USAID’s CFYR Program uses the Self-Efficacy Pre- and Post-Intervention Questionnaire to gauge the effectiveness of its capacity building interventions in empowering youth beneficiaries (10-29 years old) from within its target communities. The questionnaire was developed through an iterative internal process and is still being fine-tuned. Ultimately, CFYR hopes to develop a means of tracking beneficiary change across a diverse range of training and competency development activities and link the outcomes into the Program’s overall goal of crime and violence prevention. More specifically, the questionnaire allows us to report effectively on the following CFYR Program Indicator: Percent of youth who report increased self-efficacy at the conclusion of USG-assisted training/programming.

Thus far, the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire has been used in CFYR’s after school programs, an Easter Camp, a Robotics Program, and for its workforce development programs. Thus far, 843 have been administered. Criteria for the use of the tool have been established. Qualifying interventions must involve building youth competencies on a range of topics, including, but not limited to, leadership skills, youth development, conflict resolution, negotiation skills, mediation skills, communication skills, business skills, advocacy and networking, management, leadership and/or civic engagement. The intervention must also last for at least five days.

Currently, the tool consists of 24 Likert Scale questions, which ask participants to rate their perceived ability to perform certain functions using never, rarely, sometimes, often or always. There is a self-efficacy questionnaire for youth between the ages of 10 to 17 and an adult scale for program participants 18 and over.

The questions can be broken down into subscales that assess self-efficacy in five domains:

1. **General** Self-efficacy: individual's belief in their ability to perform well in a variety of situations.
2. **Academic** Self-efficacy: an individual's sense of competence and confidence in the performance of class work.
3. **Social** Self-efficacy: an individual's confidence in her/his ability to engage in social interactional tasks necessary to initiate and maintain interpersonal relationships.
4. **Street** Self-efficacy: an individual's confidence in their ability to keep themselves safe and away from harm.
5. **Emotional** Self-efficacy: an individual’s belief in their ability to self-regulate their emotions.
The above domains were identified as relevant to the overall objective of building resilience amongst training program participants, which would contribute to the reduction of their involvement in crime, as victims and/or perpetrators. Once the domains were selected, a series of 3-4 questions per domain were identified and the questionnaire was piloted in the three CFYR countries. An initial analysis demonstrated the need to revise the tool, more questions were added to each domain and the tool was re-piloted.

The completion of CFYR’s after-school programs provided a large enough dataset to run an in-depth analysis of the responses to over 300 questionnaires. After discussing the findings with the technical teams, the CFYR’s M&E and Knowledge Management team identified the need to develop three versions of the Self-Efficacy Questionnaire that are sub-scale specific – one for academic self-efficacy, one for vocational self-efficacy and one for social self-efficacy. This approach would avoid the issue presented by a ‘one size fits all’ questionnaire that may not best fit the intervention, thus skewing the results of the pre- and post-test analysis by attempting to measure changes in areas that an intervention was not designed to address. The aforementioned sub-scale specific questionnaires are currently under development. Once the three questionnaires are developed they will be piloted in the CFYR countries to examine their reliability and validity before being widely used throughout the program.

The analysis of the pre and post questionnaires for the CFYR After School Program revealed that 75% of participants had an increase in self-efficacy after completing the intervention. Additionally, males had a higher rate of increased self-efficacy when compared to females (79% to 72%). When examining trends across the three countries, Guyana had lower rates of increased self-efficacy when compared to the other two CFYR countries (70% for Guyana and 77% for both St. Kitts and Saint Lucia.

The analysis of the after-school program data also demonstrated that the strongest sub-scale was the one related to academic-self efficacy, which predictably linked to the After School Programs’ focus on homework help. Therefore, we believe that the pending modifications of creating domain specific questionnaires related to CFYR areas of programmatic focus will enhance the utility of the tool in linking the outcomes of CFYR interventions with an anticipated increase in self-efficacy.