Positive Approach to Youth Studies: An Educational Perspective

ABSTRACT
A positive perspective in social sciences is one of the key directions in contemporary youth studies and an important point of reflection on education. In recent decades, the Positive Youth Development concept (PYD) has been a particularly clear and significant perspective for studying adolescence on a global scale. This perspective is crucial for many theoretical assumptions and educational projects. The aim of this article is to analyse the concepts and theories (directly and indirectly) related to this concept in youth studies. In this paper, significant changes in the reflection on adolescence have been analysed, which turned the vision of a developmental stage full of tensions and conflicts into a period of great opportunities for the personal development and also gave new meaning to youth’s good life. The PYD key concepts and theories plus practical education have been presented. Additionally, critical remarks on positive concepts in youth studies have been analysed.
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INTRODUCTION
Positive perspective of youth development has become an important theoretical platform in youth studies, gaining more popularity since the 1990s (Lerner et al., 2005). “Good life” is the key concept and means relying on one’s own strengths
in the pursuit of authentic happiness, striving for autonomy and efficient activity towards self-fulfillment important factors of adolescence (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000).

The aim of the article is to analyse contemporary positive concepts of adolescence (with particular emphasis on PYD) due to their importance in education. A crucial problem is how such concepts are implemented in educational practice perceived as in-school and out-of-school activity? Additionally, it is important to analyse what questionable features were found during the evaluation of activities based on positive concepts of adolescence.

**PYD: BASIC CONCEPTS AND THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES**

Five Cs is the most common notion in PYD. It is widely discussed in the literature and is the basis for numerous intervention programmes. Based on the ecological perspective, Lerner and his colleagues proposed five basic elements of PYD, including Competence, Confidence, Connection, Character, and Caring/Compassion (Lerner et al., 2005). Competence relates to the cognitive, social, academic and professional dimensions. In cognitive perspective there are abilities to solve problems, make decisions or learn the rules of logical thinking. Social competence refers to the ability to build and maintain interpersonal relationships, including conflict solution. Academic competences refer to the quality of educational activity of adolescents: received grades, school attendance, or test results. Vocational competence is a work habit and the ability to explore various career choices. Confidence is an individual perspective of perceiving values and how to follow them. It is an inner feeling and conviction about positive self-esteem in relation to one’s own activity and relations with others. Connection refers to positive relationships with others in your near and distant environment, and with institutions and organisations. Connection is based on positive relations between adolescents and their peers and adults: family and neighbourhood members, local community, school staff and colleagues and representatives of institutions and service providers. Character defines morality, honesty, internalised rules of conduct, respect for applicable standards and social rules or cultural norms. It is related to moral development that contributes to the integrity of the individual and the respect for social norms and rules. Caring/Compassion determines the capacity for empathy. It comes down to being empathetic and trying to understand other people. In later years these elements allow to shape the sixth C (Contribution) – involvement in life and activities for the community (Lerner et al., 2005). It is social and volun-
tary activity, a sense of responsibility for the place of residence and members of the local community.

The Five Cs model has been overstated empirically many times, but mostly focused on one or selected elements, such as promoting competence in various areas or facilitating bonding and building trust (Pendry et al., 2014). The complementary approach to the model took place as part of the 4-H research project enabling activities for the positive development of adolescents by creating a positive educational space, developing relationships between youth and adults, a safe development environment and acquiring the ability to act constructively in a situation of risk (Phelps et al., 2009) or global, holistic background for educational processes (Geldhof et al., 2014).

Developing an alternative PYD vision, Peter L. Benson with colleagues from the Search Institute in Minneapolis drew attention to the adolescents’ adaptation to external requirements, available environmental resources leading to optimal development and functioning (Zarrett & Lerner, 2008). As part of the research (Benson, Scales, & Syvertsen, 2011), the team confirmed that a higher level of assets is associated with a lower level of risk behaviour and a higher level of prosperity regardless of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic status and place of residence of youth, which means that adolescents with more personal and social assets have a greater chance of both current well-being and future success.

Adolescent strengths and environmental resources have been defined by Benson and colleagues (2006) as 40 developmental assets relating to the developmental process, individual experiences, social relationships, and interaction patterns. They grouped them into two categories: internal and external resources. Internal resources are unit properties grouped into four categories: Commitment to learning, Positive values, Social competencies, and Positive identity. External resources are positive elements of the ecological development that young people can use when interacting with education and socialisation systems. They consist of: Support, Empowerment, Boundaries and expectations, and Constructive use of time.

**DERIVATIVE CONCEPTS**

In addition to the concepts that constitute PYD content directly, one can also indicate cross-border proposals (Tolan et al., 2016). Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is a model that aims to understand, manage, and express the social and emotional aspects of human’s life (Elias et al., 1997). This approach serves as the
basis for: intervention concepts to strengthen positive resources of youth, to promote constructive interactions based on theories about social information processing, social cognition and emotional intelligence. Collaborative for Academic and Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL, 2017) is an example of SEL implementation defining the skills of young people in five domains integrating cognitive, affective and behavioural competences: Self-awareness, Self-management, Social awareness, Relationship skills, and Responsible decision-making. This includes the ability to identify and solve problems and take ethical responsibility for their own behaviour.

According to the above list, SEL puts emphasis on individual competences, with particular emphasis on educational activity. Research shows that children with highly developed social and emotional competences rarely display risk behaviours and are more successful at school as pupils (Elias & Haynes, 2008; Trentacosta & Fine, 2010). Positive effects of SEL-based programmes are significant for students from low-status families (Durlak et al., 2011). Also, teachers who implement this concept in schools have better teaching results and a greater sense of job satisfaction and a lower level of stress (Collie, Shapka, & Perry, 2012; Domitrovich et al., 2016).

The “Being” approach is a concept based in particular on one of the Five Cs elements, (Character). Research shows that the strengths of character are not only an important factor protecting against depression and suicide (Tehranchi et al., 2018), but also increase the sense of life satisfaction, well-being and school success (Peterson et al., 2007). Peterson and Seligman constructed the Value in Action model (VIA) including its six dimensions: “wisdom and knowledge”, “courage”, “humanity”, “justice”, “temperance” and the core of this approach, “transcendence” (Peterson et al., 2007). This is an inherent aspect of human nature that unfolds during adolescence as the individual searches for transcendence, meaning, and life sense.

Shek and Zhu (2018) proposed that spirituality includes searching for the meaning and purpose of life, seeking and responding to the limitation of life (e.g., death), and seeking holiness or infinity. According to King (2008), it is a resource conducive to the development of adolescents, especially in the religious context, as a buffer against mental problems (Shek & Zhu, 2018).

Relational Developmental Systems Perspectives (RDSPs) is a perspective that emphasises self-agency in social relations. According to this perspective (Overton, 2010, 2015), development is recognized in a holistic and relational dimension. It consists not only of persons and the contexts in which they are active that affect development. Both of these elements constitute a component of a larger system, which emphasises the role of “developmental regulations” (Lerner, 2015). They
can be the basis for adaptation actions but also for the manifestations of maladjustment. Adaptive actions are those that cannot selectively benefit individuals and contexts at the expense of others, and thus are limited to a coherent relationship between individuals and the contexts in which they exist. In turn, maladaptation in this sense is processes that actively harm people and (or) contexts. Their source may be the unpredictability of the effects of one’s own actions, or a misconception about the rightness of the actions taken. Incidental maladaptive behaviour does not have to bring negative consequences, however, sustaining and reproducing them may lead to a maladaptive pattern of behaviour.

Another proposal – Social Justice Youth Development (SJYD) – takes as a reference point the issue of developing the awareness of youth and their social relations (Cammarota, 2011). It consists of many elements in common with PYD. In particular, attention is paid to youth activity in disadvantaged conditions and it raises the awareness of adolescents in terms of personal potential, social and human responsibility, providing the basis for actions for social justice. SJYD fulfils two functions: it is a buffer minimising the impact of disadvantage development conditions and a turning point for social changes at the level of local structures inspired by youth activity.

The goal of SJYD is to engage three levels: self, community and global awareness, which serve to expand and develop youth engagement, their empathy, social criticism, and promote the social justice idea (Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002). SJYD is based on a critical analysis of social, economic and political factors, especially ethnicity, gender, culture, and class, it analyses the causes of social problems, referring to unfair relations between the authorities and the oppressive conditions of communities and families. SJYD influences young people’s critical perspectives and willingness to engage in actions for social change (Cammarota, 2011). Ross (2011) calls it youth-inspired community change: “Rather than adults continue to push for the change on behalf of the youth, inclusion of SJYD framework should be looked at as a way to sustain youth’s energy and motivation to stay involved over the long haul” (p. 699).

EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS

Weissberg and O’Brien (2004) analysing PYD from the perspective of school-based programmes, propose three dimensions: social, emotional, and academic learning programmes. Curran and Wexler (2017) pay attention to the content of PYD-based programmes, taking into account: curriculum-based youth developed
programs, youth leadership, and youth mentorship. For the purpose of this article, it was assumed that PYD programmes will be presented in two perspectives: in-school and out-of-school activities.

Physical education (PE) is dominant area of in-school PYD programmes implementation and has special features (Wright & Li, 2009). For example, SCORE! (Santos, Strachan, & Pereira, 2019) focuses on 4 Cs (Confidence, Character, Competence, and Connection) during activities carried out by PE teachers at school. Based on PYD, physical activities at school are mostly linked with PE programmes, but there are other opportunities to engage adolescents through other extra-curricular activities: intramural sports or school sport teams.

School curriculum support through preventive programmes is another significant form of PYD implementation. Inspire Aspire (IA) is promoting awareness of character development by creating educational experiences for youth that foster honesty, generosity, reliability, forward-looking activity, diligence, thrift, joy, purpose, curiosity, and humility (Tevington et al., 2020). Positive Adolescent Training through Holistic Social programmes (PATHS to Adulthood) is another example implemented on a large scale in schools (Shek & Sun, 2009). Students develop proactive attitudes and learn to react to symptoms of bullying. The PATHS evaluation shows a reduction of adolescent developmental problems, especially bullying, crime and drug use.

Some programmes are prepared in a broader theoretical context, for example including SEL. In Take the Lead programme, attention is paid to self-assessment and self-awareness, building competence and confidence, improving communication in the class group, social skills improving identification and emotional management. Programme is defined as an alternative approach to school bullying (Domino, 2013). Such intervention programmes are also important preventive background for education of adolescents from ethnic minorities because they empower self-concept, peer affiliations, ethics, and social skills (Lewis et al., 2016).

PYD applications also serve as a concept empowering school staff to build an optimal environment for adolescents’ development through the proper relationship between teachers and learners. This is a special form of activity for school social work influencing the change of the teaching climate at school, which results in better efficiency of teachers’ work and greater school successes of learners (So & Shek, 2011).

In case of out-of-school programmes, it is possible to indicate activities aimed directly at school achievements. The College Orientation Workshop is a PYD work programme to prepare male participants for college education (Whipple, Frein, & Kline, 2020). It is implemented in the form of four-week mentoring stays,
during which adolescents live in barracks, learn English, maths, financial literacy, career exploration and physical activities to take on a challenge (e.g., climbing a mountain).

Environmental education based on the assumptions of PYD is often understood as an activity aimed at searching for solutions to environmental problems. Educators shape learners as actively engaged citizens through open-air activities which gives adolescents physical, emotional and cognitive assets (McClaren & Hammond, 2005). It is perceived as a socio-ecological system of resilience because it is also related to Five Cs proposal.

Arts education is another important element of out-of-school programmes. Music programme for adolescents from socio-economically disadvantaged settings is an example (Barrett & Bond, 2015). Such activities lead to foster social inclusion, minimise prejudice, increase cultural maintenance, social cohesion and students’ empowerment. These activities have a special impact on Five Cs competences (musical as well as academic and social). They combine intense challenges with the development of peer support, which strengthens their possibilities for learning through experience. Building positive group culture is an additional element perceived as a buffer against potential threats (Orson, McGovern, & Larson, 2020). It applies especially to youth at risk (migrant youth, in particular) and gives them psychosocial benefits.

Out-of-school programmes can be organised according to place-based approach (similarly to environmental education programme) in which the emphasis is on attachment to the place, building local identity with respect for one’s own rights and the rights of other people with whom this place is shared. Maori and New Zealand European adolescents sailing programme, aimed at shaping resilience, self-esteem and a positive attitude to life, is an example of place-based approach (Arahanga-Doyle et al., 2019). It is an extensive three-phase programme based on wilderness adventure education. During the pre-expedition phase, participation in the programme and its content are made more precise by youth, parents, employees and mentors (with experience in outdoor setting). In the proper phase, a 7–8 day trip takes place. Post-expedition phase is a summary of experiences from the expedition and a mentorship for the future.

Project K has similar features (Deane et al., 2017). It is a programme aimed at improving the self-efficacy of adolescents not qualified as high-risk persons (behavioral or mental health). It is based on three elements of wilderness adventure, community challenge and an annual mentoring partnership. Although the essence of such programmes does not directly concern school education, adolescents participating in such activities become more motivated to learn.
QUESTIONABLE ISSUES AND CRITICAL REMARKS

PYD sceptics point out several doubts related to this concept. As Kelly (2006) points out, positive views about youth are simply an alternative to negative concepts and theories and each of them is an important tool for creating tasks in the field of youth work and PYD is “old wine in new bottles” (p. 18). Coussée, Roets and De Bie (2009) expressed a particularly boldly critical opinion on PYD, stating that “the underlying assumptions of this seemingly positive and preventative paradigm indicate and reaffirm a view of the development of vulnerable youth as lacking, deviant and pathological”. As a result, PYD is characterised as “tricky snake in the grass” (p. 425).

Socio-political context of PYD is another discursive question. Perception of youth as a period of development is related to the neo-liberal principles of vocational education, promoting close partnerships in business education, and transforming schools and other institutions working with youth in line with corporate, business and market lines (Tannock, 2001). As a result, it may be a less interesting framework for young people from excluded areas and can effect in a discrepancy between youth work and the experiences of adolescents from disadvantaged backgrounds, leading to epistemic form of violence (Coleman, 2021).

The discussion on PYD also concerns the initiatives and undertaken projects. While the authors agree on the role of youth programmes in positive development by ensuring contact with responsible adults and peers as well as activities that develop creativity (Scales et al., 2000), it is debatable which areas of development should be included in such programmes (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2016). The answer to this problem can be found in the works of Durlak, Weissberg and Pachan (2010) who found significant effectiveness of youth programmes based on the broad PYD perspective in relation to students’ self-assessment, social behaviour or school achievements.

According to the critics of the analysed concept (Arnold & Silliman, 2017), various frameworks describing the theoretical background and evaluation criteria were created. This variation makes it difficult to implement programmes at local levels as a result of designing educational and preventive measures based on a limited understanding of the theory. As a result, the developed operating models may differ from the original assumptions of the implemented activities under PYD.

Specific examples of inadequate activity can be found – according to critics – in the evaluation of programmes built on the Five Cs model. It reduces adolescents’ depression and anxiety, while it is noted that one of the basic elements of the model (Caring) shapes this correlation. Research has shown a correlation between
Caring and anxiety and depression, which means that “clear pattern suggesting the potential risk of internalising problems when an adolescent ‘cares too much’” (Geldhof et al., 2019, p. 6).

Caring is a particular area of potential misunderstanding during Five Cs implementation. Geldhof et al. (2014) argued that excessive Caring may correlate with adaptation since the relationship between caring and maladaptive outcomes may lead to “emotional hypersensitivity, or an anxiety-producing over concern for (or about) others’ thoughts and feelings” (p. 944).

A similar relationship also applies to people with a high level of empathy. As Holsen et al. (2017) noted, “Some young people high on empathy and sympathy might have a tendency toward manifesting higher anxiety and depressive feelings” (p. 567). Higher levels of empathy can also lead to adaptation problems due to over-internalisation of problems experienced by others but also caused by the over-care of adolescents and those exercised by the closest ones; it may also concern the correlation between empathy and individual characteristics (personality predispositions) or socialisation experiences (growing problem family) (Tone & Tully, 2014).

It is indicated that sociopathic people show a high level of self-confidence and de facto fit well into the Five Cs structure (Competencies), which is referred as efficacious Cs (Geldhof et al., 2014b). Therefore, there may be a situation in which an adolescent functions in accordance with the assumptions of global PYD, but it carries the risk for parasitic developmental regulations; in turn, increased emphasis on Character and Care may cause adolescents to engage in martyring developmental regulations (Geldhof et al., 2019).

Other issues related to the implementation of projects based on positive concepts of young people are also debatable. Research on the PYD efficacy in EP is limited, moreover, it does not satisfactorily address the complexity of sport and physical activity from a gender perspective (Rauscher & Cooky, 2016) Moreover, critical awareness supports the development and participation of adolescents in civil society, but it is unclear how this process is related to PYD indicators (Tyler et al., 2020). Another doubts concern the implementation of programmes with adolescents from minority or marginalised groups. Project K evaluation made it impossible to examine its effectiveness among Maori youth due to a small number of representatives. In effect, PYD-based programmes’ efficacy may result from socio-cultural adaptation of youth to peers from majority groups (Deane et al., 2017). Additionally, mentoring as key mechanism is, however, limited to youth in active mentoring relationships (Erdem et al., 2016) so all considerations should be related to such adolescents only.
CONCLUSIONS

Positive concepts of youth development are in part a change in the way youth is conceptualised based on neoliberal ideology and human capital theory, and have contributed to a broader perception of the social category of youth in terms of age range, social groups and areas of practice that take youth as a point of reference with different possibilities; but they also have some limitations. They have enabled a new perspective for social sciences, which results from the adoption of a holistic perspective, combining the individual and environment resources.

Importantly, the concept highlights elements that have so far been neglected in thinking about youth. In particular, it is necessary to emphasize building a sense of agency in the young generation and taking into account the elements of transcendence, which areas have been neglected and unnoticed in recent decades in youth work.

Contemporary PYD has a global dimension. Assuming that this is a model of thinking about youth work from a neoliberal perspective, a significant challenge is its cultural adaptation, especially in those areas where such views are not rooted in social thinking and the everyday life culture. It is also a question about the limits of potential PYD modifications during adaptation and implementation. The key to effective youth work in this dimension is the creation of programmes that take into account the cultural or gender specificity of adolescents in different countries or regions. It is also youth workers’ awareness that young people covered by educational and intervention programmes are exposed to specific risks in the environments they live in.

The above examples indicate that PYD is a concept in development, reactive, which assumptions are still the subject to gradual modification. It is also a field for potentially effective actions within the broadly understood education of adolescents, enabling them to deal with the challenges of everyday life.
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