

INSTRUMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS: A POTENTIAL RELATIONAL MODEL FOR INNER-CITY YOUTH PROGRAMS

Robert Halpern

Erikson Institute for Graduate Study in Child Development

In this article, a distinct type of adult–youth relationship found in some youth programs and characterized as instrumental is discussed. Such relationships focus primarily on joint work on a task or project, or in a discipline, with the adult having expertise and a strong identity in the substantive domain involved, rather than in youth work per se. It is hypothesized that, by virtue of their matter-of-fact quality, their substantive focus, and their particular interactional patterns, instrumental relationships offer potential for some reworking of adolescents' sense of self. © 2005 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Adults unquestionably have a critical role to play in supporting adolescent development; but how and why exactly are adults, or at least specific kinds of adults and adult roles, important to adolescents? What kinds of adult relationships are helpful to inner-city adolescents in particular? These questions arose for the author recently as he embarked on a program of research with a Chicago youth initiative called After-School Matters. This initiative organizes 10 to 20 week “apprenticeships” for Chicago high-school students in such areas as visual and performing arts, creative and professional writing, video and computer technology, sports instruction, and lifeguarding. Apprenticeships are led by instructors who have knowledge and skill in a specific craft or discipline, but typically lack professional preparation in—and sometimes any obvious disposition for—youth work. Yet, within limits created by the relatively short duration of the apprenticeships, many instructors appear on first glance to be effective and helpful in supporting participants’ development (Halpern, 2003b).

Correspondence to: Robert Halpern, Erikson Institute, 420 N. Wabash, Chicago, IL 60611. E-mail: rhalpern@erikson.edu

In considering the reasons, I was reminded of a study of innovative youth programs by Musick (1999, p. 35). She observed that, while relationships are “essential ingredients” in promoting personal growth in teens in out-of-school programs, such relationships are particularly helpful when they are “instrumental” and when they occur “in the context of meaningful, shared endeavors.” Obviously, different adolescents need different kinds of supports from non-familial adults. The argument here is that some adolescents benefit from relationships with adults who have expertise and a strong identity in some substantive domain and who are focused on adolescent development and productivity in the context of a specific task or project, craft, or discipline. Why this is so is the subject of this essay.

DEVELOPMENTAL TASKS OF ADOLESCENCE: THE CONTEXT FOR THINKING ABOUT RELATIONSHIP

To understand the value of instrumental relationships, it is helpful to consider both the developmental tasks of adolescence and the distinctive situation of inner-city youth. Over half a century ago, Erikson (1950) argued the importance of issues of identity and fidelity in adolescence: deciding what is important to do, learning what one is interested in and good at, deciding what one is for and against, determining who and what one might become, and to whom and what one might be loyal. Adolescents try to figure out not just who they are, but what their place is, where they fit, and who might accept them—in family, peer group, school, community, the economy, and society. They begin to recognize a trajectory to their lives, one that feels both partly open and partly set.

Identity is forged partly through experimentation. Adolescents try out different roles, sample different kinds of experiences, question themselves and others, take risks, and test limits. It is forged equally through commitment—of sustained energy and attention to some domain (or domains), whether academic, artistic, athletic, vocational, or other. Such commitment “delimits the potential for growth . . . [a youth] cannot become a plumber or a nurse or a poet unless he pays considerable attention to the skills required for plumbing, nursing or writing poetry” (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1984, p. 13). It also yields general lessons, for instance a greater understanding that it takes practice, repetition, and hard work to become skillful in a particular domain, and a more specific understanding of what it means to be responsible and accountable (Larson, Hansen, & Walker, in press; Larson et al., in press; Musick, 1999).¹ As adolescents explore and consolidate identity and gain experience, they address a variety of self- and relational tasks—learning to balance preoccupation with self and commitment to others, finding a balance between connectedness and autonomy, strengthening capacity to recognize and regulate emotions, and learning to test perceptions against reality.

¹As a number of researchers have noted, adolescents are still “novices” in many important respects (see, e.g., Larson, Hansen, & Walker, in press; Perkins, 1981). For instance, they may fail to size up or plan a task, choosing instead to plunge in and see what happens. They may not know how to break down a large task into manageable pieces. They may fail to monitor the consequences of actions, be inflexible, and become disorganized in the face of situational constraints and contingencies.

INNER-CITY ADOLESCENCE

To work effectively on the tasks of adolescence requires a variety of personal and social resources—openness to new experience and willingness to take some risks, the maintenance of curiosity and motivation, a sense of agency, the sense of an (at least partly) open future, opportunity to exercise growing capacities, and a diverse portfolio of adults to support, guide, instruct, model, and hold. These resources in turn are rooted in adolescents' earlier life experiences, in the institutions in which they participate and the communities in which they reside, and less concretely—but no less powerfully—in such “master” variables as social class and race.

Growing up poor, in a devalued group, and in a devalued and neglected neighborhood profoundly affects adolescents' ability to address the tasks of that age period. Growing up in the inner city changes the normative calculus—including the potential costs—of both experimentation and commitment. It increases the costs of curiosity and enthusiasm. It alters the normative balance between day-to-day preoccupations and long-term goals. It gives particular meanings to money, academic success, and standing out, and in that way shapes adolescent choices about where to focus energies. It affects the ways in which teachers and other authority figures view an adolescent. Moreover, in a host of ways, it limits opportunity to exercise growing capacities.

By the time they have reached high school, many inner-city adolescents' lives have been marked by the kinds of relational experiences, day-to-day pressures, unexpected life events, and crises that pull children off track—preoccupied or erratic parenting, inordinate responsibility to care for self and siblings, loss of family members through separation or death, family or community violence, pressure from gangs, contact with police, juvenile justice, and child-welfare authorities. Such experiences can lead to questioning of self and mistrust of others (Lee, 1994; Nightingale, 1993), and can sap the psychic and physical energy needed to address the normative tasks of middle childhood.

Although individual teachers often are caring, schools as such are not positive developmental settings for many low-income children, and they become steadily less welcoming as children advance in grade. Gregory (1994) found that inner-city adolescents who get off track in middle school attribute it to peer pressure (e.g., hanging out with the wrong crowd, being unable to withstand or cope with peer pressure), “having the freedom to misbehave” (p. 7), and the impersonal quality of middle schools—no one seems to care if they are there or not, or if they are doing well or not.

The damaging forces that so shape the early and middle childhood experience of inner-city adolescents not only continue into the high-school years, but also tend to intensify, and the costs of the damaging forces to grow. Family relationships become more complicated. Negotiating—some might say surviving—street culture becomes a significant source of stress. Schooling becomes, if anything, more impersonal. The great majority of students simply get lost in the mass of most urban high schools. More subtly, the inner-city context limits the range of ways of being adult that adolescents come into contact with, and limits exposure to “the demands of ‘personhood in a wide range of domains making up the adult community’” (Shaw, 1996, p. 63).

Ironically, but not surprisingly, inner-city adolescents face heightened psychological and situational barriers to taking advantage of opportunities that are afforded them. For some, self-expectations have been lowered, in part through experience, in part through identification with a denigrated group or community, leading them to

doubt their own agency (Kagan, 1984). Other youth are held back by family, friends, or their own fears of “journeying beyond the familiar” (Musick, 1999, p. 4). Some youth determine that the hypothetical benefits of making commitments, and perhaps standing out—working hard in school, getting good grades, participating in organized after-school activities, testing interests and skills, seeking to go to college—are not worth the predictable costs. As MacLeod (1987) noted, in reflecting on the group loyalty that keeps low-income youth from striking out on their own, they “disqualify” themselves, even before others have the opportunity to disqualify them.

A ROLE FOR YOUTH PROGRAMS

It is in this difficult context that a diverse set of largely voluntary institutions, collectively described as youth programs, operates. In most cities, this set of institutions exists as a thin, decentralized, idiosyncratically, and inadequately funded network sponsored by a diverse array of community-based agencies, youth-serving organizations, arts, sports or other focused organizations, and a small number of vocationally oriented organizations. Some youth programs are primarily places to hang out, play ball, feel safe, and receive a small measure of help in thinking about the future (see, e.g., Halpern, Barker, & Mollard, 2000). Some, as implied, are built around focused and structured experiences in the visual or performing arts, communications, technology, sports, community service, or other areas (see, e.g., Heath, 2001; Heath & Roach, 1998). A handful of youth programs provide vocationally oriented apprenticeship experiences, although these too are diverse in attributes.

In general, urban youth programs serve the sizable group of low-income youth who are in between—neither the handful of high-achieving, resourceful stars of their high schools, nor those who have become fundamentally “disconnected”—due to gang involvement, too early parenthood, dropping out of school, being caught up in the juvenile justice system, etc. Youth in this middle group typically are weakly attached to school, have vague (if any) vocational aspirations, and have limited (or sometimes grandiose) views of possibilities for the future. Although possessing a degree of resilience and a decent understanding of their life situation, they often are unwilling—or unable—to take themselves seriously (Halpern et al., 2000).

Given the populations they serve, youth programs in the inner city face a quandary: how best to address the normative tasks of adolescence without neglecting the range of vulnerabilities—self-doubt, mistrust, lack of basic skills, and self-disqualification—resulting from growing up under conditions of resource scarcity, social isolation, and depredation. As noted, such vulnerabilities can impede both the exploration and the commitment needed for identity work. In addition, their prevalence implies that at least some core tasks for staff in inner-city youth programs are psychological ones—rebuilding capacity for trust, for dependence, and for openness to learning, and, equally, social ones—strengthening young peoples’ sense that they have something to say, are worthy of being listened to, the sense that their aspirations and struggles matter to the larger world around them. These tasks have been described by Pittman and Zeldin (1994, pp. 51–52) as nurturance, “healing,” and affirmation.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADULT-ADOLESCENT RELATIONSHIPS

Although some of the core tasks for youth programs are, arguably, psychological, the attendant issues cannot always be addressed directly. For one thing, adolescents are

ambivalent about adult attention, especially attention focused on aspects of their core selves. Those with difficult family and/or school histories are likely to be doubly sensitive. For another, most vulnerabilities are not easily accessible, having become integral parts of the self. Such qualities as guardedness and reluctance to take oneself seriously also have adaptive dimensions.

In some cases, the consequences of accumulated hurts and insults are best addressed indirectly in the context of relationships that are about something else—that is, joint work on a task or project, or in a discipline—and are, in some respects, incidental. In such relationships, adults take youth seriously, but treat them matter-of-factly. They are not unaware of who youth are, the vulnerabilities and stresses in some youth's lives, and the fact that some have received little adult attention and little recognition as individuals. They are willing and able to help with personal struggles and support needs. However, they do so incidentally and, one might say, indirectly. While they are on youth's side, and may view their role in part as helping strengthen youth belief in themselves, they do not see it as their mission to save, validate, lecture to, socialize, re-parent or reform youth, and are not inclined to let the difficulties in youth's lives excuse them from the responsibilities of the work at hand.

An Exemplar: Chicago's After-School Matters

This type of adult–adolescent relationship is not hypothetical. It has been seen in all kinds of youth programs, sometimes at particular moments or in particular activities and less commonly as a characteristic form of relationship. It is most common in thematic, especially arts-focused, youth programs, less common in vocationally and recreationally oriented ones.² This has been observed recently in *After-School Matters*, a Chicago initiative that organizes apprenticeship-like experiences for some 3000 high-school students a semester from 26 high schools, using the schools themselves and nearby park district facilities as bases. Within the range of each high-school's population, apprentices come from every grade level and are diverse in academic standing, as well as in prior experience in the particular apprenticeship domain. The majority fall into what have been described above as the sizable “in-between” group of inner-city youth.³

The goal of After-School Matters is to provide a learning experience in a specific craft, art form, trade, or discipline organized around a final product or performance and structured to expose the participant to the basic concepts, techniques, and procedures in that domain, as well as to strengthen a variety of generic skills and dispositions needed for work, school, and other life challenges. Groups of about 20 youth each meet for 10 weeks, three days a week for three hours a day in paid (\$5.00/hour) apprenticeships in one of four domains—arts, words/communications, technology, and sports. Examples of specific apprenticeship foci include print making, drawing and painting, portrait painting, mural making, flamenco dance, oral history, journalism, story telling, theater (writing, directing, performing), screen writing, film making

²Vocationally oriented programs, especially those built on job-site apprenticeships, tend to be characterized by weak supervisor–apprentice relationships. Instruction may be a part of the prevocational experience, but it is sometimes unclear who is responsible for the primary relationship with a particular youth.

³In some—but by no means all—high schools, the academically highest-risk students are made ineligible by a requirement to attend remedial classes after school. Students are also “selected out” by completing after-school commitments, parental restrictions on after-school time, and the desire to earn more money than that provided through apprenticeships, among other factors. The important point is that these apprenticeships do not “cream” by selecting the most able students in their schools.

and video production, photography, web-page design, computer programming, robotics, sports broadcasting, lifeguard training, and baseball instructor training. About two-thirds of apprentices continue for a second ten-week experience in the same or a different apprenticeship.

The apprenticeships are proposed, designed, and led by teams of instructors (one lead, one assistant) skilled—and often working professionally—in the particular art, craft, or discipline, but with varying amounts of experience with youth. (Lead instructors are paid \$25 an hour, assistants somewhat less. Both work as independent contractors for After-School Matters. For some instructors, this work affords a means of subsidizing their own creative endeavors.) Instructors work within a set of guiding principles (e.g., the importance of creating a safe environment, of learning through doing, of authentic activities, etc.) and required elements (e.g., opening and closing rituals; emphasis on fundamentals; ensuring early success; a culminating product, event, or performance; etc.).

The first few weeks of an apprenticeship focus on introducing apprentices to basic concepts and techniques, fleshing out designs/plans/prototypes, team- or group-building (for collaborative projects), reawakening imagination and self-expression, and informally assessing apprentices' skills. The next five or six weeks focus, naturally, on rehearsal, production, etc., as well as continued refinement of skills, and the last two weeks focus on refining the product/performance and preparing for a culminating event in which apprentices display their work to the school community, families, and others.

By the second or third week of apprenticeships, there is less whole-group instruction and demonstration by instructors, and apprentices typically are working in a largely self-directed manner, individually or in teams. For instance, one might find a group of three apprentices in a hallway outside the classroom, one behind a video camera, a second practicing interviewing skills, and a third serving as a mock interviewee. Instructors circulate, providing feedback, demonstrating techniques, and asking questions: Within a period of perhaps 20 minutes, during one visit, the instructors were observed in a glass and wire-lamp-making apprenticeship demonstrate the proper use of the soldering iron to an apprentice who was about to begin soldering for the first time (including how to apply the iron—flat—and how to spread the liquid solder), show another apprentice how to score glass, and another how to fit glass pieces together and re-cut where necessary. During this time, they also, among other interactions, provided detailed feedback to an apprentice who was refining a paper template, commented on lamps in progress, and asked two apprentices to put on their safety goggles. Over the course of a three-hour session, the instructors spent at least some individual time with almost every apprentice.

In observations of this apprenticeship, as in others, it was worth noting the talk between instructors and apprentices, as well as among apprentices. It was largely—although not completely—technical, about approaching a task or solving a problem at hand; it was invariably in quiet tones, and it had a kind of calm intensity that sounded and felt most like what one might hear in an operating room in a hospital. (Apprentices also related to each other in a manner and talked to each other in tones dramatically different from those observed and heard in the hallways or classrooms of their schools.) Woven through the talk between instructors and apprentices was the specialized vocabulary of the art form, craft, or discipline.

Issues of discipline, control, or misbehavior rarely came up during these observations. In addition to being absorbing, the work usually embodied a good deal of

structure, some of which was provided by the instructor, some by the setting. On one occasion, a drama instructor reminded her apprentices that they were “in a theater” (in reality, the school auditorium), a setting with a long tradition. Being and acting in the theater meant a particular form of body control, posture, diction, and voice modulation. When apprentices did act up or acted disrespectfully toward other apprentices, instructors tended to focus their feedback on the work at hand. When instructors felt compelled to teach about professional behavior, it was often through example. On a few occasions, as work on a mural was observed, some youth took a long time to settle down. The instructor, a low-key individual who appeared to have excellent rapport with the apprentices, addressed this problem by example—setting to work herself and thereby communicating that it was work-time.

One—as yet unanswered—question raised by the After-School Matters model is how reliance on (mostly) young professionals, who do not identify themselves as youth workers and receive minimal preparation for youth work, influences the adult–youth relationship. A related question is whether adults’ personal qualities matter less, the same, or in different ways in adult–youth relationships that are task-oriented. The structure of the apprenticeships certainly leaves limited time for generic relationship building and for discussion and exploration of personal issues. Although instructors displayed varying levels of interest in the apprentices per se (as individuals with bundles of interests, support needs, and life stories), it is unclear if this variability is greater than one would find in other types of youth programs. For their part, apprentices seemed to tolerate instructors’ varying relational orientations, capacities, and personalities well. They tolerated strictness when it did not verge over into harshness, and when an instructor’s nonverbal affect communicated that he/she liked being with that group of apprentices. Apprentices actually seemed most uncomfortable—resisting, acting out, working on each other—when an apprenticeship was not adequately designed, structured, and thought through on a daily basis.

The majority of instructors observed thus far have been aware of the “self” work attached to apprenticeships. In apprenticeships requiring exercise of imagination or reflection on social life, instructors worked carefully to help apprentices gain some distance from their experience without denying that experience. For example, the instructors in an oral history/documentary apprenticeship in a high school in the largely Latino Pilsen neighborhood designed the project in a way that encouraged apprentices to reflect on and begin to question stereotyped images of their community (and therefore of themselves). A printmaking instructor told me that she recognized her role in part as compensating for attention that apprentices were not getting elsewhere in their lives. She noted the value of the long, undisturbed blocks of time—three hours a day, three days a week, over many weeks—in permitting such attention in the crevices of the work together.

HOW MIGHT INSTRUMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS WORK AND WHY MIGHT THEY BE HELPFUL?

When, as in programs like After-School Matters, an adult leader or instructor focuses on the work rather than the adolescent, he/she is communicating a number of things, but most importantly that he/she views the adolescent as a person who can and should be doing this work. The instructor and youth manifestly communicate about the work at hand, but there is also communication at other levels. One implicit message, for example, is that “this way of engaging tasks, of using time and energy, is one way of

being an adult.” Another is that becoming good at something is a slow, sometimes tedious process, but one that is manifest and trustworthy in a concrete way. Still another is that the adolescent is being taken seriously not because of some special category he/she belongs to, but because he/she is present, working, and learning.

There is, in task- and project-focused relationships, a certain kind of “jointness” created by the focus on a shared task and the specialized language of the art form or discipline at hand. This jointness is a mature way of learning, leaving differences in authority and power (between teacher and learner) at the margins of the learning experience. At the same time, there is a kind of decentering, which changes the valence of feedback from the adult to the adolescent. The task or project is in process, it is unfinished. Correcting and improving it as the work proceeds is integral to the process. Both qualities—the jointness and decentering—allow for incidental discussion of personal issues, aspirations, and a range of matters not directly related to the work at hand.

Constant detailed interactions between adult and youth—whether attending to a technical problem, demonstrating a technique, physical or verbal guidance, comments such as “that’s it,” “be careful of that,” “go slowly,” “keep it straight,” “keep pushing on that idea,” “what do you need to do next?”—also have a cumulative effect. They gradually change youth’s own internal dialogues. In the *After-School Matters* observations, youth were sometimes heard talking to (even complaining about) themselves in an instrumental manner as they worked. It is thought that, if an adolescent spends enough time on a regular basis in such learning situations, the gradual internalization of detailed interactions with adult instructors begins to slowly restructure the self. It may do so in a number of ways. For some adolescents, such interactions seem to have a self-organizing (even a calming) effect, extending to the ability to concentrate, learn, and attend. For some, the experience of being with, working with, and learning from an adult in this particular way may offer a different perspective on possible identities without threatening current self-organization precisely because the adult is not making a big deal.

Over time, task-focused, instrumentally oriented relationships may begin to shift the subjective experience of adolescents; that is, the way in which they perceive and experience the world around them and the adult world toward which they believe they are heading (Shaw, 1996, pp. 62–63). The visceral and constructive quality of those relationships may, for example, help resolve contradictions between what youth are told and what they observe and experience about the value of effort and commitment. As the adult instructor gains legitimacy for the youth, so does his/her perspective on work, problem-solving, and eventually broader issues. For example, when revising and correcting is an integral part of the instructor’s approach to tasks, that gradually may be “adopted” and internalized by youth, becoming an aspect of their own approaches.

CONCLUSION

It has been argued here that instrumentally oriented relationships between adults and youth, in the context of inner-city youth programming, create conditions for reworking, as well as for developing, “selfhood.” This apparent potential is not automatically—or perhaps easily—achieved. For one thing, such relationships still require attributes of good youth work. In *After-School Matters*, the large majority of instructors appear to take youth and their ideas seriously, are respectful, and provide realistic but nonjudg-

mental feedback. Yet, a handful will not or cannot take advantage of the opportunity afforded to get to know individual youth well and to develop solid relationships with them. In addition, some youth need more from adult relationships than discrete, instrumentally oriented relationships might typically provide.

Assuming the value of the experiences described here and the existence of an untapped pool of (mostly young) adults with specialized knowledge and skill, time, and inclination for work with youth, there remains a sizable organizational task. This pool still has to be found, prepared, and supported. Instructors in After-School Matters work within an organizational framework that includes guiding principles, general curricular structures, and staff for working with schools and the park district, reviewing proposals, recruiting and placing instructors, monitoring apprenticeships, and numerous other support functions. The whole model—skilled instructors along with a supporting infrastructure—is relatively expensive.

The potential in the youth work approach outlined in this article remains to be confirmed. Still, neither this nor any other approach is going to compensate for the years of institutional and social neglect experienced by inner-city youth. If it is difficult to convince such youth that they are capable of taking their place in a “new and wider world,” it is even more difficult to convince them that they are “entitled to a place in that world” (Musick, 1999, p. 22). Actually, such convincing cannot be done; it has to come from experience, day-after-day; from feedback that does not question the self (or try to affirm it), but that communicates the concreteness of development and focuses on the seriousness of the work at hand. Witnessing others who are knowledgeable, engaged, and passionate about what they do is always a revelation. Joining them, on the other hand, can seem risky, not least because, in their very commitment, these others appear as vulnerable as they do competent. Yet, joining skilled adults in some body of work is also interesting, and it is just this quality that is sometimes underestimated in the arrangements for youth.

REFERENCES

- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. (1984). *Being adolescent*. New York: Basic Books.
- Erikson, E. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Gregory, L. (1994). *The turnaround process: Factors influencing academic success among urban youth*. Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development.
- Halpern, R. (2003a). *The role of after-school programs in fostering low-income children's literacy development (Occasional Paper #1)*. New York: Robert Bowne Foundation.
- Halpern, R. (2003b). *Report on initial evaluation activities for After-School Matters*. Chicago, IL: Erikson Institute.
- Halpern, R., Barker, G., & Mollard, W. (2000). Youth programs as alternative spaces to be: A study of neighborhood youth programs in Chicago's West Town. *Youth and Society*, 31(4), 469–506.
- Heath, S. (2001). Three's not a crowd: Plans, roles and focus in the arts. *Educational Researcher*, 30(7), 10–17.
- Heath, S., & Roach, A. (1998). *The arts in nonschool hours: Briefing materials for the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Kagan, J. (1984). *The nature of the child*. New York: Basic Books.
- Larson, R., Hansen, D., & Walker, C. (in press). Everybody's gotta give: Development of initiative and teamwork within a youth program. In J. Mahoney et al. (Eds.), *Organized activities as*

- contexts of development: Extracurricular activities, after-school and community programs. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Larson, R., et al. (in press). Organized youth activities as contexts for positive development. In A. Linley & S. Joseph (Eds.), *Positive psychology in practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Lee, C. (1994). Adolescent development. In R. Mincy (Ed.), *Nurturing young black males*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- MacLeod, J. (1987). *Ain't no making it: Leveled aspirations in a low-income neighborhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Musick, J. (1999). *New possibilities for youth development: Lessons from beyond the service world*. Chicago, IL: Erikson Institute.
- Nightingale, C. (1993). *On the edge: A history of poor black children and their American dreams*. New York: Basic Books.
- Perkins, D. (1981). *The mind's best work*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pittman, K., & Zeldin, S. (1994). From deterrence to development: Shifting the focus of youth programs for African American males. In R. Mincy (Ed.), *Nurturing young black males*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Shaw, T. (1996). The ethnographer as youth's apprentice. *Journal of Child and Youth Care Work*, 11, 61-71.

Copyright of Journal of Community Psychology is the property of John Wiley & Sons Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.