1-1-2019

The Examination of Cognitive Empowerment Dimensions on Intrapersonal Psychological Empowerment, Psychological Sense of Community, and Ethnic Identity Among Urban Youth of Color

David T. Lardier
University of New Mexico

Pauline Garcia-Reid
Montclair State University, garciareidp@montclair.edu

Robert Reid
Montclair State University, reidr@mail.montclair.edu

The Urban Review (2019) 51:768–788
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00504-7

The Examination of Cognitive Empowerment Dimensions on Intrapersonal Psychological Empowerment, Psychological Sense of Community, and Ethnic Identity Among Urban Youth of Color

David T. Lardier[1,2] · Pauline Garcia-Reid[3] · Robert J. Reid[3]

Published online: 21 March 2019

Abstract
The purpose of this investigation is to examine heterogeneity and membership with subgroups of cognitive empowerment among youth of color. Within this heterogeneity, this study hopes to identify the relationship each of these subgroups of youth have with conceptually related variables including intrapersonal psychological empowerment, psychological sense of community (SOC), and ethnic identity. The participants were 383 urban youth of color in grades 9 through 12. The results showed significant variation between profile groups of youth and the association higher levels of cognitive empowerment have with intrapersonal psychological empowerment, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity; albeit, some variation was present. This study is explorative in nature and an effort to highlight the complexity of empowerment and cognitive empowerment. Findings are significant as these outcomes provide valuable insight into the intricacies of cognitive empowerment and highlight the importance of youth experiencing high levels of cognitive empowerment on domains related to civic engagement and critical awareness.

Keywords Youth empowerment · Cognitive empowerment · Psychological empowerment · Psychological sense of community · Ethnic identity

✉ David T. Lardier
dlardier@unm.edu

[1] Department of Individual, Family, and Community Education, Family and Child Studies Program, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

[2] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, The University of New Mexico School of Medicine, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

[3] Department of Family Science and Human Development, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ, USA

Introduction

Youth empowerment and the ways to cultivate a critical understanding of power and in-turn social change is largely lost to the youth literature and the community-based work with and for young people of color. Youth civic engagement and social change, including perceptions, attitudes, values, membership, and identities are increasingly important topics to practitioners, researchers, and institutions (Christens et al. 2013a; Lardier et al. 2018b). Various studies have shown the critical role empowerment of youth plays in predicting overall well-being and contributing to positive youth development (Christens et al. 2013a, b; Christens and Peterson 2012; Lardier 2018, 2019; Lardier et al. 2018a; Zeldin et al. 2017, 2018). Moreover, we are seeing countless examples in today's United States society of youth empowerment, whether students from Parkland, Florida are protesting for gun reform, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) Dreamers throughout the U.S. are protesting for a clean DREAM Act, citizenship, and equal rights, or the #BlackLivesMatter Movement is protesting for social justice, equal rights, and police reform. Despite such research and engagement by youth in the sociopolitical domain, we still know little about the mechanisms through which youth empowerment and critical awareness occurs (Lardier et al. 2018b; Peterson 2014).

Empowerment emphasizes important ways of being, which include individuals' and groups' abilities to engage in emancipatory processes that relieve the difficulties they face within their lives by participating in action-oriented solutions (Rappaport 1987; Zimmerman 2000). The World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations have both embraced the ideas within empowerment to further their causes and develop, based on Rappaport's (1984) definitions, ways in which individuals and groups can gain greater control over their lives, acquire rights, and reduce marginalization that perpetuates inequality. The United Nations' Convention on the Rights of the Child (1990), while not signed by the United States, specifically articulates in Article 12, section 1 an empowerment-oriented definition on the importance of youth voice and the abilities of young people to be actors in their own world:

> States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.

Clearly, an important construct in several fields over the past 30-years, empowerment is a largely untested theory and has been minimally examined among youth (Peterson 2014; Peterson et al. 2017). Furthermore, even fewer studies have tested empowerment constructs and measures among diverse populations, particularly young people of color (Lardier et al. 2018b). Consequently, there is limited work unpacking the context specific nature of empowerment, measures used to assess empowerment (e.g., Cognitive Empowerment Scale, Sociopolitical Control Scale), and the association specific empowerment related variables such as cognitive empowerment have with theoretically related variables including but not limited to psychological sense of community (SOC) and ethnic identity (Hunter et al. 2013).

Conceptual Framing and Literature Review

Zimmerman (1995) developed one of the primary definitions of empowerment, but more precisely psychological empowerment, which has garnered the most attention both theoretically and methodologically; albeit, representing one component of the broader multidimensional theory of empowerment that encompasses *psychological empowerment, organizational empowerment,* and *community empowerment* (Peterson 2014). While some have defined psychological empowerment as an intrapsychic variable at the individual level of analysis (e.g., Holden et al. 2004, 2005), it is more adequately described as a higher order construct that occurs and is developed within dynamic, ongoing, and participatory processes; wherein, individuals gain mastery and control over the circumstances that affect their lives (Peterson 2014). Zimmerman's (1995) nomological framework for psychological empowerment identifies psychological empowerment as a higher order multidimensional construct based on three components:

1. *Intrapersonal component* (emotional) of psychological empowerment refers to a person's ability to influence or engage in change both within personal and sociopolitical contexts. This is often measured through the Sociopolitical Control Scale for Youth (SPCS-Y), which examines perceived self-efficacy and leadership (Lardier et al. 2018c; Peterson et al. 2017)
2. *Interactional component* (cognitive empowerment) of psychological empowerment refers to an individual's critical awareness and understanding of their sociopolitical environments, as well as their functional ability to engage in change and by what means (Peterson et al. 2002; Speer 2000; Speer and Peterson 2000). Cognitive empowerment includes critical awareness, decision making, resource mobilization, and relational processes such as shaping ideologies and power to create change through relationships (Speer 2000; Speer and Peterson 2000). Cognitive empowerment is often measured through the Cognitive Empowerment Scale (CES), which examines power through relationships, the nature of power, and shaping ideologies (Peterson et al. 2002).
3. *Behavioral component* of psychological empowerment refers to an individuals' or groups' behaviors to exert influence and change over their social, political, economic, and cultural conditions that impact their lives and communities. This includes organization participation and community involvement and is measured through the Community Participation Scale (Speer and Peterson 2000).
4. Christens (2012) more recently argued for the integration of a fourth component, *relational* empowerment. Relational empowerment has been defined as relational transactions and processes that allow for the effective exercise of transformative power in the sociopolitical domain (Christens 2012). Relational empowerment has been theorized to be similar conceptually to psychological SOC; however, further research is needed to develop an adequate measure of relational empowerment (Christens 2012; Peterson 2014).

While an increasing number of studies have systematically examined both the operationalization of psychological empowerment and its higher-order nature (e.g., Peterson 2014; Rodrigues et al. 2018), little research has adequately examined components of psychological empowerment, outside of intrapersonal psychological empowerment and the behavioral component of psychological empowerment (Lardier 2018, 2019; Peterson 2014). More specifically, there are relatively few studies (notable exceptions include Christens et al. 2013a, b; Christens et al. 2018; Peterson et al. 2002; Rodrigues et al. 2018; Speer 2000; Speer and Peterson 2000) that have unpacked the cognitive component of psychological empowerment. Furthermore, few investigations have examined the relationship between subscales of cognitive empowerment and in predicting conceptually related variables such as intrapersonal psychological empowerment, measured through sociopolitical control (SPC), as well as psychological SOC, and ethnic identity. Moreover, some studies have solely focused on only the relational power subscale of the broader cognitive (interactional) empowerment measure (e.g., Wilke and Speer 2011; Lardier et al. 2018c). Nonetheless, investigations that are present that have examined cognitive empowerment have not only noted its complexity, particularly when buttressed with intrapersonal psychological empowerment (e.g., Christens et al. 2013a, b; Peterson 2014; Rodrigues et al. 2018), but the empirical relationship cognitive empowerment has with organizational type (e.g., political or service-based orientation), relational power (Wilke and Speer 2011), those features and processes of an organization (e.g., organizational sense of community and empowering organizations), and in relation to critical hopefulness and critical consciousness (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018; Hipolito-Delgado and Zion 2015). Despite such scholarship, there is need to prioritize the study of the cognitive empowerment component of psychological empowerment, with theoretically and conceptually related measures, including intrapersonal psychological empowerment, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity.

Cognitive Empowerment: The Relationship with Intrapersonal Psychological Empowerment, Psychological SOC, and Ethnic Identity

Cognitive Empowerment, or the interactional component of the broader psychological empowerment construct has been measured using several scales, including the *Interactional Empowerment Scale* (IES; Peterson et al. 2005) and the *Collective Action and Interpersonal Relationship Scale* (CAIRS; Speer 2000); however *the Cognitive Empowerment Scale* (*CES*) is the most widely utilized (Peterson et al. 2002; Speer and Peterson 2000). The CES uses three separate subscales related to power developed through relationships (relational power), the nature of power, and shaping ideologies (Peterson et al. 2002). *Power through relationships* focuses on the source of power that is developed through relationships such as organizations (Speer 2008). *The nature of power* is an understanding of the forces that shape one's environment, specifically related to political functioning (Speer 2008). *Shaping ideologies* is an understanding of knowledge of resources that can be harnessed to produce social change and where one may access these resources (Speer 2008).

Studies have examined empirically (e.g., Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018; Rodrigues et al. 2018) and conceptualized theoretically (e.g., Cattaneo and Chapman 2010; Christens et al. 2016b) the intersection between cognitive empowerment and intrapersonal psychological empowerment, measured through SPCS-Y. And while there are some investigations associating cognitive empowerment with psychological SOC (e.g., Wilke and Speer 2011), additional research is needed. Furthermore, studies are needed that examine cognitive empowerment with ethnic identity, due to the important role ethnic identity plays in the empowerment process (Christens et al. 2018; Lardier 2018, 2019; Lardier et al. 2018a, b, c, d).

Cognitive Empowerment and Intrapersonal Psychological Empowerment

Cognitive Empowerment is theorized to be related to the intrapersonal component of psychological empowerment, as part of the larger nomological network of the broader psychological empowerment construct in empowerment theory (Peterson 2014; Rodrigues et al. 2018; Zimmerman 2000). More specifically, cognitive empowerment is part of a broader process, wherein psychological empowerment dimensions both reinforce and predict one another, and all are part of a larger whole. Studies have shown the empirical connection, albeit minimally, between intrapersonal psychological empowerment and cognitive empowerment, particularly among youth of color (Peterson 2014; Rodrigues et al. 2018).

Wilke and Speer (2011) found that an organizational orientation as either service-based or politically-based predicted relational power and that an organizational orientation was mediated through both empowering organizational characteristics (e.g., social support and group-based belief systems) and organizational community belongingness. More specifically, these findings highlight the importance of participation in service-based organizations in predicting psychological empowerment, as well as the role empowering organizational characteristics such as a leadership and collective beliefs toward change have on the path toward psychological empowerment. Elsewhere, research has shown that individuals in lower SES communities who experience economic deprivation and social isolation, experience increased cognitive empowerment, are more keenly aware of injustices and the power that maintains their subjugation, and may be more likely to engage as leaders in sociopolitical change (Christens et al. 2011, 2018). However, Christens et al. (2013a, b) noted that while individuals may be critical of the social system and understand power, they are unlikely to have hope in their own ability to make change, limiting aspects of intrapersonal empowerment, specific to leadership and self-efficacy in the sociopolitical domain. Furthermore, the lack of hope in one's own ability to execute change was even more discouraging among those individuals in social isolation, which highlights that greater work is needed to both empower communities of color to develop a critical awareness of power and cultivate hope in the belief of change (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018; Speer 2008). Yet, in a recent study, Christens et al. (2018) examined latent class cluster groups of critical hopefulness through the CES and SPCS-Y among urban youth of color on psychological SOC, civic engagement, and social justice orientation. These authors identified among this sample of urban youth that a larger proportion of the sample was classified in two cluster groups

that exhibited critical hopefulness and that these groups had higher mean scores in psychological SOC, civic engagement, and social justice orientation. These outcomes illustrate the importance of being both critical of sociopolitical issues and the maintenance of hope in the face of sociopolitical realities and power imbalances. More recently, Lardier et al. (2018c) too showed while testing the factor structure of intrapersonal psychological empowerment, using an abbreviated version of the SPCS-Y, that youth with higher composite scores of both self-efficacy and leadership experienced greater relational power, or power was developed through relationships, a component of cognitive empowerment. Despite such work, research continues to be needed that examines the relationship cognitive empowerment holds with intrapersonal psychological empowerment, particularly among marginalized youth of color.

Of note, recent discussions have put into question the overarching construct of psychological empowerment (e.g., Peterson 2014), due to the lack of covariance between components of psychological empowerment. Other scholars have also put forward that dimensions of psychological empowerment may be relational in nature (e.g., Christens and Peterson 2012) and because these dimensions are relational in nature, dimensions of psychological empowerment may in fact sit on either side of the equation (e.g., Lardier et al. 2018a). To contribute to this scholarship the practice of theorizing and empirically testing dimensions of empowerment is needed (Christens et al. 2018), as well as explaining and testing the association components of psychological empowerment have with conceptually related variables such as psychological SOC and ethnic identity.

Cognitive Empowerment and Psychological SOC

Psychological SOC is based in concepts of collective efficacy and neighboring (i.e., sharing neighbors and mutual assistance; Perkins and Long 2002). Psychological SOC has been defined broadly as perceived feelings of belongingness and a shared belief that community members will meet one another's needs through these relationships (McMillan and Chavis 1986). McMillan and Chavis (1986) outlined four dimensions to psychological SOC: (1) *membership*: feelings of belongingness to one's community; (2) *influence*: feeling one can make a difference in a group and mattering as a member; (3) *needs fulfillment*: the perception that members will meet one anothers needs and resources will be shared through these relationships; and (4) *emotional connection*: a shared emotional connection through history or common places.

Largely measured though the Brief Sense of Community Scale (BSCS), studies among youth have associated psychological SOC with social activism (Forenza et al. 2017), community participation, ethnic identity development (Lardier 2018, 2019), buffering the negative effects of community violence, disorganization, and substance use, predicting school importance (Garcia-Reid et al. 2013), self-efficacy, and intrapersonal psychological empowerment (Lardier 2018, 2019; Lardier et al. 2018a; Zeldin et al. 2015). Yet, few investigations have examined psychological SOC with cognitive empowerment. Studies that are present have associated psychological SOC with relational power (Wilke and Speer 2011) and with youth being more critically

aware of power, as well as hopeful that they can enact social change (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018). Hipolito-Delgado and Zion (2015), while not directly assessing psychological SOC, also showed that participation in a critical inquiry classroom environment and connection to their school enviornment, increased youth's sense of empowerment, critical consciousness, and ethnic identity. These findings highlight the important role of sharing power and voice in developing students' awareness of power and feeling capable of enacting social change. It is, however, vital to further examine the relationship between cognitive empowerment and psychological SOC, given the empircal and theoretical connection these constructs have in the broader empowerment process (Christens et al. 2018).

Cognitive Empowerment and Ethnic Identity

Contemporary literature has also provided some evidence on the relationship between ethnic identity and empowerment, more specifically intrapersonal psychological empowerment (e.g., Gullan et al. 2013; Lardier 2018, 2019; Lardier et al. 2018a). Youth with a greater sense of their ethnic group identity are found to have higher composite scores in intrapersonal psychological empowerment, or greater leadership activity and a greater perceived ability to enact social change (i.e., self-efficacy; Lardier 2018, 2019; Lardier et al. 2018a). Gullan et al. (2013) too showed that the intrapersonal psychological empowerment was related to youth's ethnic identity; albeit, the interaction and behavioral components had no significant relationship.

Empowerment theory and concepts surrounding critical consciousness (see Christens et al. 2013a, b) imply that through social group or ethnic group association and participation, individuals are not only likely to be engaged in their community, but also connected to their community, due to the sense of belongingness, membership, and emotional connection they have to their ethnic-racial group (Watts et al. 2011). Gutiérrez (1995) and Watts et al. (2011) both noted three distinct subprocesses to a critical consciousness model: (1) critical social analysis; (2) collective identity development; (3) political self-efficacy; and (4) sociopolitical action. Under this model, individuals through a reciprocally recurring process begin to understand and recognize social inequalities and through collective identification (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, immigration), one is likely to not only feel collective empowerment, but driven to engage in inspiring action and change for the betterment of the collective (Hipolito-Delgado and Lee 2007). Under this logic, a critical understanding of power and the ways in which change can occur involves a complex relationship between developing an accurate understanding of the world through one's social context and relationships (Christens et al. 2013a, b; Watts et al. 2011). Liberation Psychologists Luque-Ribelles and Portillo (2009) stated in reference to sociopolitical change and critical consciousness that people change, along with their relationships within their context, and become critically aware of power and the ways in which to rupture and change hierarchical structures of inequality. Hence, cognitive processes related to a critical understanding of one's social world are predictive of collective social group identity and in-turn the action toward change (Gutiérrez 1995; Watts et al. 1999, 2011). Despite such preliminary empirical evidence and

theoretical considerations, minimal scholarship has placed cognitive empowerment as a predictor or in relation to ethnic identity.

Purpose

The current study represents one of a few investigations examining subcomponents of cognitive empowerment (notable exceptions include, but are not limited to Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018; Rodrigues et al. 2018) and the relationships these components hold with intrapersonal psychological empowerment, measured through SPC, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity. The primary purpose of this investigation is to examine heterogeneity and membership with subgroups of cognitive empowerment among youth of color. Within this heterogeneity, we hope to identify the relationship each of these subgroups have with conceptually related variables including the intrapersonal psychological empowerment, measured through SPC, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity.

An additional purpose is to determine whether this approach provides empirical evidence on the multidimensionality of the cognitive empowerment scale. If significant heterogeneity is found, these results could have critical implications for the identification of cognitive empowerment profiles and provide some consideration for theory that cognitive empowerment within the broader psychological empowerment construct and even more broadly within empowerment theory is not a monolithic construct but developed within and among varying intersections. Findings can be useful for practitioners as they design and advocate and work with and for youth of color in engaging social and systemic change, and the ways in which to cultivate critical awareness among youth of color.

Methods

Sample and Design

Data were collected in 2013 as part of a Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) Minority AIDS Initiative (MAI) grant program. These data were gathered from a northeastern United States under-resourced, financially-strapped, urban school district. The data gathered helped to inform environmental strategies and prevention-intervention protocols within the target community and school system.

A convenience sample of 383 students were recruited through their high school's physical education and health classes in grades 9 through 12 within the largest high school in the focal community. In compliance with university Institutional Review Board (IRB) and state laws requiring active parental consent, and student assent, students who returned both parental consent and student assent were eligible to complete the questionnaire over a one-hour time period (36.5% response rate). This response is low for school-based surveying; however, this outcome must be considered with laws from the focal state, which require active parent consent. Studies

indicate that while active parental consent is important, it may in fact influence the overall consent procedures and reduce the response rate of students (Nulty 2008).

Students ranged from grades 9 through 12, with 29.2% in 9th grade, 45.7% in 10th grade, 6% in 11th grade, and 19.1% in 12th grade. The majority of students identified as Hispanic/Latina(o) (75%), with the next largest demographic group identifying as Black/African American (24.3%). A nearly equal proportion of students identified as male (46.9%) and female (53.1%), with 50.6% ($n=193$) between 13 and 15 years of age and 49.4% ($n=190$) between 16 and 18 years of age. The majority of youth received free or reduced lunch (75%), an indicator for low socioeconomic status.

Measurement

Cognitive Empowerment Scale

Speer and Peterson (2000) developed the interactional empowerment or Cognitive Empowerment Scale. Through principal components factor analyses, Speer and Peterson (2000) illustrated and confirmed that the measure for cognitive empowerment encompassed three subscales: *power through relationships* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.72$; $M=18.47$, $SD=3.83$), *nature of problem/political functioning* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.78$; $M=16.69$, $SD=4.24$), and *shaping ideologies* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.77$; $M=14.44$, $SD=2.77$). More recently, Rodrigues et al. (2018) tested the factor structure of the entire psychological empowerment construct among 861 Portuguese youth. These authors similarly found that the overall cognitive empowerment scale (overall scale: Cronbach's $\alpha=.81$; $M=18.47$, $SD=3.83$) encompassed the same three broad sub-scales of *power through relationships* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.78$), *nature of problem/political functioning* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.76$) and *shaping ideologies* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.87$). For the current study, the four-item measure of power through relationships (Cronbach's $\alpha=.81$; $M=3.99$, $SD=.85$), the four-item measure of nature of power/political functioning (Cronbach's $\alpha=.73$; $M=3.67$, $SD=.83$), and the six-item measure of shaping ideologies (Cronbach's $\alpha=.81$; $M=3.62$, $SD=.77$) were combined. The overall scale had a mean score of 3.75 ($SD=.68$; Cronbach's $\alpha=.89$). Participants responded using a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) *to strongly agree* (5).

Conceptually Related Variables

Intrapersonal (Emotional Component) Psychological Empowerment was measured through the *Sociopolitical Control Scale for Youth* (SPCS-Y; Christens et al. 2016a; Peterson et al. 2011; Lardier et al. 2018c; Zimmerman and Zahniser 1991) using a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) *to strongly agree* (5). Peterson et al. (2011) confirmed the SPCS-Y as a two factor measure that examined *leadership competence* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.81$) and *policy control* (Cronbach's $\alpha=.85$). Guided by previous literature examining the SPCS-Y (e.g., Lardier et al. 2018a, b, c, d; Peterson et al. 2011) the eight-item measure (sample items: I am a leader in

groups. I can usually organize people to get things done) of *leadership competence* (Cronbach's α = .82; *M* = 3.42, *SD* = .71) and the nine-item measure for *policy control* (Cronbach's α = .81; *M* = 3.20, *SD* = .69) were combined. The overall SPCS-Y had a mean score of 3.30 (*SD* = .62; Cronbach's α = .89).

Psychological Sense of Community (SOC) was examined using the Brief Sense of Community Scale (BSCS), an eight-item measure (sample items: I feel like a member of this neighborhood.), assessed on a five-point Likert scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). This scale is based on the work of Peterson et al. (2008) and McMillan and Chavis (1986). Recently, Lardier et al. (2018d) validated the BSCS among a sample of youth of color, supporting the factor structure among a youth sample (*M* = 3.07, *SD* = .80; Cronbach's α = .85). The BSCS was designed using four dimensions (e.g., needs fulfillment, group membership, influence, and emotional connection) of psychological SOC theorized by McMillan and Chavis (1986). Responses were combined. The overall scale had a mean score of 3.05 (*SD* = .83; Cronbach's α = .85).

Ethnic identity was measured using a six-item scale developed by the federal funding agency (sample items: I have spent time trying to figure out more about my ethnic group.). Youth participants responded to each item on a four-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (4). Confirmatory factor analysis was undertaken to further establish support for the factor structure of this ethnic identity scale, developed by the federal funding agency. Accepted indicators of model fit were assessed: Chi Square (χ^2) test, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Goodness of fit indices (GFI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) (West et al. 2012). Nonsignificant χ^2 values indicate acceptable model fit. Second, higher values (i.e., greater than .95) on the Comparative Fit Index and Goodness of Fit Index, and smaller RMSEA (i.e., less than .08) are desirable. Last, RMSEA that are ≤ .05 = good fit, .05–.08 = acceptable fit and .08–.10 = unacceptable fit (West et al. 2012).

Results indicate that this six-item scale had adequate model-to-data fit ($\chi^2 = 7.72$ [5], $p = .17$; CFI = .99; TLI = .98; GFI = .99; RMSEA = .03 [90% CI = .00, .05]), supporting that these questions loaded onto a single ethnic identity latent variable, or that one factor was extracted, with an Eigenvalue of 2.75 and explained 81% of the variance. Scores were combined and the overall scale had a mean score of 3.62 (*SD* = .85; Cronbach's α = .80). Prior studies using validated ethnic identity measures (i.e., Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure) have demonstrated similar levels of internal consistency and validity that range from .71 to .92 and showed useful and important findings (e.g., Phinney and Ong 2007).

Analytic Approach

Before main analyses, missing data were examined. Little's Missing Completely at Random (MCAR) Test was used to assess the level and type of missingness (Little and Rubin 2014). Little's MCAR test revealed that the χ^2 result was significant ($\chi^2 = [df = 23]$ 43.23, $p = .006$), and that these data were most likely not missing completely at random (MCAR). Although numerous missing data techniques are

available (McGinniss and Harel 2016), missing data for this study were handled using maximum likelihood (ML) estimations.

Following ML estimations of imputation, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) using SPSS (v 23.0) software was used to determine if profile groups, which were created based on scores from the CES, differed on a set of conceptually related variables: intrapersonal psychological empowerment, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity. Initially, gender, age, Hispanic/Latina(o) ethnic identity, and African American/Black racial identity were included in analyses due to previous investigations illustrating differences on the basis of race and ethnicity and gender (Christens et al. 2016b; Rodrigues et al. 2018; Speer and Peterson 2000), as well as theoretical conjectures that highlight the context specific nature of empowerment based on such vertical intersections (Zimmerman 2000). Results, however, indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between cognitive empowerment and gender (χ^2 (40) = 55.22, $p = .10$), age (F (6, 371) = .79, $p = .57$), Hispanic/Latina(o) ethnic identity (χ^2 (40) = 36.64, $p = .62$), and African American/Black racial identity (χ^2 (40) = 35.62, $p = .67$).

Results

Table 1 displays the correlation matrix for all variables. All subcomponents were highly correlated with the one another and the overall cognitive empowerment scale ($p < .01$). In addition, all conceptually related variables were correlated with the overall CES. Some variability was present among subscales. For instance, ethnic identity was not associated with both power through relationships (relational power) and the nature of power. In addition, ethnic identity was not correlated with psychological SOC.

Table 1 Correlation matrix and descriptive statistics for main study variables (N = 383)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Overall CE scale	–	.79**	.83**	.88**	.27**	.12*	.15*
2. Power through relationships			.53**	.52**	.20**	.08	.15**
3. Nature of power				.59**	.22**	.09	.11**
4. Shaping ideologies					.25**	.11*	.12*
5. Intrapersonal PE (SPCS-Y)						.12*	.39**
6. Ethnic identity							.03
7. Psychological SOC							
Mean	3.75	3.99	3.67	3.62	3.30	3.62	3.05
SD	.68	.85	.83	.77	.62	.85	.83
Skew	− .37	− .87	− .48	.04	.19	− .25	.01
Kurtosis	.57	.71	.38	− .18	1.30	.56	.08
α	.89	.81	.73	.81	.89	.80	.85

Psychological SOC, psychological sense of community; SPCS-Y, sociopolitical control scale for youth

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$

Table 2 displays results from MANOVA analyses. MANOVA results showed significant differences between cognitive empowerment profile groups for all three conceptually related variables. Post Hoc pairwise comparison showed generally that youth in profile Group 1 (i.e., higher levels of power through relationships, nature of problem, and shaping ideologies) had higher composite scores in intrapersonal psychological empowerment, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity, when compared to those youth in profile Group 5 (i.e., lower power through relationships, nature of problem, and shaping ideologies). Interestingly, some variation was present between subgroups, which points toward the complex nature of cognitive empowerment among ethnic-racial minority adolescents. For instance, while Group 1 showed a higher mean score on intrapersonal psychological empowerment, when compared to Groups 3–6, Group 2, or youth with higher scores in relational power and shaping ideologies, were found to also have a higher mean composite score on intrapersonal psychological empowerment, when compared to Groups 3–6. In addition, Group 6 had a greater mean composite score—i.e., those youth higher in relational power and nature of power—when compared to Group 1 on psychological SOC. Regarding ethnic identity, although profile Group 1 had the highest mean composite score, Group 3—i.e., those youth with higher nature of power—had an equally higher mean composite score. This may mean that because one has a stronger connection to their ethnic group, they may be equally aware of oppressive structures. Despite such variations, youth in profile Group 5—i.e., lower scores in relational power, shaping ideologies, and power through relationship—had significantly lower mean composite scores on all three conceptually-related variables.

Discussion

Perceptions of cognitive empowerment, through a critical understanding of power, power through relationships (i.e., the ways in which power can be exercised toward change), and awareness of how to and where to access resources have all been identified as important components of youth developing empowerment and critical consciousness or a critical awareness of their social world and enacting critical social change (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018). Previous investigations, though minimal, have identified cognitive empowerment as a correlate with intrapersonal psychological empowerment (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018; Lardier et al. 2018c; Rodrigues et al. 2018), psychological SOC (Wilke and Speer 2011), and empirically, as well as theoretically associated with ethnic identity (Gutiérrez 1995; Hipolito-Delgado and Lee 2007; Kirshner et al. 2015; Watts et al. 2011). Cognitive empowerment components have also been found to be an important outcome within organizational settings (Speer 2008). Yet, this study remains one a few that situates cognitive empowerment among youth of color and begins to tease at the relationship cognitive empowerment has with conceptually related variables including the intrapersonal component of psychological empowerment, measured through SPC, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity.

The results of this study were largely consistent with previous findings (e.g., Christens et al. 2011, 2013a, b) in that youth with higher overall composite scores

Table 2 MANOVA results subgroups of cognitive empowerment (measured through the CES) on sociopolitical control scale for youth, psychological sense of community, and ethnic identity (N = 383)

Variable	Group 1: High PTR, NOP, Shaping Ideology (n = 108)	Group 2: High PTR, Low NOP, High Shaping Ideology (n = 33)	Group 3: Low PTR, High NOP, Low Shaping Ideology (n = 29)	Group 4: High PTR, Low NOP, Low Shaping Ideology (n = 66)	Group 5: Low PTR, NOP and Shaping Ideology (n = 82)	Group 6: High PTR, High NOP, Low Shaping Ideology (n = 64)	Univariate F (5, 381)	Mean different, $p < .05$
Psychological empowerment	3.45	3.51	3.32	3.14	3.11	5.20	4.72***	2 > 1 > 3, 4, 5, 6
Psychological SOC	3.09	3.17	2.81	3.01	2.93	3.26	2.47*	6 > 1, 2 3, 4, 5
Ethnic identity	2.75	2.45	2.71	2.64	2.51	2.57	2.76**	1, 3 > 2, 4, 5, 6

CES, cognitive empowerment scale; SOC, sense of community; PTR, power through relationships; NOP, nature of problem; Shaping Ideol, shaping ideologies

Wilks' Lambda = .89, F (15,118.00) = 2.86, $p < .001$

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

of relational power (or power through relationships), awareness of the nature of the problem (nature of problem or critical understanding of social inequality), and shaping ideologies or knowledge of resources that can be harnessed to produce social change were greater when compared to those youth who were lowest in these submeasures (i.e., Group 5). This finding in and of itself is important as it highlights the empirical association higher levels of cognitive empowerment have with intrapersonal psychological empowerment, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity. If we consider both empowerment and models of critical consciousness put forward by Gutiérrez (1995) and Watts et al. (2011), we visualize the role that a critical awareness of one's world, how power is generated through social relationships, and the ways in which resources are accessed to make change align with models of critical consciousness. Furthermore, results provide some evidence of the empirical connection the cognitive component of psychological empowerment has with ethnic identity and psychological SOC, measures of collective identification and belongingness, and the intrapersonal psychological empowerment, a measure of perceived sociopolitical self-efficacy and leadership. Yet, some variation was present in how these subgroups performed on conceptually related variables.

A noteworthy finding was that those youth in Group 2 (i.e., high in power through relationships, low in nature of problem, and high in shaping ideologies) experienced higher mean scores on intrapersonal psychological empowerment, when compared to other groups. This result points toward the role that relational power and shaping ideologies have in facilitating leadership and one's perceived ability to make changes in the sociopolitical realm. The perceived ability to engage in sociopolitical change as a leader has been found to be associated with the ways in which power is manifested or occurs, such as through organizations (Speer 2008), the sense of collective efficacy created within and among organizations and communities (Hipolito-Delgado and Lee 2007; Hipolito-Delgado and Zion 2015), and the capacity to harness resources and engage individuals to produce change (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018). This finding supports the notion that while being critically aware is associated with empowerment overall (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018), a more nuanced understanding may indicate that the intrapersonal psychological empowerment is closely associated with relational perceptions (i.e., relational power and shaping ideologies). Hence, this finding situates components of intrapersonal psychological empowerment—i.e., leadership and political self-efficacy—to relational power and awareness of how to access resources and produce social change.

The association between cognitive empowerment and psychological SOC is equally complex. Findings presented in this study show that while youth in Group 1 had high composite scores in all subcomponents of cognitive empowerment, youth in Group 6 had higher composite scores of cognitive empowerment when associated with psychological SOC. This result indicates that those youth higher in relational power and a critical awareness of power in society had higher psychological SOC or belongingness. As both qualitative (e.g., Bermea et al. 2019; Forenza et al. 2017) and quantitative studies (e.g., Wilke and Speer 2011) have illustrated, the broader conceptualization of psychological SOC—i.e., membership, influence, needs fulfillment, and emotional connection—not only facilitates community participation and action-oriented empowerment, but promotes, through empowering social

relationships, a critical awareness of social inequalities and the ways in which to exercise power. Hence, power is developed through collective identity, group membership, and community association, which in turn translates into broader capabilities of manifesting power and enacting social change (Christens et al. 2011; Freire 1968[2014]; Hipolito-Delgado and Zion 2015).

The association subgroups of cognitive empowerment had with ethnic identity also yielded interesting results. Youth in Group 3—i.e., low power through relationships, high nature of problem, and low shaping ideology—had higher mean composite scores than those young people in Group 1. These findings may indicate that a stronger connection to one's ethnic group may make one equally aware of oppressive structures that feed the perceived problem and contribute to the current and past social inequalities (Anderson et al. 2016; Diemer and Rapa 2016; Diemer et al. 2016; Hope et al. 2016). Gutiérrez (1995) highlighted that for individuals in marginalized social positions (i.e., specifically Latino[a]s) to become empowered, they must develop "a group identification and consciousness" (p. 230) and empower individuals to think more critically about their own social positions and invoke participation among others to work/lead toward group consciousness. Individuals within Group 3, while having a higher mean composite scores on ethnic identity, are likely to think more critically about concerns impacting their ethnic-racial group (Diemer and Rapa 2016; Luginbuhl et al. 2016), and realistically, be part of a reinforcing cycle where critical awareness about social inequalities creates greater feelings of solidarity, collective efficacy, culture, and identity (Watts and Hipolito-Delgado 2015). Hence, as Forenza et al. (2017) illustrated qualitatively and Lardier (2018, 2019), quantitatively, individuals who have stronger ethnic group identity and solidarity tend to experience greater community belongingness, greater self-efficacy to enact sociopolitical change, and be leaders in their social world.

Limitations

Several limitations of the study need to be recognized. First, the cross-sectional design of the study limits causal interpretation of data. Although cross-sectional studies are important for rapid analyses and dissemination of outcomes for marginalized groups (Smith et al. 2011), future research should consider replicating this study on a broader longitudinal scale.

A second limitation concerns the measurement of cognitive empowerment. While the current study used the most recently validated CES (e.g., Speer and Peterson 2000), this measure has yet to be validated among a sample of youth (notable exceptions include Rodrigues et al. 2018 among Portuguese youth), from, specifically, the United States. Therefore, future research needs to consider the measurement and validation of a CES among youth, and replicate this study using a validated measure among youth.

An associated limitation concerns the measurement of ethnic-identity. For the present study, questions on ethnic-identity were limited to those questions proposed by the funding agency. Although the measure for the current study was psychometrically sound, future research is advised to replicate this study using alternative ethnic

identity measures from widely validated scales (e.g., Phinney 1992; Umana-Taylor et al. 2004), which would further corroborate the role of ethnic-identity with dimensions of psychological empowerment and among theoretically related measures.

A fourth limitation concerns the measurement of intrapersonal psychological empowerment. While validated among youth (e.g., Christens et al. 2016a; Lardier et al. 2018c; Peterson et al. 2017), this measure of psychological empowerment only concerns a single component of the full PE construct (Peterson 2014). Future research should examine the relationship cognitive empowerment has with other measures of psychological empowerment and the role of cognitive empowerment within the factor structure of the larger psychological empowerment construct among youth (notable exceptions include Rodrigues et al. 2018), and more specifically, among youth of color.

A fifth limitation relates to the use of mean-splits for creating profile groups. Although previous empowerment studies (e.g., Lardier et al. 2018c; Peterson et al. 2011; Speer 2000) have used mean-split to establish profile groups, and in the current study, the created categorical variables matched the proportions of the psychological empowerment and ethnic-identity variables, mean-split approaches tend to be less rigorous when compared to person-centered analytic approaches. Future studies should consider the use of person-centered analyses to establish profile groups, which would provide a more nuanced examination of cognitive empowerment subgroups. Person-centered analyses would also allow researchers to infer the characteristics of group membership from the items that specified group membership (Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018).

A final limitation concerns the study's external validity, as our investigation was conducted among a specific group of adolescents from a U.S. community. In addition, youth were part of a larger federally funded HIV/AIDS prevention-intervention program, which may have influenced their perceived levels of cognitive empowerment, intrapersonal psychological empowerment, ethnic identity, and psychological SOC. Being part of a larger federally funded HIV/AIDS prevention-intervention program may also limit the generalizability of findings. Results from this study are, however, consistent with prior investigations (e.g., Christens et al. 2013a, b, 2018; Forenza et al. 2017; Hipolito-Delgado and Zion 2015; Lardier 2018, 2019) and extend the current, yet, limited literature.

Implications Community-Based Youth Work

Cognitive Empowerment is more than an intrapersonal or personality variable, it is a subcomponent of the broader psychological empowerment and empowerment constructs. Cognitive empowerment is also part of a broader empowerment process that works toward promoting collective identity, psychological SOC, leadership and self-efficacy. Therefore, a question for community-based youth work is often how to cultivate cognitive empowerment among youth and the associated outcomes of cognitive empowerment can have among youth of color. Furthermore, policymakers should consider the ways in which they can support such endeavors among youth, particularly in under-resourced communities of color.

Given the current historical iteration of youth engagement we are witnessing today in the United States, the results from this study provide important insight and point toward the critical role of creating action-oriented and critical youth-spaces that can work toward facilitating not only awareness, but developing youth as leaders, youth who have a stronger psychological SOC, and youth of color who have a stronger connection to their ethnic-racial group. This instantiation of critical youth engagement, points toward the need to move beyond the typical narrative of positive youth development work that simply focuses on saving (Kirshner 2015; Lardier et al., under review). Instead, as Lardier et al. (2018b) discuss, youth engagement needs to take on a more liberatory and critical framework, with an aim of working with and for youth in social transformation and community change. This type of youth engagement may lead to the creation and maintenance of youth-based community locations where adults and youth work in an alliance and youth visualize themselves as part of a community, as leaders, and capable of executing change (Lardier et al. 2018b). Moreover, youth need to be provided opportunities to engage in deep discussion on the circumstances that impact their cultural group, which both increases solidarity and ethnic-racial identity (Umaña-Taylor et al. 2012). Through participation in activities for and with one's ethnic group, one's sense of group critical consciousness and hope is also enhanced (Forenza et al. 2017). Hence, providing youth opportunities not only for deep discussion but action-oriented change will increase cognitive empowerment and simultaneously work toward expanding youth intrapersonal psychological empowerment, ethnic identity, and psychological SOC. Policymakers need to also put more monies toward expanding youth programming in under-resourced communities with a majority minority youth population. Furthermore, targeted grant opportunities to engage youth critically in social change within their community and highlight values and resources specific to varying communities of color and marginalized youth (e.g., collective identity, family) is needed.

Conclusion

This study examined heterogeneity and membership of subgroups of cognitive empowerment among youth of color on conceptually related variables including the intrapersonal psychological empowerment, measured through SPC, psychological SOC, and ethnic identity. Results highlighted that while youth with high composite scores in all three components of relational power, awareness of the nature of the problem, and shaping ideologies were greater than those youth in Group 5, who were low in all three components of cognitive empowerment, variation was present between subgroups on conceptually related variables. Such findings should be considered by researchers and practitioners of youth work alike, as the promotion of civic engagement and critical awareness of one's social circumstances is highly important in a world where social divides are ever increasing.

Funding U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), Grant No. SPO20229-01.

References

Anderson, C., Turner, A. C., Heath, R. D., & Payne, C. M. (2016). On the meaning of grit… and hope… and fate control… and alienation… and locus of control… and… self-efficacy… and… effort optimism… and…. *The Urban Review, 48*(2), 198–219.

Bermea, A. M., Lardier, D. T., Jr., Forenza, B., Garcia-Reid, P., & Reid, R. J. (2019). Communitarianism and youth empowerment: Motivation for participation in a community-based substance abuse prevention coalition. *Journal of Community Psychology, 47*(1), 49–62.

Cattaneo, L. B., & Chapman, A. R. (2010). The process of empowerment: A model for use in research and practice. *American Psychologist, 65*(7), 646–659. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018854.

Christens, B. D. (2012). Toward relational empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 50*(1–2), 114–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-011-9483-5.

Christens, B. D., Byrd, K., Peterson, N. A., & Lardier, D. T. (2018). Critical hopefulness among urban high school students. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(8), 1649–1662.

Christens, B. D., Collura, J. J., & Tahir, F. (2013a). Critical hopefulness: A person-centered analysis of the intersection of cognitive and emotional empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 52*(1–2), 170–184. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9586-2.

Christens, B. D., Krauss, S. E., & Zeldin, S. (2016a). Malaysian validation of a sociopolitical control scale for youth. *Journal of Community Psychology, 44*(4), 531–537. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21777.

Christens, B. D., & Peterson, N. A. (2012). The role of empowerment in youth development: A study of sociopolitical control as mediator of ecological systems' influence on developmental outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 41*(5), 623–635. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9724-9.

Christens, B. D., Peterson, N. A., Reid, R. J., & Garcia-Reid, P. (2013b). Adolescents' perceived control in the sociopolitical domain: A latent class analysis. *Youth & Society, 47*(4), 443–461. https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118x12467656.

Christens, B. D., Speer, P. W., & Peterson, N. A. (2011). Social class as moderator of the relationship between (dis) empowering processes and psychological empowerment. *Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(2), 170–182. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20425.

Christens, B. D., Winn, L. T., & Duke, A. M. (2016b). Empowerment and critical consciousness: A conceptual cross-fertilization. *Adolescent Research Review, 1*(1), 15–27.

Diemer, M. A., & Rapa, L. J. (2016). Unraveling the complexity of critical consciousness, political efficacy, and political action among marginalized adolescents. *Child Development, 87*(1), 221–238.

Diemer, M. A., Rapa, L. J., Voight, A. M., & McWhirter, E. H. (2016). Critical consciousness: A developmental approach to addressing marginalization and oppression. *Child Development Perspectives, 10*(4), 216–221.

Forenza, B., Rogers, B., & Lardier, D. T. (2017). What facilitates and supports political activism by, and for, undocumented students? *The Urban Review, 49*(4), 648–667.

Freire, P. (1968[2014]). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Garcia-Reid, P., Hamme Peterson, C., Reid, R. J., & Peterson, N. A. (2013). The protective effects of sense of community, multigroup ethnic identity, and self-esteem against internalizing problems among Dominican youth: Implications for social workers. *Social Work in Mental Health, 11*(3), 199–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2013.774923.

Gullan, R. L., Power, T. J., & Leff, S. S. (2013). The role of empowerment in a school-based community service program with inner-city, minority youth. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 28*, 664–689. https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558413477200.

Gutiérrez, L. M. (1995). Understanding the empowerment process: Does consciousness make a difference? *Social Work Research, 19*(4), 229–237.

Hipolito-Delgado, C., & Lee, C. (2007). Empowerment theory for the professional school counselor: A manifesto for what really matters. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(4), 327–332.

Hipolito-Delgado, C. P., & Zion, S. (2015). Igniting the fire within marginalized youth: The role of critical civic inquiry in fostering ethnic identity and civic self-efficacy. *Urban Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915574524.

Holden, D. J., Crankshaw, E., Nimsch, C., Hinnant, L. W., & Hund, L. (2004). Quantifying the impact of participation in local tobacco control groups on the psychological empowerment of involved youth. *Health Education & Behavior, 31*(5), 615–628.

Holden, D. J., Evans, W. D., Hinnant, L. W., & Messeri, P. (2005). Modeling psychological empowerment among youth involved in local tobacco control efforts. *Health Education & Behavior, 32*(2), 264–278. https://doi.org/10.1177/1090198104272336.

Hope, E. C., Keels, M., & Durkee, M. I. (2016). Participation in Black Lives Matter and deferred action for childhood arrivals: Modern activism among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 9*(3), 203.

Hunter, B. A., Jason, L. A., & Keys, C. B. (2013). Factors of empowerment for women in recovery from substance use. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 51*(1–2), 91–102.

Kirshner, B. (2015). *Youth activism in an era of education inequality*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Kirshner, B., Hipolito-Delgado, C., & Zion, S. (2015). Sociopolitical development in educational systems: From margins to center. *The Urban Review, 47*(5), 803–808. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-015-0335-8.

Lardier, D. T., Jr. (2018). An examination of ethnic identity as a mediator of the effects of community participation and neighborhood sense of community on psychological empowerment among urban youth of color. *Journal of Community Psychology, 46*(5), 551–566.

Lardier, D. T., Jr. (2019). Substance use among urban youth of color: Exploring the role of community-based predictors, ethnic identity, and intrapersonal psychological empowerment. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(1), 91.

Lardier, D. T., Jr., Garcia-Reid, P., & Reid, R. J. (2018a). The interacting effects of psychological empowerment and ethnic identity on indicators of well-being among youth of color. *Journal of Community Psychology, 46*(4), 489–501.

Lardier, D. T., Jr., Herr, K. G., Bergeson, C., Garcia-Reid, P., & Reid, R. J. (under review). Locating disconnected minoritized youth within urban community-based educational programs: Confronting neoliberalism and the loss of critical social analyses. *International Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*.

Lardier, D. T., Jr., Herr, K. G., Garcia-Reid, P., & Reid, R. J. (2018b). Adult youth workers' conceptions of their work in an under-resourced community in the United States. *Journal of Youth Studies, 21*(8), 1029–1044.

Lardier, D. T., Jr., Reid, R. J., & Garcia-Reid, P. (2018c). Validation of an abbreviated Sociopolitical Control Scale for Youth among a sample of underresourced urban youth of color. *Journal of Community Psychology, 46*(8), 996–1009.

Lardier, D. T., Jr., Reid, R. J., & Garcia-Reid, P. (2018d). Validation of the Brief Sense of Community Scale among youth of color from an underserved urban community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 46*(8), 1062–1074.

Little, R. J., & Rubin, D. B. (2014). *Statistical analysis with missing data*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Luginbuhl, P. J., McWhirter, E. H., & McWhirter, B. T. (2016). Sociopolitical development, autonomous motivation, and education outcomes: Implications for low-income Latina/o adolescents. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology, 4*(1), 43.

Luque-Ribelles, V., & Portillo, N. (2009). Gendering peace and liberation: A participatory-action approach to critical consciousness acquisition among women in a marginalized neighborhood. In *Psychology of liberation* (pp. 277–294). Springer.

McGinniss, J., & Harel, O. (2016). Multiple imputation in three or more stages. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, 176,* 33–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspi.2016.04.001.

McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14,* 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629.

Nations, U. (1990). United Nations convention on the rights of the child.

Nulty, D. D. (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: What can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(3), 301–314.

Perkins, D. D., & Long, D. A. (2002). Neighborhood sense of community and social capital: A multilevel analysis. In A. Fisher, C. Sonn, & B. Bishop (Eds.), *Psychological sense of community: Research, applications, and implications* (pp. 291–318). New York, NY: Plenum.

Peterson, N. A. (2014). Empowerment theory: Clarifying the nature of higher-order multidimensional constructs. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 53*(1–2), 96–108. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9624-0.

Peterson, N. A., Gilmore Powell, K., Hamme Peterson, C., & Reid, R. J. (2017). Testing the phrase completion response option format in a Sociopolitical Control Scale for Youth. *Community Psychology in Global Perspective, 3*(1), 57–71.

Peterson, N. A., Hamme Peterson, C., & Speer, P. W. (2002). Cognitive empowerment of African Americans and caucasians: Differences in understandings of power, political functioning, and shaping ideology. *Journal of Black Studies, 32*(3), 336–351. https://doi.org/10.1177/002193470203200304.

Peterson, N. A., Lowe, J. B., Aquilino, M. L., & Schneider, J. E. (2005). Linking social cohesion and gender to intrapersonal and interactional empowerment: Support and new implications for theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 33*(2), 233–244. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20047.

Peterson, N. A., Peterson, C. H., Agre, L., Christens, B. D., & Morton, C. M. (2011). Measuring youth empowerment: Validation of a sociopolitical control scale for youth in an urban community context. *Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(5), 592–605. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20456.

Peterson, N. A., Speer, P. W., & McMillan, D. W. (2008). Validation of a brief sense of community scale: Confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(1), 61–73. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20217.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure a new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*(2), 156–176. https://doi.org/10.1177/074355489272003.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(3), 271–281. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15,* 121–148. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00919275.

Rappaport, J., Rappaport, J., Swift, C., & Hess, R. (1984). Studies in empowerment: Introduction to the issue. *Studies in empowerment: Steps Toward Understanding and Action, 3,* 1.

Rodrigues, M., Menezes, I., & Ferreira, P. D. (2018). Validating the formative nature of psychological empowerment construct: Testing cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and relational empowerment components. *Journal of Community Psychology, 46*(1), 58–78.

Smith, A. K., Ayanian, J. Z., Covinsky, K. E., Landon, B. E., McCarthy, E. P., Wee, C. C., et al. (2011). Conducting high-value secondary dataset analysis: An introductory guide and resources. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 26*(8), 920–929. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-010-1621-5.

Speer, P. W. (2000). Intrapersonal and interactional empowerment: Implications for theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28,* 51–61. https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1520-6629(200001)28:1%3c51:aid-jcop6%3e3.0.co;2-6.

Speer, P. W. (2008). Social power and forms of change: Implications for psychopolitical validity. *Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(2), 199–213.

Speer, P. W., & Peterson, N. A. (2000). Psychometric properties of an empowerment scale: Testing cognitive, emotional, and behavioral domains. *Social Work Research, 24*(2), 109–118. https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/24.2.109.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Wong, J. J., Gonzales, N. A., & Dumka, L. E. (2012). Ethnic identity and gender as moderators of the association between discrimination and academic adjustment among Mexican-origin adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*(4), 773–786.

Umana-Taylor, A. J., Yazedijian, A., & Bamaca-Gomez, M. Y. (2004). Developing the ethnic identity scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 4,* 9–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407506064214.

Watts, R. J., Diemer, M. A., & Voight, A. M. (2011). Critical consciousness: Current status and future directions. In C. A. Flanagan & B. D. Christens (Eds.), *New directions for child and adolescent development* (pp. 43–57).

Watts, R. J., Griffith, D. M., & Abdul-Adil, J. (1999). Sociopolitical development as an antidote for oppression—theory and action. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 27*(2), 255–271.

Watts, R. J., & Hipolito-Delgado, C. P. (2015). Thinking ourselves to liberation? Advancing sociopolitical action in critical consciousness. *The Urban Review, 47*(5), 847–867.

West, S. G., Taylor, A. B., & Wei, W. (2012). Model fit and model selection in structural equation modeling. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Handbook of structural equation modeling* (pp. 209–231). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Wilke, L. A., & Speer, P. W. (2011). The mediating influence of organizational characteristics in the relationship between organizational type and relational power: An extension of psychological empowerment research. *Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(8), 972–986.

Zeldin, S., Gauley, J. S., Barringer, A., & Chapa, B. (2018). How high schools become empowering communities: A mixed-method explanatory inquiry into youth-adult partnership and school engagement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 61,* 358–371.

Zeldin, S., Gauley, J., Krauss, S. E., Kornbluh, M., & Collura, J. (2017). Youth–adult partnership and youth civic development: Cross-national analyses for scholars and field professionals. *Youth & Society, 49*(7), 851–878.

Zeldin, S., Krauss, S. E., Kim, T., Collura, J., & Abdullah, H. (2015). Pathways to youth empowerment and community connectedness: A study of youth-adult partnership in Malaysian after-school, co-curricular programs. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *45*(8), 1638–1651.

Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Psychological empowerment: Issues and illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*(5), 581–591. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02506983.

Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 44–59). New York, NY: Plenum Publishers.

Zimmerman, M. A., & Zahniser, J. H. (1991). Refinements of sphere-specific measures of perceived control: Development of a sociopolitical control scale. *Journal of Community Psychology, 19,* 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-662.