respondents in the lower grades expressed that they had less input to scheduling their school classes than they would like. The older respondents were approaching "about right" on the scale.
Table 5. T-test for decision-making by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>t-probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have in the scheduling your school classes?</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD^</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about your class subjects?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about what happens on your sports teams?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your family?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your local community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your community's interest in youth?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^M = Mean.  ^SD = Standard deviation.

The next item that had an F-value at the .01 level of significance asked participants how much input they had into decisions made by their local communities. In this case, the difference between means was so great that the difference was detected by the Scheffe post hoc test, which
Table 6. Analysis of variance for decision-making items by grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>F-probability</th>
<th>6-7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have in the scheduling of your school classes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about your class subjects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about what happens on your sports teams?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your local community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your community’s interest in youth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Mean.  ^SD = Standard deviation.  % = Duncan.  = Scheffe.

7,8<9,11,12Dc  7<9,11Dc; 7<10Dd  7>11,12Dc; 8>12Dc

aM = Mean.  bSD = Standard deviation.  cD = Duncan.  dS = Scheffe.
is a more conservative test than Duncan's multiple range test. Seventh graders perceived their input to be nearer to about right than did the tenth graders, however neither group considered that it was about right. The Duncan procedure continued to test whether any means were noticeably different, statistically, and indicated that even more grades were different. In this test, eighth graders' means also were different from tenth graders' means. In addition, seventh graders' means were different from eleventh and ninth graders' means. Consistently, the seventh graders were closer to thinking that their input to decisions made by their local community was about right.

Table 7 presents the results of an analysis of variance for decision-making items by residence. The only item on which residence made a difference concerned the amount of input teens had into what happens on their sport teams. The means on this item were statistically significant at the .05 level. The Duncan post hoc test detected that the means for rural nonfarm and town/city residents were different from the rural residents. Teens who live on farms responded that they had almost too little to say on their sport teams.

Analysis of Youth's Perceptions of Their Community Involvement

Community involvement was assessed from yes/no responses to items 84 to 91. (See Appendix C.) Youth perceptions were sought on the problems of drinking and drug use by youth in their communities. As presented in Table 8, a Chi-square test on each of the items resulted in statistically significant values on six of the eight items. Four of the items were significant at the .001 level, indicating that only once in a thousand
Table 7. Analysis of variance for decision-making items by residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Non-farm</th>
<th>Town/City</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>F-probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have in the scheduling of your school classes?</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about your class subjects?</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about what happens on your sports teams?</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your family?</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you have about decisions made by your local community?</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your community's interest in youth?</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aM = Mean.
^bSD = Standard deviation.
^cD = Duncan post hoc test found farm residents to have less input than non-farm and town-city residents.
Table 8. Chi-square of community involvement by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community participation item</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>Chi-square probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that drinking is a problem for kids in your community?</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the use of drugs by kids is a problem in your community?</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09.6</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
times would the same result occur by chance. The other two items had Chi-square values that were significant at the .01 level.

A fewer number of females responded “no” than was expected when asked whether they felt drinking was a problem for youth in their communities. This was also the case when asked if they wanted to be involved in planning programs against drinking. Both of these responses were significant at the .001 level. Females saw fewer opportunities for involvement in planning such programs than was expected.

More “no” response were received from females than expected when asked whether they felt use of drugs by youth in their communities was a problem. The Chi-square value for this item was significant at the .01 level. Fewer females than expected indicated that they did not want to be involved in planning programs against drug use. More females than expected responded “no” when asked whether there were opportunities to be involved in planning programs against drug use. These two items yielded Chi-square values that were significant at the .001 level.

Table 9 presents a comparison of community involvement by grade. Several statistically significant differences were detected. Fewer seventh graders than would be expected were not interested in being involved in planning programs against drinking (significance was at the .05 level). Seventh graders responded “yes” fewer times than were expected when asked whether there was opportunity to be involved in planning programs against drinking.

Teens in the same grade responded that they felt the use of drugs was a problem for youth in their community fewer times than was ex-
Table 9. Chi-square comparison of community involvement by grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community involvement item</th>
<th>6-7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>Chi-square probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related to drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that drinking is a problem for kids in your community?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against drinking?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the use of drugs by kids is a problem in your</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against drug use?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pected (Chi-square value was significant at the .05 level). In another grade, twelfth, respondents answered “yes” significantly fewer times than expected to the item about whether they wanted to be involved in planning programs against drug use. Seventh graders answered “no” significantly fewer times than was expected when asked about whether they wanted to be involved in planning programs against drug use.

Residence seemed to give little guidance to predicting teens’ perceptions of drinking and drug use in their communities. As presented in Table 10, only once did a statistically significant difference emerge from Chi-square analysis, and then significance was observed at the .001 level. Fewer farm residents than expected thought use of drugs was a problem for youth in their communities, but the opposite was true for nonfarm rural residents. Fewer of these respondents thought it was not a problem.

Analysis of the Relationships of Locus of Control Score to Decision-Making and Community Involvement

Cronbach alpha allowed the researcher to check reliability for internal consistency of the eight items that were combined to obtain the locus of control score. The Cronbach alpha measure is appropriate to assess a single dimension, such as locus of control score, that was obtained from administering one test to determine attitudes (McMillan, 1984).

The Cronbach coefficient alpha for standardized variables was .436. This alpha (and those between .30 to .50) indicated a low positive correlation (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs, 1988). Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh wrote (1985, p. 237).
Table 10. Chi-square of community involvement by residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community involvement item</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>Chi-square probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related to drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that drinking is a problem for kids in your community?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drinking?</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Related to drug use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel that the use of drugs by kids is a problem in your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drug use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The degree of reliability needed in a measure depends to a great extent on the use that is to be made of the results. If the measurement results are to be used for making a decision about a group or even for research purposes, a lower reliability coefficient (in the range of .30 to .50) might be acceptable. But if the results are to be used as a basis for making decisions about individuals, especially important or irreversible decisions, only instruments with the highest reliability are acceptable.

The information from this research study will be useful in making decisions about groups and will be among the body of knowledge used as a reference for program direction by Iowa State University Extension Youth and 4-H (Morris, 1991). Research that will be used to make decisions about groups and for reference tolerates lower reliability (McMillan, 1985). McMillan also stated that instruments affect reliability. Instruments for personality traits have lower reliability than instruments that assess achievement.

Several other factors should be considered when interpreting reliability coefficients (McMillan, 1985). Among these is heterogeneity of the group. The random sample provided heterogeneity in this research. Reliability is affected by number of items and increases with number of items. The locus of control score was obtained from eight items, a relatively low number of items. A greater range of scores contributes to higher reliability. The range of scores is quite broad, within the possible range for the locus of control scores using the scale for the eight items. Reliability is also based on a norming group. Ross and Mirowsky established reliability on the instrument when it was administered to individuals 18 to 85 years of age. The participants in this research were 13 to 18 years of age—people at
earlier stages of cognitive development and maturation than the norming group.

The eight items used to obtain the score came from the Multi-measure Control and Defense Instrument developed by Ross and Mirowsky (1989). They used the instrument for community assessment via telephone as this study did. They reported alpha reliability of .68. The alpha reliability of the eight items in this study (.436) is quite a difference (Shelley, 1992). The correlation analysis that produced the Cronbach coefficient alpha indicated that one of the eight items didn't factor in well ("My bad luck is the result of mistakes that I have made.") and that if that item were deleted, the alpha reliability would be .5, a pretty substantial increase (Shelley). The reader was referred to a 1991 article by Mirowsky and Ross that continued to discuss the reliability of the eight-item measure compared to Rotter's locus of control instrument and also verified content, criterion, and construct validity of the eight items.

With an alpha reliability of .436 for the locus of control items in this research, readers should carefully consider whether to generalize the subsequent findings to the population. The researcher recommends caution.

The locus of control score resulted from answers on the eight locus of control items. The values for the responses range from +5 to +1 for the items that assess internal locus of control. For the items that measure external locus of control, the values for the responses range from -5 to -1. The locus of control scores range from +16 to -16. A score of +16 could result from choosing +5 on all four of the internal locus of control items and -1 on all four external locus of control items. A score of -16 could
result from choosing -5 on all four external locus of control items and +1 on all four internal items. Zero is the midpoint on the 33-point continuum of -16 to +16.

The locus of control score presented in Table 11 was the dependent variable for an analysis of variance by the independent variable, gender. The statistical procedure detected no differences between means. Notice that the means of the locus of control score were very similar for male and female teens, 5.68 and 5.78 respectively.

Analysis of variance of locus of control mean scores by the grade of the respondents are presented in Table 12. The statistical procedure verified that only one time in 100 would this F-value emerge naturally or by chance. The Duncan post hoc test indicated that the locus of control score was significantly different for participants in lower and upper grade levels. The seventh and eighth graders had statistically different mean scores from eleventh and twelfth graders. The younger respondents had lower locus of control mean scores than the older respondents.

When the locus of control scores were considered by residence (Table 13), no statistically significant differences emerged from the analysis of variance test on group means. Regardless of whether respondents lived on the farm, in the country but not on a farm, or in a town or city, their mean scores indicated an internal locus of control at about 5.6 on a scale where +16 is the highest possible score.

Figure 1 pictures how often each of the locus of control scores occurred. The range of scores for teens who participated in the Iowa Youth
Poll was from -3 to +16. More than 500 of the Iowa Youth Poll sample was represented with a positive locus of control score that indicated that they felt that they had some control over their lives.

Table 11. Analysis of variance for locus of control score by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>F-probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus of control score</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Analysis of variance for locus of control score by grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>6-7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>F-prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus of control score</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7.8&lt;11,12D\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}M = Mean.  
\textsuperscript{b}SD = Standard deviation.  
D = Duncan.
Table 13. Analysis of variance for locus of control score by residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Farm</th>
<th>Non-farm</th>
<th>Town/City</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>F-prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>M = Mean.
<sup>b</sup>SD = Standard deviation.

Summary of Major Findings

The following statements summarize the major findings of this research study.

1. Participants scored high on internal measures of locus of control items. About 90 percent of the sample had positive locus of control scores.

2. Respondents reported that they had too little input to community decisions.

3. Iowa teens perceived that drinking is more of a problem than drug use for people their ages in their communities.

4. The responses indicated that teens were willing to be more involved in planning programs against drinking and drug use, but their interest seemed to exceed the opportunities they perceive for such involvement.

5. Females are more dissatisfied with their community's interest in youth than males.
Figure 1. Histogram frequency of locus of control scores

6. Respondents in the lower grades expressed that they had less input to scheduling their school classes than they would like.

7. Seventh graders were closer to thinking that their input to decisions made by their local community was about right.

8. Residence made a difference when it came to input to decisions on sport teams. Teens who live on farms responded that they had almost too little to say on their sport teams.
9. Being female was a major factor in perceptions about involvement in community problems that affect them and their peers. More females than expected felt drinking was a problem. More females than expected felt drug use was not a problem in their communities. Their willingness to be involved exceeded expectations. More females than would be expected, perceived opportunities to do so.

10. Analysis by grade found numerous cases in which seventh graders emerged as significantly different in their perceptions than expected. They perceived drinking and drug use to be problems at a rate greater than one might expect. They saw fewer opportunities for involvement in planning programs than would be expected.

11. More teens who live on farms than were expected, perceived drug use to be a problem for young people.

12. Means of the locus of control score are very similar for male and female teens.

13. Younger respondents had lower locus of control mean scores than the older respondents.

14. Residence had little affect on the locus of control score.
DISCUSSION

The information analyzed for this study allowed the researcher to address the objectives presented in the Introduction. The study was designed to (1) determine the control that Iowa youth think they have over their lives, (2) assess youth's perception of their input into making decisions and being involved in the community, (3) analyze the relationships of selected factors to locus of control, (4) establish implications for agricultural and extension education programs to assist youth in meeting their needs.

The study was appropriate for meeting the objectives in arriving at generalizations about the influence of locus of control on decision making and community participation. The study design included features that strengthened the collection of data available to analyze. The information was obtained from a random sample of 545 Iowa youth 13 to 18 years of age. The interaction via telephone to collect the data was well suited to the teen sample. The Computer Assisted Telephone Interview system expedited data collection and coding (Hoyt, 1992).

Considerations to strengthen future data collection include constructing the interview response options to provide continuous data rather than dichotomous data whenever appropriate so that more in-depth statistical procedures could be used for analysis of relationships. In addition, administration of the research project should include a research agreement between participating units that specifies details for
archival of data so that it is readily accessible to appropriate parties for further analysis.

In general, Iowa Youth Poll participants scored quite high on items that measured internal locus of control. When the responses to the eight internal and external measures were summed, about 90 percent of the sample had positive locus of control scores. It was interesting to note that means of the locus of control scores were very similar for male and female teens. In addition, residence had little affect on the locus of control score. Whether Iowa teens lived on a farm, in the country but not on a farm, or in a city or town, most of them perceived that they had some degree of control over their lives.

It was observed that residence made a difference when it came to input to decisions on sport teams. It was the teens who live on farms that responded that they had almost too little to say on their sport teams. One possible explanation could be that farm youth often carry some responsibility for farm operation and may be more involved in daily decision-making than nonfarm residents. If they participate at this level at the home in the farm business, they may be more likely to expect to have more input to decisions that affect them on their sport teams.

Residence also was a factor in another finding. More farm teens than were expected, perceived drug use to be a problem for young people. Such a perception may be the result of reality. Perhaps more farm youth use drugs than expected. Information about drug use was gathered from the sample, but was not analyzed for the study at hand.
The researcher recommends further data analysis to check for a relationship.

Regardless of where the Iowa teens in the random sample resided, they perceived that drinking was more of a problem than drug use for people their ages in their communities. The conclusion supports Kurth-Schai's (1988) observation that associated with lack of participation for youth comes expressions of self-destructive and anti-social behaviors such as drug use. She called for involvement of youth as catalysts for positive social change.

The responses to the Iowa Youth Poll indicated that teens were willing to be more involved in planning programs against drinking and drug use, but their interest seemed to exceed the opportunities they perceive for such involvement. This finding supports the literature cited that reported youth as being eager for a part in making decisions that affect them. Kohler (1982) wrote that society gives adolescents little practice or experience in being responsible, participating members of society yet expects people to be responsible when they reach adulthood. Kurth-Schai (1988) cautioned that society limits children's ability to develop a strong sense of self-worth when they are denied their potential to contribute to society.

In the study at hand, only participants in the seventh grade were close to thinking that their input to decisions made by their local community was about right. This difference among grade levels could suggest that seventh graders are in the early stages of awareness of
community decisions that affect them so they may tend to be more satisfied than those with more insight in higher grades.

One area in which respondents in the lower grades expressed dissatisfaction was with the amount of input to decisions about scheduling their school classes. They would like to be more involved. In the literature, Lofquist (1989) stated that in a democracy, young people have a right and responsibility to participate in decisions that affect them. The seventh and eighth grader's perception about lack of access to decisions about their school classes may be a comment on school structure in which students in grades nine to 12 are more likely to have opportunities to choose elective classes.

Analysis by grade found numerous cases in which seventh graders emerged as significantly different in their perceptions than expected. They perceived drinking and drug use to be problems at a rate greater than one might expect. Such an observation suggests that seventh graders may be more cognizant of the effects of drinking and drug use than anticipated. Such awareness of the actions of their older role models may have prompted their responses. In addition, information was gathered from the sample on their use of substances. It could be analyzed to determine to what extent seventh graders have such experience.

Seventh graders also saw fewer opportunities for involvement in planning programs against drug use and drinking than would be expected. Several authors noted that youth are willing, even eager, for a part in making decisions that affect them. Kurth-Schai (1988) wrote
that youth want to contribute to society. Dollar (1975) also emphasized that adolescents have a basic need to contribute to society. Society, however, has kept youth in a holding pattern, excluded them from responsibility, and kept them on a waiting list until adulthood, many authors stated. Iowa and Iowa youth would benefit if such attitudes were abandoned because, as Konopka (1973) said, the extent to which the adolescents experiences responsible participation determines and maximizes human development. As youth would experience the freedom to take part in the world that Schine and others (1981) called for, youth could make a difference with supportive guidance from adults who appreciate youth. The youth partners that would join with adults possess skills to be effective participants in making decisions as indicated by their positive locus of control scores. An example of the literature that reported that youth believed they were good at making decisions is The Troubled Journey survey (Search . . . , 1990). Kurth-Schal (1988) called for providing opportunities for youth to take part in guiding the development of human society, especially if the decisions to be made relate to their concerns.

Results from the Iowa Youth Poll tend to indicate that Iowa teens would be willing to become involved, yet adults may wonder at their qualifications. Klayman (1985) found that by age 12, children understand many of the basic concepts of strategic decision-making. Low confidence in decision-making may stem from limited opportunities for them to make decisions. With opportunity for such decision-making
experiences, the literature related that self-esteem as a decision-maker increased with age.

Younger respondents to the Iowa Youth Poll had lower locus of control mean scores than did the older respondents. Hall (1991) noted that where people placed on the external-internal control continuum can change over time. She called for making deliberate efforts to help children perceive greater degrees of internal control. Involving youth in community decisions that affect them may lead to an increase in the internal locus of control. Ross and Mirowsky (1989) pointed out that people who feel in control solve problems. An internal locus of control activates a person to solve problems. A personal history of solving problems improves self-assurance.

Addressing the needs of youth may lead to meeting the needs of society. Werner and Smith (1989) found in their longitudinal study of impoverished Asian and Polynesian youth, that resilient youth have an internal locus of control and that they are more responsible. Ortman (1988) wrote that teens expressed that having control and being responsible were desirable conditions. Findings from the Iowa Youth Poll study would tend to support a positive teen attitude toward being responsible. Society needs responsible youth. What can be done to bring the wants of teens and the needs of society together? The literature would seem to suggest that society should seize youth's interest in participating in the community decisions by involving them in experiential education with time for reflection (Kohler, 1982). Such participation can build self-esteem and an internal locus of control.
according to Omizo and Omizo (1988). The importance of youth involvement was emphasized by Eberhart and Keith (1989) who suggested that self-concept and locus of control are positively correlated and may be related in a causal, complex way and one that may change with maturation.

The youth-as-resources approach promoted by Lofquist (1989) and others would seem to be especially beneficial for the young women in Iowa. According to findings from the Iowa Youth Poll, being female was a major factor in perceptions about involvement in community problems that affect them and their peers. More females than expected felt drinking and drug use were problems in their communities. Their willingness to be involved in planning programs against these problems exceeded expectations. An important consideration here may be related to daily observations that teen females may be making that lead them to reflect on the long term problems associated with substance abuse, such as the damage to their peer's health and eligible life partners who would be the fathers to their children. The Iowa teen females may observe the disruption to family life and earning potential associated with substance abuse. Iowa Youth Poll data does not document whether teen females make these connections, but whatever their reasoning, they indicated that they are more willing to be involved in planning programs against drug use and drinking than they perceived opportunities to do so.

It was further observed that females were more dissatisfied with their community's interest in youth than males. The respondents may have observed and experienced the effects of being female, if, for
example they were members of households headed by women who, in general, earn 69 cents for every dollar that men make. The Iowa Youth Poll gathered information on family composition, employment status, and job title of parents and stepparents, but this data was not analyzed for this study. Analyzing and checking these relationships with the findings about females in this analysis may lead to greater understanding of the reasons for responses by females.

The strength of responses from female adolescents in the study tends to support recent psychological theory of adolescent development. Gilligan (1990) conducted research that indicated that females speak in a different voice than males. She found that a focus on care concerns was associated primarily with females.

The gender differences in the Iowa Youth Poll findings also were consistent with research being done by sociolinguist Tannen (1990) who studied communication patterns of men and women. She wrote that females are hurt under the pretense that females and males are equal because the ways females are treated are based on the norms of males. In the effort toward equality, some scholars fail to acknowledge gender differences in ways of thinking and speaking. She presented a need to identify and understand others' language styles in order to discover a shared message.

Respondents to the Iowa Youth Poll reported that they had too little input into community decisions and were disappointed in the community's interest in youth. This finding and those presented above convey a unified message of teen's interest in helping to solve
community problems that affect them and society. The community should empower youth by recognizing them as resources and partners in addressing contemporary issues such as air and water quality, the environment, and recycling. Involve them in writing legislation on these issues for youth soon will be among the adults who will observe the laws.

The Iowa Youth Poll findings have implications for agriculture and extension educators. They should note that youth appear willing to and capable of solving their own problems if only there were ways for them to be involved. Youth programmers, whether in the formal or nonformal systems, should recognize seventh grade as a point with much potential for positive response to programming. Success may be dependent upon the approach. Programmers should renew a dedication to the experiential education (Dewey, 1938) that binds the pragmatists who often choose the agricultural and extension education fields of endeavor. Review the suggestions for successful programs presented by Kohler (1982). In addition, heed the cry of youth to be involved in planning programs and making decisions that affect them. Maintaining adolescents' involvement in activities is important to help them learn and experience skills they need now and as adults (Fertman and Chubb, 1990). Programs with these qualities seem more likely to maintain their involvement.

Implications call for informing the community on the perceptions and attitudes of youth documented in findings of this research. In addition, adults may need education on how to interact positively with teens. Programs for adults to build facilitative skills may be needed.
Include youth as educators for adults. Include a section on Dewey's (1938) philosophy to value the present experience rather than waiting for it to be meaningful in the future. Include a portion on the youth-as-resources concept to help community citizens see that human capital is as great a resource in solving society's problems as financial resources, especially in the current fiscal condition of the state of Iowa.

A particular point of entry may be the junior high or middle school classroom. Extension programmers frequently deliver enrichment programs in school classrooms. The vocational agriculture classroom may be one place for Extension and formal educators to work together. Perhaps youth could become involved in program planning, decision-making, and delivery to reach their peers with program messages against drug use and drinking. Supervised occupational experiences for older teens could include a segment on qualities of a productive, contributing worker that is responsible in substance use.

In addition, the agriculture school classroom may be a delivery point for information about community health programs to build awareness of emotional health as associated with locus of control, self-esteem, and self-concept so that if a problem arises, youth know how to access options for help.

A multi-faceted research agenda could emerge from the unanswered questions raised by this study related to the needs of youth and the needs of society. Several of these have been mentioned in the preceding discussion. In addition, haste should be taken to analyze the extensive information contained in the data gathered during the Iowa
Youth Poll. A more thorough knowledge of the needs and perceptions of Iowa teens will aid youth development programmers for Iowa State University Extension Youth and 4-H and educators in the formal school system. Further analysis of the Iowa Youth Poll data should start with a factor analysis of all nondemographic data. The new groupings that result would help shape the direction of further analysis.

In addition, the possibility for a panel survey as a result of the first Iowa Youth Poll should be activated. The last question asked the teens whether they would be willing to be interviewed again. Principal investigator Miller reported that the response was overwhelmingly positive, thereby establishing a readily accessible panel who could be queried a number of times on varied topics.

Information could be gathered using existing instruments that have established validity and reliability. For example, self-esteem and problem-solving ability could be measured and the data could be analyzed in relation to locus of control data.

Further research should be conducted to attempt to write an item that would tend to support the locus of control construct and lead to a higher reliability for the eight-item measure used in this study. Care should be taken to assess the word choice and the age of the sample as well as any interaction between word choice and age. In addition, two versions of the eight-item set could be developed and administered prior to checking split-half reliability.
SUMMARY

This study considered locus of control in relation to youth decision-making (or problem solving) and community involvement. Perceived control allows people to actively and effectively solve problems and make decisions. The Iowa State University Extension Youth and 4-H program aims to help youth develop decision-making skills. An understanding of locus of control will assist programming to help youth become contributing members of society who have a sense of control over important outcomes in their lives.

The objectives of the study were to: (1) Determine the control that youth think they have over their lives. (2) Assess youth's perception of their input into making decisions and being involved in the community. (3) Analyze the relationships of selected factors to locus of control. (4) Establish implications for agricultural and extension education programs to assist youth in meeting their needs.

The Iowa Youth Poll study was used to provide research-based information to assess locus of control influences on decisions and community participation as expressed by Iowa youth.

The instrument, administered by telephone in spring 1990, consisted of 162 questions to assess the behaviors, needs, and desires of Iowa youth. It documented their feelings, concerns, and perceptions about societal problems and solutions. The questions dealt with problems that faced Iowa youth 13 to 18 years of age and their lifestyle
The 545 interviews with a random sample of Iowa youth averaged 18.5 minutes for approximately 150 questions.

The data collected in the Iowa Youth Poll were coded as the responses were collected during the telephone interview. The data from 25 items were analyzed for this study using the statistical treatments included in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-X, 1988).

The following statements summarize the major findings of this research study.

Participants scored high on internal measures of locus of control items. About 90 percent of the sample had positive locus of control scores.

Respondents reported that they had too little input to community decisions.

Iowa teens perceived that drinking is more of a problem than drug use for people their ages in their communities.

The responses indicated that teens were willing to be more involved in planning programs against drinking and drug use, but their interest seemed to exceed the opportunities they perceive for such involvement.

Females were more dissatisfied with their community's interest in youth than males.

Respondents in the lower grades expressed that they had less input to scheduling their school classes than they would like.
Seventh graders were closer to thinking that their input to decisions made by their local community was about right.

Residence made a difference when it came to input to decisions on sport teams. Teens who live on farms responded that they had almost too little to say on their sport teams.

Being female was a major factor in perceptions about involvement in community problems that affect them and their peers. More females in the study than was expected felt drinking was a problem. More females than expected felt drug use was not a problem in their communities. Their willingness to be involved exceeded expectations. More females than would be expected perceived opportunities to do so.

Analysis by grade found numerous cases in which seventh graders emerged as significantly different in their perceptions than expected. They perceived drinking and drug use to be problems at a rate greater than one might expect. They saw fewer opportunities for involvement in planning programs than would be expected.

More teens who live on farms than were expected, perceived drug use to be a problem for young people.

Means of the locus of control score were very similar for male and female teens.

Younger respondents had lower locus of control mean scores than the older respondents.

Residence had little affect on the locus of control score.

Research-based information from this study should be considered as an impetus for financial resource development.
Development and maintenance of a positive locus of control in youth can be enhanced by active involvement in community decisions that affect youth. Based on findings from this study, youth development programmers in extension and agricultural education are encouraged to give priority to programs for seventh graders.

Recognizing that getting research results used is one of the most important problems associated with research, this researcher strongly suggests that the Iowa State University Extension Youth and 4-H staff use this research-based information to benefit youth and society.
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APPENDIX A. SCREENING INSTRUMENT
SCREENING

I am (your name) calling from the Sociology Department at Iowa State University. We are planning a state wide study of youth in Iowa for the 4-H under the direction of Dr. Miller.

1. May I speak to one of the heads of the household?
   1. Yes  Skip to question 4
   2. No
   3. REFUSED

2. Does anyone live in your household who is between the ages of 13 and 18?
   1. Yes
   2. No -- If no thank them for their assistance
   3. REFUSED

3. When would it be a good time to call back and discuss with the parents the possibility of interviewing one of their children?
   DAY _________
   TIME _________

4. Do you have any children living at home between the ages of 13 and 18?
   1. Yes
   2. No --> Thank them for their assistance and terminate the phone call
   3. REFUSED

We are doing a state wide study looking at the needs and problems of youth. We will be talking to teenagers between the ages of 13 and 18. The information we get will help to develop and improve youth programs. If you agree, we will send a letter explaining this study to you and your child. All information received will be kept confidential, no identifying information will be used. Your child's answers will be grouped with the responses of the 600 youth interviewed.

5. Will you give us permission to talk to one of your children?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. REFUSED
6. How many teenage daughters do you have?

1 Zero  SKIP TO QUESTION 9  
2 One  
3 Two  SKIP TO QUESTION 8  
4 Three  SKIP TO QUESTION 8  
5 Four  SKIP TO QUESTION 8  
6 Five  SKIP TO QUESTION 8  
7 Six  SKIP TO QUESTION 8  
8 REFUSED

7. To help us know how many children from each age we will be talking to. Will you tell me the age of your daughter and her first name?

Name ____________________

Age __________

8. For us to get a good understanding of the concerns of youth in Iowa it is important that we talk with girls from each age group. To be able to do this we need to select the youth to be talked to using a random process. Would you please tell me the age and name of each of your daughters who are between 13 and 18 years old.

Name ____________________

Age ________________

Name ____________________

Age __________

Name ____________________  THIS WILL BE REPEATED DEPENDING ON THE NUMBER OF DAUGHTERS THIS FAMILY HAS

8. How many teenage sons do you have?

1 Zero  SKIP TO QUESTION 12  
2 One  
3 Two  SKIP TO QUESTION 11  
4 Three  SKIP TO QUESTION 11  
5 Four  SKIP TO QUESTION 11  
6 Five  SKIP TO QUESTION 11  
7 Six  SKIP TO QUESTION 11  
8 REFUSED
10. To help us know how many children from each age we will be talking to. Will you tell me the age of your son and his first name?

Name __________________________
Age _______

11. For us to get a good understanding of the concerns of youth in Iowa it is important that we talk with boys from each age group. To be able to do this we need to select the youth to be talked to using a random process. Would you please tell me the age and name of each of your sons who are between 13 and 18 years old.

Name __________________________
Age __________________________

Name __________________________
Age __________________________  THIS WILL BE REPEATED DEPENDING ON THE NUMBER OF SONS THIS FAMILY HAS

12. May we have your address, so we will be able to send you and your child a letter explaining this survey?

Street __________________________
City __________________________
Zip Code ________________________
To be printed on ISU letterhead

January, 1990

Dear (Respondent's name):

Next week we will be calling to ask you to participate in a research study. This is a state-wide survey in which we are seeking to understand how the youth in Iowa feel about the issues, concerns, and problems that youth face today and what could be done about them.

You will be called between the hours of 6 pm and 9 pm on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday evening. The interview will take approximately twenty minutes. If you are called at an inconvenient time, please tell the interviewer and they will be happy to call you back at a more convenient time.

The information you are able to give us is essential to the success of this study. If you are asked a question you do not feel comfortable answering, you have the right to refuse to answer that question. Just tell the interviewer and she will go on to the next question.

All of your answers will be kept confidential. The final report will consist of your answers combined with the answers of the six hundred other youth in this survey.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to ask our interviewer when you are called. Or you may contact me by phone at 515-294-8008.

Cordially,

Martin G. Miller, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology
APPENDIX C. IOWA YOUTH POLL SURVEY INSTRUMENT
Hello, this is (your name) calling for Dr. Miller in the Sociology Department at Iowa State University. We are contacting youth in Iowa to get their opinions on the issues and concerns youth face today. Have you received the letter we sent you explaining the project? **If the response is no, an explanation of this project will need to be given at this time.** We are very interested in your opinions on the problems youth face today. We hope you will assist us by participating in this survey. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. If there are any questions you are uncomfortable answering, just tell me and I will continue on with the next question.

1. **Respondent's gender:** *(IF YOU ARE NOT SURE ASK)*
   
   1. Male
   2. Female

   We will begin by asking what your age was on your last birthday?

2. **What was your age on your last birthday?**

   YEARS __  
   
   **If age is not between 13 and 18 stop this interview.**

   19. Not in any range
   20. REFUSED

3. **Are you currently going to school?**

   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. REFUSED

4. **What grade are you in?**

   1. 6th grade
   2. 7th grade
   3. 8th grade
   4. 9th grade
   5. 10th grade
   6. 11th grade (Junior)
   7. 12th grade (Senior)
   8. Refused
5. Are you a member of any sports teams such as basketball, football, swimming, softball, volleyball, wrestling, tennis, soccer?

1 Yes
2 No
3 Refused

**ONLY WANT KIDS WHO ARE MEMBERS OF ORGANIZED TEAMS WITH COACHES**

6. Now could you tell me the sporting events you are a member of at your school?

7. Now we are interested in school activities other than sports that you are involved in? Could you tell me all the school activities that you are involved in, such as, choir, band, cheerleading, debate, student council, FFA, FHA or math club.

8. What activities are you currently involved in outside of school? Such as scouts, church groups, 4-H, dancing, art, music lessons, volunteer programs, sports.

9. Have you had problems in finding a job?

1 Yes
2 No **Skip to question 11**
3 DON'T KNOW **skip to question 11**
4 REFUSED **Skip to question 11**
10. How often?
   1  Once or twice
   2  Sometimes
   3  Often
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

11. Have you had any problems finding out what jobs are available?
   1  Yes
   2  No  Skip to question 13
   3  DON'T KNOW  SKIP TO QUESTION 13
   4  REFUSED  Skip to question 13

12. How often?
   1  Once or twice
   2  Sometimes
   3  Often
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

13. Have you been benched for discipline by a coach?
   1  Yes
   2  No  Skip to question 15
   3  DON'T KNOW  SKIP TO QUESTION 15
   4  REFUSED  Skip to question 15

14. How often?
   1  Once or twice
   2  Sometimes
   3  Often
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

15. Have you experienced boy/girl discrimination or favoritism in sports?
   1  Yes
   2  No  Skip to question 17
   3  DON'T KNOW  SKIP TO QUESTION 17
   4  REFUSED  Skip to question 17
16. How often?
1. Once or twice
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

17. Have you experienced boy/girl discrimination or favoritism in school courses?
1. Yes
2. No [Skip to question 19]
3. DON'T KNOW [Skip to question 19]
4. REFUSED [Skip to question 19]

18. How often?
1. Once or twice
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

19. Have you experienced too much pressure and competition with the teams you are on?
1. Yes
2. No [Skip to question 21]
3. DON'T KNOW [Skip to question 21]
4. REFUSED [Skip to question 21]

20. How often?
1. Once or twice
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

21. Have you ever experienced too much pressure and competition in school?
1. Yes
2. No [Skip to question 23]
3. DON'T KNOW [Skip to question 23]
4. REFUSED [Skip to question 23]
22. How often?

1. Once or twice
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

23. Have you been physically hurt by coaches?

1. Yes
2. No Skip to question 25
3. DON'T KNOW SKIP TO QUESTION 25
4. REFUSED Skip to question 25

24. How often?

1. Once or twice
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

25. Have you ever been expelled or suspended from school?

1. Yes
2. No Skip to question 27
3. DON'T KNOW SKIP TO QUESTION 27
4. REFUSED Skip to question 27

26. How often?

1. Once or twice
2. Sometimes
3. Often
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

27. Have you been physically hurt by teachers?

1. Yes
2. No Skip to question 29
3. DON'T KNOW SKIP TO QUESTION 29
4. REFUSED Skip to question 29
28. How often?
   1. Once or twice
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. DON'T KNOW
   5. REFUSED

29. Have you been physically hurt by other kids?
   1. Yes
   2. No Skip to question 31
   3. DON'T KNOW Skip to question 31
   4. REFUSED Skip to question 31

30. How often?
   1. Once or twice
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. DON'T KNOW
   5. REFUSED

31. Have your parents physically hurt you?
   1. Yes
   2. No Skip to question 33
   3. DON'T KNOW Skip to question 33
   4. REFUSED Skip to question 33

WE WANT TO KNOW ABOUT PHYSICAL OR SEXUAL ABUSE, WE ARE NOT INTERESTED IN ROUTINE PUNISHMENTS, SPANKINGS, ETC.

32. How often?
   1. Once or twice
   2. Sometimes
   3. Often
   4. DON'T KNOW
   5. REFUSED
33. Do you feel that recreational activities such as movies, musical events or sporting events cost too much?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

34. Do you feel there are enough entertainment and recreation centers available to you?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

Now we are interested in what you think about problems sometimes experienced by youth. I will read you some problems and ask if you see them as not being too serious of a problem, a somewhat serious problem, or a very serious problem for youth?

36. Finding a job, is this ...

1. Not too serious
2. A somewhat serious
3. Or a very serious problem for youth?
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

37. Finding out what jobs are available, is this ...

1. Not too serious
2. A somewhat serious
3. Or a very serious problem for youth?
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED

38. Kids being "benched", not being allowed to play during the game, is this ...

1. Not too serious
2. A somewhat serious
3. Or a very serious problem for youth?
4. DON'T KNOW
5. REFUSED
39. Boy/girl discrimination or favoritism in sports, is this ...

1  Not too serious
2  A somewhat serious
3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

40. Boy/girl discrimination or favoritism in school, is this ...

1  Not too serious
2  A somewhat serious
3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

41. Kids experiencing too much competition in the teams they plan on, is this ...

1  Not too serious
2  A somewhat serious
3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

42. Kids experiencing too much competition and pressure in school, is this ...

1  Not too serious
2  A somewhat serious
3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

43. Coaches physically hurting their players, is this ...

1  Not too serious
2  A somewhat serious
3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED
44. Kids being expelled or suspended from school, is this ...
   1  Not too serious
   2  A somewhat serious
   3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

45. Teachers physically hurting their students, is this ...
   1  Not too serious
   2  A somewhat serious
   3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

46. Kids being physically hurt by other kids, is this ...
   1  Not too serious
   2  A somewhat serious
   3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

47. Kids being physically hurt by their parents, is this ...
   1  Not too serious
   2  A somewhat serious
   3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED

48. The cost of recreational activities such as movies, sporting events, or musical events, is this ...
   1  Not too serious
   2  A somewhat serious
   3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
   4  DON'T KNOW
   5  REFUSED
49. The lack of available recreational activities and facilities for kids, is this ...

1  Not too serious
2  A somewhat serious
3  Or a very serious problem for youth?
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

Next, I would like to ask you a few questions about how much input or say you have on some things.

50. How much say do you have in the scheduling of school classes? Is it ...

1  Too little
2  About right
3  Too much
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

51. How much input do you have about your class subjects? Is it ...

1  Too little
2  About right
3  Too much
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

52. How much input do you have about what happens on your sports team(s)? Is it ...

1  Too little
2  About right
3  Too much
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

53. How much input do you have about decisions made by your family? Is it ...

1  Too little
2  About right
3  Too much
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED
54. How much input do you have about decisions made by your local community? Is it ...

1  Too little
2  About right
3  Too much
4  DON'T KNOW
5  REFUSED

Next, I have some questions about how you feel about certain situations.

55. Do you feel your coaches understand you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or none of the time?

1  All of the time
2  Most of the time
3  Some of the time
4  None of the time
5  DON'T KNOW
6  REFUSED

56. Do you feel your coaches are interested in you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1  All of the time
2  Most of the time
3  Some of the time
4  None of the time
5  DON'T KNOW
6  REFUSED

57. Do you feel your teachers understand you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1  All of the time
2  Most of the time
3  Some of the time
4  None of the time
5  DON'T KNOW
6  REFUSED
58. Do you feel your teachers are interested in you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1. All of the time
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

59. Do you feel your counselors understand you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1. All of the time
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

60. Do you feel your principal understands you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1. All of the time
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

61. Do you feel your parents understand your problems, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1. All of the time
2. Most of the time
3. Some of the time
4. None of the time
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED
62. Do you feel your parents are interested in you, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1  All of the time
2  Most of the time
3  Some of the time
4  None of the time
5  DON'T KNOW
6  REFUSED

63. How often do you feel there are times when you don't have enough things to do, all of the time, most of the time, some of the time or none of the time?

1  All of the time
2  Most of the time
3  Some of the time
4  None of the time
5  DON'T KNOW
6  REFUSED

64. Do you have enough time to do what you want to do?

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

65. Do you have enough time to do what is expected of you?

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

66. What is the highest level of education you plan to complete?

SUCH AS HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, BEAUTY SCHOOL, AREA COLLEGE, B.S., M.A., PhD, LAW SCHOOL, MEDICAL SCHOOL, NURSING SCHOOL (2 OR 3 YEAR)
67. What do you think your chances are of reaching that level of education? Are they good, fair or poor?

1 Good
2 Fair
3 Poor
4 DON'T KNOW
5 REFUSED

68. What are the chances of you dropping out before completing high school? Are they good, fair or poor?

1 Good
2 Fair
3 Poor
4 DON'T KNOW
5 REFUSED

69. How many of your friends do you think will go on to college? Would you say all, most, some or none of your friends will go on to college?

1 All
2 Most
3 Some
4 None
5 DON'T KNOW
6 REFUSED

70. What job do you want to have as an adult?

-----------------------------------------------

PROMPT: WHAT KIND OF JOB SOUNDS GOOD TO YOU

71. What do you think your chances are of getting the job you want? Are they good, fair, or poor?

1 Good
2 Fair
3 Poor
4 DON'T KNOW
5 REFUSED
72. What do you think the chances are of a young person getting this kind of job in your community?

1 Good
2 Fair
3 Poor
4 DON'T KNOW
5 REFUSED

73. How good do you think your chances are of being successful at this kind of job? Are they good, fair or poor?

1 Good
2 Fair
3 Poor
4 DON'T KNOW
5 REFUSED

74. What person influenced you the most in selecting your future job choice? Possible examples being mother, father, teacher, counselor, coach, grandparent, aunt, uncle, brother, sister, etc.

75. Have you ever used cigarettes, cigars or a pipe?

1 Yes
2 No SKIP TO QUESTION 78
3 DON'T KNOW SKIP TO QUESTION 78
4 REFUSED SKIP TO QUESTION 78

76. How often have you used it, once or twice, 1-3 times a month, 1-3 times a week, or more than 3 times a week?

1 Once or twice
2 1-3 times a month
3 1-3 times a week
4 More than 3 times a week
5 DON'T KNOW
6 REFUSED

77. Have you ever used smokeless tobacco, snuff, or chewing tobacco?

1 Yes
2 No SKIP TO QUESTION 80
3 DON'T KNOW SKIP TO QUESTION 80
4 REFUSED SKIP TO QUESTION 80
78. How often have you used it, once or twice, 1-3 times a month, 1-3 times a week, or more than 3 times a week?

1. Once or twice
2. 1-3 times a month
3. 1-3 times a week
4. More than 3 times a week
5. DONT KNOW
6. REFUSED

Next we are interested in knowing about young peoples' use of drugs and alcohol. I will read to you a list of substances and ask you if you have ever used it. If you have, I will ask you how often.

79. Have you ever drank any kind of alcoholic beverage such as beer, whiskey, vodka, gin, or wine? We are not referring to the drinking of wine as part of a religious ceremony such as communion.

1. Yes
2. No  SKIP TO QUESTION 81
3. DONT KNOW  SKIP TO QUESTION 81
4. REFUSED  SKIP TO QUESTION 81

80. How often have you used it, once or twice, 1-3 times a month, 1-3 times a week, or more than 3 times a week?

1. Once or twice
2. 1-3 times a month
3. 1-3 times a week
4. More than 3 times a week
5. DONT KNOW
6. REFUSED

81. Have you ever used drugs such as, pot, marijuana, cocaine, or amphetamines?

1. Yes
2. No  SKIP TO QUESTION 83
3. DONT KNOW  SKIP TO QUESTION 83
4. REFUSED  SKIP TO QUESTION 83
82. How often have you used it, once or twice, 1-3 times a month, 1-3 times a week, or more than 3 times a week?

1. Once or twice
2. 1-3 times a month
3. 1-3 times a week
4. More than 3 times a week
5. DON'T KNOW
6. REFUSED

83. Have you ever used steroids?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

84. Do you feel that drinking is a problem for kids in your community?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

85. Are you involved in planning programs against drinking?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

86. Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drinking?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

87. Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drinking?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED
88. Do you feel that the use of drugs by kids is a problem in your community?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

89. Are you involved in planning programs against drug use?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

90. Do you want to be involved in planning programs against drug use?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

91. Is there any opportunity for you to be involved in planning programs against drug use?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

92. How satisfied are you with the amount of time you have for yourself? Would you say you are very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied?

1 Very satisfied
2 Satisfied
3 Dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied
5 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
6 DON'T KNOW
7 REFUSED
93. How satisfied are you with the choices you have regarding the activities you are in? Would you say you are very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied?

1 Very satisfied
2 Satisfied
3 Dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied
5 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
6 DON'T KNOW
7 REFUSED

94. Do you feel you are in ...?

1 Too many activities
2 Too few activities
3 or in the activities you want to be.
4 DON'T KNOW
5 REFUSED

95. If you had a choice, which activities would you stop participating in?

96. If you had a choice, which activities would you start participating in?

Now I am going to read you a list of problems and complaints that some kids may have. For each one, I would like you to tell me how many days in the past week you had this feeling.

97. In the past week, how many days have you felt depressed?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8 DON'T KNOW
   9 REFUSED

98. In the past week, how many days have you been bothered by things that do not usually bother you?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8 DON'T KNOW
   9 REFUSED
99. In the past week, how many days have you felt lonely?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED

100. In the past week, how many days have you felt fearful?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED

101. In the past week, how many days have you felt sad?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED

102. In the past week, how many days have you felt like you can't shake off the blues?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED

103. In the past week, how many days have you felt like not eating?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED

104. In the past week, how many days have you had trouble concentrating?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED

105. In the past week, how many days have you felt like everything is an effort?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8  DON'T KNOW
   9  REFUSED
106. In the past week, how many days have you had trouble sleeping?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8 DON'T KNOW
   9 REFUSED

107. In the past week, how many days have you talked less than usual?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8 DON'T KNOW
   9 REFUSED

108. In the past week, how many days have you felt that you could not get going?

   NUMBER (0-7) ___
   8 DON'T KNOW
   9 REFUSED

109. Taking all things together, how would you say you are feeling these days? Would you say you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?

   1 Very happy
   2 Pretty happy
   3 Not too happy
   4 DON'T KNOW
   5 REFUSED

Next I am going to read you a few general statements. For each one, please tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or neither agree nor disagree.

110. I have someone I can really talk to. Do you ...

   1 Strongly agree
   2 Agree
   3 Disagree
   4 Strongly disagree
   5 Neither agree nor disagree
   6 DON'T KNOW
   7 REFUSED
111. I have someone I can turn to for support and understanding when things get rough. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree
2  Agree
3  Disagree
4  Strongly disagree
5  Neither agree nor disagree
6  DON'T KNOW
7  REFUSED

112. I am responsible for my own successes. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree
2  Agree
3  Disagree
4  Strongly disagree
5  Neither agree nor disagree
6  DON'T KNOW
7  REFUSED

113. I can do just about anything that I really set my mind to. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree
2  Agree
3  Disagree
4  Strongly disagree
5  Neither agree nor disagree
6  DON'T KNOW
7  REFUSED

114. The really good things that happen to me are mostly luck. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree
2  Agree
3  Disagree
4  Strongly disagree
5  Neither agree nor disagree
6  DON'T KNOW
7  REFUSED
115. Most of my problems are due to bad breaks. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree  
2  Agree  
3  Disagree  
4  Strongly disagree  
5  Neither agree nor disagree  
6  DON'T KNOW  
7  REFUSED  

116. I have little control over the bad things that happen to me. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree  
2  Agree  
3  Disagree  
4  Strongly disagree  
5  Neither agree nor disagree  
6  DON'T KNOW  
7  REFUSED  

117. I am responsible for my failures. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree  
2  Agree  
3  Disagree  
4  Strongly disagree  
5  Neither agree nor disagree  
6  DON'T KNOW  
7  REFUSED  

118. My bad luck is the result of mistakes that I have made. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree  
2  Agree  
3  Disagree  
4  Strongly disagree  
5  Neither agree nor disagree  
6  DON'T KNOW  
7  REFUSED
119. There's no sense planning a lot, if something good is going to happen, it will. Do you ...

1  Strongly agree
2  Agree
3  Disagree
4  Strongly disagree
5  Neither agree nor disagree
6  DONT KNOW
7  REFUSED

Now I'm going to read you some statements. For each one I would like you to tell me how often it is true for you. Is it true all of the time, some of the time, or none of the time.

120. I have had thought of harming myself. I feel this way ...?

1  all of the time
2  some of the time
3  or none of the time
4  DONT KNOW
5  REFUSED

121. I feel I would be better off if I were dead. I feel this way...?

1  all of the time
2  some of the time
3  or none of the time
4  DONT KNOW
5  REFUSED

122. I have had definite plans about committing suicide. I feel this way...?

1  all of the time
2  some of the time
3  or none of the time
4  DONT KNOW
5  REFUSED

123. I have thought I would like to kill myself. I feel this way ...?

1  all of the time
2  some of the time
3  or none of the time
4  DONT KNOW
5  REFUSED
Now I have some questions regarding dating. Dating habits vary among kids, some kids date and some kids don't.

124. Do you date?

1 Yes
2 No SKIP QUESTIONS 125 126 129 130 131 132 133 134
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

125. How often do you date? Do you date less than once a month, once a month, 2 or 3 times a month, once a week, twice a week, or more than twice a week?

1 More than twice a week
2 Twice a week
3 Once a week
4 2 or 3 times a month
5 Once a month
6 Or less than once a month
7 DON'T KNOW
8 REFUSED

126. Do you have a steady boyfriend or girlfriend?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

127. How many of your close friends date? Would you say all, most, some or none of your close friends date?

1 All
2 Most
3 Some
4 None
5 DON'T KNOW
6 REFUSED

128. Have you ever known anyone who was involved in a dating relationship in which they were physically hurt or beat up?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED
129. In dating relationships, has your partner ever been physically violent toward you?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

130. In your dating relationships have you ever been physically violent towards your partner?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

131. Have you ever had sexual intercourse?

1 Yes
2 No  SKIP TO QUESTION 134
3 DON'T KNOW  SKIP TO QUESTION 134
4 REFUSED  SKIP TO QUESTION 134

132. How many times have you had sexual intercourse since the beginning of last summer? Has it been ...

1 Once
2 2 or 3 times
3 More than 4 times
4 Or never
5 DON'T KNOW
6 REFUSED

133. When you last had sexual intercourse did you use any time of birth control?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

134. Have any of your close friends ever been pregnant?

1 Yes
2 No
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED
135. Have you ever been pregnant? (Female respondents)

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

136. Do you feel people your age need information about methods of birth control?

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

137. Do you feel people your age need counseling regarding sexual activity?

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

138. Do you feel people your age need pregnancy counseling?

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

139. Do you feel people your age need abortion counseling?

1  Yes
2  No
3  DON'T KNOW
4  REFUSED

Now I have a few more background questions before we are finished.

140. Are you living with both of your parents?

1  Yes—SKIP QUESTIONS 141, 148-153
2  No
3  REFUSED
141. Are you living with your mother or your father?
   1. Mother
   2. Father
   3. Both

142. Which do you spend most of your time with?
   1. Mother
   2. Father
   3. Equal amount of time with both

143. Who are you living with now?
   1. Mother
   2. Father
   3. Equal amount of time with both

144. Is your father currently working full-time, part-time, going to school, or doing something else?
   1. Working full time (35 hours or more)
   2. Working part time
   3. Unemployed, laid off, looking for work -
   4. Retired
   5. In school -
   6. Keeping house - Skip question 145
   7. Other -
   8. DON'T KNOW
   9. REFUSED

145. What does your father do at work?

146. Is your mother currently working full-time, part-time, going to school, or doing something else?
   1. Working full time (35 hours or more)
   2. Working part time
   3. Unemployed, laid off, looking for work -
   4. Retired
   5. In school -
   6. Keeping house - Skip question 148
   7. Other -
   8. DON'T KNOW
   9. REFUSED
147. What does your mother do at work?

-----------------------------------

148. Has your mother remarried?

1 Yes
2 No SKI P QUESTION 149 - 153
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

149. Is your step-father currently working full-time, part-time, going to school, or doing something else?

1 Working full time (35 hours or more)
2 Working part time
3 Unemployed, laid off, looking for work
4 Retired
5 In school
6 Keeping house
7 Other
8 DON'T KNOW
9 REFUSED

150. What does your step-father do at work?

-----------------------------------

151. Has your father remarried?

1 Yes
2 No SKIP QUESTION 152-153
3 DON'T KNOW
4 REFUSED

152. Is your step-mother currently working full-time, part-time, going to school, or doing something else?

1 Working full time (35 hours or more)
2 Working part time
3 Unemployed, laid off, looking for work
4 Retired
5 In school
6 Keeping house
7 Other
8 DON'T KNOW
9 REFUSED
153. What does your step-mother do at work?

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about where you live.

154. What county do you live in?

155. Do you live on a farm, outside of town but not on a farm, town or city?
   1 Farm **SKIP QUESTION 156**
   2 Outside of town but no on a farm **SKIP QUESTION 156**
   3 Town or City **SKIP TO QUESTION 156**
   4 DON'T KNOW
   5 REFUSED

156. What is the name of the town or city you live in?

157. What town or city do you live closest to?

158. How satisfied are you with your community's interest in youth? Would you say you are very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied?
   1 Very satisfied
   2 Satisfied
   3 Dissatisfied
   4 Very dissatisfied
   5 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   6 DON'T KNOW
   7 REFUSED

159. In what ways would you suggest the community could make improvements for youth?
160. What race do you consider yourself?

1  White/Caucasian
2  Black
3  Hispanic/Chicano
4  Native American
5  Asian
6  Other
7  DON'T KNOW
8  REFUSED

161. How many sisters do you have? _________

162. How many brothers do you have? _________

163. That completes the survey. I do have one more question to ask you. We are interested in calling some people again next year for more information. Would you be willing to talk to us again?

1  YES
2  NO
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