

Youth Retention Study of 1st Year Members ~ Qualitative Insights

MULTI-STATE RESEARCH STUDY

Epsilon Sigma Phi Virtual Conference – Research Presentation

October 6, 2020

NAE4-HYDP Virtual Conference – Research Roundtable

October 22, 2020

Presented by:

JoLynn Miller, University of California

Sarah Hensley, University of Florida

Jeannette Rea Keywood, Rutgers University



Qualitative Team Research Presenters

Sarah Hensley, UF

Jeannette Rea Keywood, RU

JoLynn Miller, UCANR

Janet E. Fox, LSU

CarMun Kok, UCANR


Marianne Bird, UCANR

Missy Cummins, WSU


Sarah Torbert, UWYO

Dale Pracht, UF

Cindy Wells, MO



**NEED:
PRIMARY INDICATOR FOR YOUTH
DROPOUT FROM 4-H IS BEING A FIRST-
YEAR MEMBER (ASTROTH, 1985)**




**RESEARCH QUESTIONS:
WHY ARE YOUTH LEAVING AS FIRST YEAR
FAMILIES?**

WHY ARE THEY STAYING IN THE PROGRAM?

Research

Participating States



2014-2015 : CA and ID

2018-2019: 8 states



Survey Distribution

- Qualtrics Survey
- First Year Families & Members
- IRB Approved

Survey Development:
<https://joe.org/joe/2018june/t3.php>



Qualitative Data

Qualitative Survey Questions

Expectations
(Adult Only)

Expectations Met
(Adult Only)

Leave (Adult)

Best Part of 4-H
(Adult & Youth)


Changes They'd
Make (Adult & Youth)

Share (Adult & Youth)

Code Book Development

Developed original codes

- Individual open coding of responses
- Discussed among research team and, using a grounded theory framework (Strauss, 1987), organized into consensus-based themes.
- With project growth, themes expanded and deepened.
- Initial data is being re-coded with newly revised code book.



Re-enrollment Correlations

Years 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18

Responses to the question "What would you change?" were coded as "positive", "constructive", "critical".

The data were double coded via consensus.

- Positive: "I wouldn't change a thing" or "nothing-it was great"
- Constructive feedback: "better communication" or "mandatory record books"
- Critical feedback: "We felt like a fish out of water and it gave her a bad feeling about 4-H" or "information was very very vague, which made us very very frustrated"

Findings

2015-2016 findings

- Parents who gave constructive feedback were 3.84 times more likely to re-enroll their child
- Parents who gave positive feedback were 19.13 times more likely to re-enroll their child than parents who gave critical feedback.

2016-2017 findings

- Parents who gave constructive feedback were 4.04 times more likely to re-enroll their child
- Parents who gave positive feedback were 16.07 times more likely to re-enroll their child than parents who gave critical feedback.

2017-2018 findings

- No significant difference between parents who gave constructive and critical feedback was found

Thematic Analysis of 2017-2018 Qualitative Data



Initial Inter-reliability Check of Data Coding



Round 1 – Deductive coding using code book developed apriori – Data randomly assigned qualitative team members



Discussion of Emerging Themes



Round 2 – Verification of Themes Identified & Peer Debriefing Process



Key Findings

Belonging Inclusion

Communication

Organizational
Structure



Youth & Adult Perceptions



Belonging

“Being a part of a group where I can grow, learn about animals and learn how to help others.”

“Connected to members of the group”

“The club was unwelcoming and cliquy. Not one member, parent, nor leader made an effort to welcome us as new members. Not once over the entire year.”

“We were never welcomed into the 4H club.”



Communication

“I just wish better communication to when projects are due”

“Honestly I would like the website to be cleaned up. I spent a lot of time searching for thing and found myself in a loop of not what I wanted”

“Better and more timely communication”

“More direction for new parents. I didn’t know when meetings were or how to get involved or who to contact for more information.

“More information did not feel guided or connected for a first-year member. Was overwhelming.”

Organizational Structure



"It would be more organized so we can participate"

"Thrown in without understanding what 4h (4-H) does or how things work"

"The meetings were disorganized & rules about when they could start their first project continually changed."

"The meetings where all members come together were disorganized. The 4-H officers didn't seem prepared. "



UTILIZE QUALITATIVE SURVEY
FINDINGS TO DEVELOP EXIT
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL



GUIDE THE WORK OF THE
IMPLEMENTATION TEAM TO DEVELOP
MATERIALS THAT SUPPORT RETENTION
OF YOUTH

Future Research

Peer Reviewed Publications

Lewis, K. M., Ewers, T., Miller, J. C., Bird, M., Borba, J., Hill, R., . . . Trzesniewski, K. (2018). Addressing retention in youth programs: A survey for understanding families' experiences. *Journal of Extension*, 56. Retrieved from <https://joe.org/joe/2018june/tt3.php>

Lewis, K. M., Borba, J., Hill, R. D., & Miller, J. C. (2019). Effective communication of 4-H program essentials to 4-H families. *Journal of Extension*, 57. Retrieved from <https://www.joe.org/joe/2019june/tt5.php>

Special Thanks ~ Youth Retention Research Team

**Louisiana State
University**
Janet Fox

**New Mexico State
University**
Stephen Beck
Cheryl Butterfield

**Rutgers, The State
University of New Jersey**
Jeannette Rea Keywood

University of Florida
Sarah Hensley
Dale Pracht

University of Idaho
Tim Ewers
Nancy Shelstad

University of Wyoming
Sarah Torbert

**Washington State
University**
Missy Cummins

University of Missouri
Cindy Wells
Becky Simpson
Velynda Cameron

**University of
New Hampshire**
*Kendra Lewis (former
study co-chair
with UCANR)*

**University of California,
Agriculture and Natural
Resources**
JoLynn Miller
Marianne Bird
John Borba
Claudia Diaz Carrasco
Dorina Espinoza
Emma Fete
Russell Hill
Car Mun Kok
Kali Trzesniewski



Q & A
