

Classroom Materials: Suggestions for Class Use of *Pathways to Civic Engagement among Urban Youth of Color*

Laura Wray-Lake & Laura S. Abrams
University of California, Los Angeles

Readings are found in:

Wray-Lake, L. & Abrams, L. S. (2020) Pathways to civic engagement among urban youth of color. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 85(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12415>.

Additional materials useful for teaching may be found on [Monograph Matters](#).

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES

Readings:

Required: Chapters 1 and 8
Optional: Chapters 3, 4, and 6

Written Assignment:

After completing the readings from the *Monograph* suggested above, students may be asked to choose one of the prompts below to write a reflection paper. This could be a 2- to 3-page paper assignment to submit before the class discussion, or it might be a shorter writing activity completed during class to prompt discussion. Then, lead the class through discussion of one or more of the questions below.

Discussion Questions:

1. The monograph identifies several unique forms of youth civic engagement. Do you agree with Wray-Lake and Abrams' use of inductive methods to let youth define civic engagement for themselves? How do their findings contrast with other researchers' definitions of civic engagement? What are the implications of these findings for measuring civic engagement, and for studying civic engagement from a positive youth development perspective? Which other theoretical frameworks, if any, would be more relevant for studying civic development among urban youth of color?
2. When considering positive youth development, how are positive outcomes for youth conceptualized, defined, and measured? Who gets to decide what is included? Consider some of the non-typical forms of civic engagement described in the monograph. What are examples of positive youth development outcomes that are controversial? How, if at all, could controversies around what is considered "positive" be resolved by the field?

3. How did the findings of this monograph help us understand Positive Youth Development (PYD) among urban youth of color? Consider another particular subgroup of youth from a historically marginalized group (e.g., Native American youth, Latinx youth, LGBTQ youth, youth with disabilities). How would PYD theory apply to this group and what would be the limitations of the theory in understanding this group's experiences? To what extent do you think that the monograph's findings generalize (or not) to other marginalized groups?
4. How should the field move toward a theory of PYD that is more culturally and contextually informed? What might a revised theory look like? What other empirical approaches could help to inform more culturally and contextually relevant PYD theory?
5. Should PYD include the study of adversities? What would be the benefits or drawbacks of incorporating adversities into PYD models? How could assets and adversities be studied in an integrated way to better understand civic development? If adversities were incorporated into PYD models, what would be the similarities and distinctions between this approach and resilience theory?