

MANAGING ORGANIZED LEISURE ACTIVITIES AMONG YOUTH: POLICY IMPLEMENTATION FROM STATE TO SCHOOL

Mawarni Mohamed*

*Dr. Mawarni Mohamed. University Technology MARA UITM, MALAYSIA. mmawarni@gmail.com

Abstract

Leisure time and the activities play important roles in the lives of young people in many countries. It provides opportunities for personal well-being and self-fulfilment and allows people to understand how the freedom of leisure requires people to make good choices for them and the community. However, most programs organized are not only irrelevant to the needs of the young people but failed to reach them across the country. Such current low participation level is not helpful to the desired development of more permanent meaningful leisure time use among youth because involvement in organized sports leisure and recreation activities at young age helps to shape the positive attitudes. Malaysia Young Partners (YP) for instance, was established to encourage youth involvement in a variety of physical, social, cultural, and community activities. The Young Partners program was based on the transformation of the Community Youth Development approach which emphasizes total involvement of youth and local communities. The initiative was in response to a perceived decline in motivation for healthy involvement in recreation and an increase in deviant behaviors among youth in the country. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to assess program implementation of the organized leisure activities handled by YP for youth in schools up to state level in Selangor, one of the most active Young Partners' organizations in Malaysia. First, youth leisure preferences were determined before the implementation was evaluated. Using the cluster random sampling technique for quantitative data gathering, self-completed questionnaires on leisure activities were distributed to Young Partners participants. The assessment of program implementation was gathered from interviews with Young Partners officers regarding their views on the management aspects. Results on leisure activities showed that work-related and passive activities seemed to be more frequently involved by youth (n=413) followed by active and social leisure. Their time for YP involvement is only available after school hours, during weekends and holidays. In managing the program, policy implementation at school levels are based on the original programs structured at the district but pass down to schools. The state education department and district education office are informed on the programs scheduled so they can coordinate with the education offices' own programs. Teachers who handle co curriculum activities are usually informed by District Education offices and they are aware about YP programs and can use the budget allocated in schools to handle related YP programs at school levels. However, in order to effectively implement the policy, programs must be developed accordingly and a timeframe must be set toward achieving the policy's stated goal and the formulation must involve a highly participatory process involving youth in schools. In other words, activities must be based on youth leisure preferences and Needs Assessment Analysis for young people between the ages of 15-25, regardless of their ethnic groups and backgrounds should be carried out to encourage full participation in YP. Therefore, Young Partners policy is able to achieve its objectives in both following the top-down administrative role of the cycling programming process and also bottom-up from the needs assessment of the participants.

Keywords: Organized Leisure Activities, Young Partner, Policy

1. INTRODUCTION

Leisure time and its activities play significant roles in the lives of people because of its potential in providing opportunities for personal well-being and self-fulfilment. Understanding the benefits of leisure allows people to make good choices for them and the community. Furthermore, positive leisure activities seem to be able to decrease the needs to seek experiences in more risky behaviors like substance use among youth

(Caldwell & Darling, 1999; Caldwell & Smith, 2006). With the development of economic and urbanization, more recreational places are also developed and more participation in other than physical activities is also created.

To encourage more participation in sports and recreation, Malaysian government has developed several policies to initiate the effort. Among those are the National Sports Policy, the National Youth Policy, and the creation of the National Fitness and Recreation Council. The National Sports policy, introduced "Sports for All" policy (Ministry of Youth and Sports Malaysia, 1985) proposed that the efforts of the government be 'directed toward the entire population' with the aim to develop a healthy, disciplined and united society through greater participation and better opportunities in sports. Since it focuses on the age group of 15-40 which represents almost half of the nation's population, its aim is to encourage youth involvement in a variety of physical, social, cultural, and community activities.

The policy development with the emphasis on a variety of youth development strategies and plans are to promote greater youth participation in the building of the society. It was also initiated in response to a perceived decline in motivation, morality, and an increase in deviant behaviors among youth. For example, a number of 2,822 young adolescents drugs addicts were detected in January 2010 as compared to 555 recorded in Jan 2009 (Drug Agency Report, 2010), with an increased number of drugs addicts between the ages of 13-24. In relation to this, Young Partners movement was introduced in 1994 and considered as one of the most significant programs for youth in Malaysia. The Young Partners program is based on the transformation of an implementation philosophy in line with the Community Youth Development approach which emphasizes total involvement of youth and local communities.

In response to the challenges addressed regarding the young generations, organized leisure and recreational programs are seen to be one of the solutions to fill their leisure time more beneficially. Thus, Young Partners policy, the biggest youth movement in Malaysia was implemented to handle programs for the young people in the country. In order to implement leisure or any recreational programs, leisure behavior must be understood in the context of the local culture. For example, a study by Asma, (1993) showed that cultural traits are pertinent to the understanding of leisure and recreation in that country. Therefore, this research examines youth leisure behavior through their use of free time and determines the effectiveness of the organized leisure program through the Young Partners policy based on the following objectives:

- 1) To identify leisure activities among youth who came from different socio-economic backgrounds.
- 2) To assess the implementation of Young Partners management program policy for youth in schools in the state.

1.2 Young Partner Policy

The Young Partners was introduced in 1994 and is the biggest youth movement in Malaysia. The mission was formulated to instill a sense of pride, belonging and confidence; Promote a sense of unity, loyalty and patriotism; Cultivate a thirst for knowledge; Inculcate an appreciation for high moral values and positive attitudes (National Youth and Sports Department, 1994).

This movement was demonstrated through Nine Lifestyles with the elements for Mind, Skill, Spiritual, and Community Development and also for Physical Fitness. It is to suit the needs of youth and accomplish the vision of producing youth who are disciplined, responsible, conscientious, dynamic, proactive and active with exemplary qualities such as good leadership, perseverance, independence, patriotism, and highly competitive ('Rakan Muda' Development Department, 2010). The Nine Lifestyles include Games, Entrepreneurship, Self Defense, Fitness, Love for Nature, Community, Culture, Recreation and Innovation.

The Second Phase of Young Partners was launched in 2008 which emphasized more on the development of youth within the community. Several other ministries, organizations and non-governmental intermediaries are also involved in mobilizing it. This is to ensure that each lifestyle gets direct knowledge transfer and support from the respective agencies. For example, the Ministry of Science, Technology & Innovations is involved in the Innovative Young Partners Lifestyle.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A classical understanding of leisure is that it is made of activities which enlighten and educate (Torkildsen, 1992). According to Larson and Verma (1999), activities of adolescents are typically freely chosen and non-instrumental in which adolescents can try out different social roles and develop social identities. Their

activities can be rather unstructured (e.g., hanging out with peers or structured (e.g activities with a registered youth club). However, Hutchinson et al. (2006) found positive consequences of unstructured activities as they provide social support from the peers whereas Mahoney and Stattin (2000) proposed that the lack of leisure activities' structure can be detrimental to the development of adolescents and that this kind of leisure activities even may be a risk factor for problem behavior.

Furthermore, there were also many research findings on the benefits of leisure activities at different stages of life for different groups of people. For example, out-of-school leisure contexts among disadvantaged youth offer an opportunity for experimentation with various social roles, establish individual preferences and develop relationship among peers (Byrne, et al, 2006). Another comprehensive study among young people revealed that participating in extracurricular activities is associated with long-term positive development (Eccles et al., 2003).

In relation to leisure, time use research has been used in a broad range of disciplines as it is also capable of providing critical information and useful data such as the behavioral output of decision, preferences, attitudes, and environmental factors, and used to examine, describe, and compare cultures and lifestyles (Chapin, 1974; Nakanishi & Suzuki, 1986). In addition to that, young people's use of time has also become an issue of importance to youth, families and society as a whole because the amount of time spent on various activities has been associated with the development of youth problem behavior, such as substance use and delinquency (Barnes, Hoffman, & Welte, 2006). This condition is worsened by the large amount of time spent in unsupervised peer activities that may contribute to a variety of risky behavior among youth (Osgood & Anderson, 2004).

2.1 Leisure Services

Many leisure activities are usually sponsored and organized by formal organizations. They deal with various aspects of leisure and participants with many common goals - to reach the highest potential of human-beings through leisure and recreation, and/or for commercial. Leisure Services must ensure that staffs are well equipped with the necessary information and knowledge to give the support, guidance and help needed, and a policy can serve as a guideline for staff and also help when considering any training issues and the right direction for future services. One way of identifying types of leisure services is to identify their roles (Godbey, 1999). This is because leisure service organizations play a role as a promoter of specific leisure activities and facilities. In the context of Young Partner, for example, the development department's role is to provide programs for the members with the objective to create greater and stronger relationship by organizing activities with relevant agencies in accordance to 'Young Partner Lifestyles'. Similarly, the programs also involve the process of planning, implementing and evaluating, based on the needs of the local community (Community Youth Development). As it is a government agency, the officers work as public servants promoting the common goals through leisure and recreational programs, which were established from the 'Lifestyles of YP'.

The roles of service organizations depend on the types of agencies, activities and the target groups. For example, a study conducted by Edginton (1978), Edginton and Neal (1983), Hastings (1984), and Howat and Edginton (1986) in several countries over the years found a higher rankings for provision of services for seniors (in the United States), and for people with special needs (in Canada), along with other support providing services to children. Another survey finding conducted among college students in Midwestern campus suggested that the college leisure service providers should focus on educating students about their satisfying experience, giving them space to use their imagination to challenge them and escape from the students' life (Beggs & Elkins, 2010).

In formulating agency mission and goals statement, many leisure-service organizations formulate specific mission statement that summarizes their own values and purpose. This means, the mission represents the philosophical beliefs and values of each organization, which can be revised and changed over time to meet the needs of the community it serves. However, it is not easy to measure the needs for leisure and recreation but the need can be conceived in several ways. Godbey (1999) believes that some concepts of public need for recreation must be internalized before the leisure service plans can be systematically developed and utilized.

Structured leisure activities are organized and directed, stimulating, and skill-focused pursuits requiring commitment and regular participation (Larson & Verma, 1999; Mahoney & Stattin, 2000). For example, school activities are usually highly structured with specific goals, usually directed towards cognitive and social development and play a role in molding young people's morale and able to help them to have self-

control. Furthermore, youth participation in structured out-of-school activities is often associated with positive behavioral outcomes. This is supported by Melnick et al. (2001) who found a positive association between participation in structured activities and a negative correlation with tobacco use.

In contrast, time spent unsupervised with peers tend to influence youth towards negative behaviors because youth behaviors are least constrained by supervision during unstructured leisure activities and make them more conducive to rule-breaking and deviant attitude (Wikstrom et al, 2012).

3. METHOD

The study investigated after school leisure activities among youth in the context of the Young Partner (YP) policy where the respondents were from Selangor as the representatives of Malaysian youth. Their participation was measured through their leisure activities using questionnaires as the instruments. Meanwhile, the Young Partner policy was explored in relation to the management aspect. Data were gathered from interviews and document analysis in identifying the management process in the aspect of implementing YP programs at schools in the state.

The sampling units were drawn from the numbers of youth, from age 15-25. Since the population is large and very widespread, the researcher used cluster random sampling that is by selecting specific districts in the state of Selangor. Leisure activities are based on the Adolescent Leisure-Time Use Inventory (Gordon & Caltabiano, 1996) lists of activities: Passive Leisure, Active Leisure, Social Leisure, and Work-related activity. The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency of their participation in leisure activities using a five-point Likert type response from 1- Hardly ever or never to 5 – Several times per week. One way **ANOVA** was used to see the differences across SES, followed by Post Hoc tests to find out where the differences lie.

The qualitative method involved two separate interviews with two officers from the organization using the purposeful sampling strategies on a one to one basis. The analyses focused on the following research question: 'How is the policy being implemented in the aspects of managing programs at schools in the state'?

The interviews were open-ended with semi-structured questions prepared beforehand by the researcher. The interview was a face-to-face session, guided by open-ended questions that lead to topical areas structured for the research. Content analyses were used to explain and provide information. The officers were chosen because they were responsible in managing and developing Young Partner in various aspects. They also worked directly with the deputy director and involved in all programs at state level, making them familiar with the implementation at school level as well.

Discussions of the themes were categorized into contextual, diagnostic, and evaluative methods in order to obtain more in-depth information. The categorizations were based on qualitative methods used to meet a variety of different objectives in applied policy research (Ritchie & Spencer, 2002), thus help the researcher to organize the materials and later use strategic method to discuss the findings.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This research investigates the implementation of the Young Partner policy at schools in the state of Selangor in the effort to encourage active participation among youth in organized leisure activities. In doing so, youth leisure activities during free time were determined and program implementation at schools in the state was analyzed.

4.1 Leisure Activities

The items in the activities included passive, active, social leisure and work-related activity, and family background comes from lower, middle and higher socioeconomic status. In general, the majority of youth involving in YP programs was from the lower SES, followed by middle then upper group. Thus, the analysis was conducted to determine if there was any significant difference in terms of SES groups with the types of activities that the youth participated.

Table 1 shows the results of leisure activities across SES. There are four leisure activities that were found to be not significant among different SES groups ($\text{sig} > .05$). They are passive leisure and work-related leisure. For passive leisure, the total means of 3.49 indicated that regardless of their family backgrounds, youth were frequently involved in passive leisure 'about every other week'. This is similar with work-related activities where youth across three different SES were also frequently involved in the activities' about every other

week' with a total mean of 3.5.

However, results showed that there were significant differences between SES in active and social leisure activities, which indicated that leisure participation among youth in both leisure activities were also influenced by their social background and income. Post Hoc Test was carried out to determine the differences.

Table 1
 Youth Leisure Activities from different Socio-economic (Sec) backgrounds

Categories of Leisure Activities	Sec	N	Mean	df	t	Sig
a) Passive	lower	244	3.4485	2,392	1.619	0.199
	middle	105	3.5862			
	upper	46	3.5193			
	Total	395	3.4934			
b) Active	lower	244	2.7336	2,392	1.619	0.000*
	middle	105	3.0667			
	upper	46	3.1123			
	Total	395	2.8662			
c) Social leisure	lower	244	2.9476	2,392	3.565	0.029*
	middle	105	3.0995			
	upper	46	3.1787			
	Total	395	3.0149			
d) Work related	lower	244	3.5033	2,392	1.716	0.181
	middle	105	3.6114			
	upper	46	3.6913			
	Total	395	3.5539			

Note s* < .05

- 1 - Hardly ever or never
- 2 - About once a month
- 3- About every other week
- 4 - About once a week
- 5- Several times per week

4.1.1 Post Hoc Test

Post Hoc test was carried out in order to identify exactly where the differences between each of the groups lie. There was statistically a significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in leisure activities scores for active and social leisure between different SES groups (Table 2). For active leisure ($f = 1.619$, $p = .0$) for instance, although the actual difference in mean score between groups was quite small but Post Hoc Test in Table 2 showed that the actual difference lay between lower and middle groups ($sig. = .000$). Another significant difference was between lower and upper SES ($sig = .005$). There was actually no true significant difference between middle and upper groups.

The post-hoc finding indicated that youth of lower SES involved in less active leisure as compared to middle and higher SES groups. This signified that youth from bigger income families are able to involve in more active leisure since the activities may require more expensive sports and exercise equipment, also expenses to travel for watching live sports, latest musical instrument and cost for buying food for pets and new CDs for games.

For social leisure ($f = 3.56$, $p = .029$), although there were significant differences across SES as shown in Table 2, however Post Hoc test revealed that the lower group did not differ significantly with either middle or upper groups, meaning, there is no real difference in between the three SES groups and youth across all socioeconomic status spend similar social leisure activities.

Table 2
 Post Hoc test for Leisure Activities

Dependent Variable	(I) SES	(J) SES	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Active	Lower	middle	-.33306*	.08728	.000	-.5429	-.1232
		upper	-.37871*	.12021	.005	-.6677	-.0897
	middle	lower	.33306*	.08728	.000	.1232	.5429
		upper	-.04565	.13222	1.000	-.3636	.2723
	Upper	lower	.37871*	.12021	.005	.0897	.6677
		middle	.04565	.13222	1.000	-.2723	.3636
Social	Lower	middle	-.15184	.07683	.146	-.3366	.0329
		upper	-.23111	.10581	.089	-.4855	.0233
	middle	lower	.15184	.07683	.146	-.0329	.3366
		upper	-.07927	.11639	1.000	-.3591	.2006
	Upper	lower	.23111	.10581	.089	-.0233	.4855
		middle	.07927	.11639	1.000	-.2006	.3591

Note.* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Results indicate that there is a direct relation between income and interest for active leisure, as the income increases the participation for active leisure increases. Youth from middle and higher social economic status are able to involve more in active leisure as they can purchase required equipment and spend more money for such involvement that youth from lower economic backgrounds are unable to commit. Some examples of active leisure include sports and exercise, playing musical instrument, camping, and games such as computer and board games that seem to be getting more expensive over time. However, the choice of activities may consider the cost and/or benefits when they want to choose how to spend their free time. Benefits-Driven Model by Kraus (1977) suggested that possible benefits should be identified and become the outcomes to be achieved through leisure programming because the benefits are seen to increase in emotionally healthy youth, improve their social and personal skills, which not only benefits them but also the community from such programmatic efforts (DeGraaf, 1999). So, it is important that Young Partner provide programs that are able to attract youth so their time is fulfilled with interesting and meaningful activities.

4.2 Policy Implementation

The data were analysed according to themes. YP policy management is viewed from the planning, implementation and assessment aspects. In this research, the focus is only on the implementation aspect where it revolved around the programs held at the national, state, district and school levels.

The Management:

- i. Planning (needs, objectives, mission, and vision).
- ii. **Implementation (national, states, districts, schools levels).**
- iii. Assessment (participants, activities, monitoring, implications).

The policy and the function of YP throughout the country involve programs for the same target group between 15-25 years old, who in the planning stage were identified as youth who have greater tendency to involve in deviant activities, which was the main objective of the establishment:

“That was the primary reason for Young Partner establishment at that time with the functions to mould them and to curb crime rate among the young people.”

So YP movement initially was hoped to develop youth personal traits and instill a sense of pride, and inculcate an appreciation for high moral values and positive attitude as mentioned by Officer 2:

“The planning of activities is to instill positive attitude, personality and high morale development among youth”

It means that while it is important for a policy to be formulated and integrated with the overall national

development plan and coordinating it with other relevant agencies, it is also essential that the components and the process leading to the establishment is not only analyzed but fulfilled. This is relevant to the vision of Young Partners in the new phase which is to produce young generations who are close to the community and to promote a sense of unity.

During program implementation in the state of Selangor, several officers are placed at each district of the state. For example, there are 9 districts in Selangor therefore 9 youth and sports officers are in-charged there. They are responsible for planning the physical resources, facilities and program implementation. It is a top to bottom management where the Ministry empowers the programs through providing schedules and budgets to the state so these can be distributed to all the 9 districts. At this juncture, the officers need to determine when the programs are scheduled, who are the participants (within the target age groups), and how much allocation to be used from the budget provided in running the programs.

The staffs at the districts are responsible in running the programs as they are the key persons in ensuring that all programs that have been structured and scheduled are handled and implemented, as recorded by Officer 1:

“Yes, at district levels, we are the core persons who implement it, whereas at the state level we only handle the management aspect and acting as the middle person between people at the districts and also the Ministry.”

This describes the details of the practical aspects of the project or programs movements where the officers' roles are implementing the programs and incorporating all the major stakeholders. Here the programs must fulfill the objectives at the district and regional level and local agencies should also be incorporated and included to assist and support programs in the respective state.

Each year several programs are planned and structured at the ministry using the yearly budget allocated before it is passed down to the state for program implementation. Then the officers will decide on the suitability of programs to be executed in districts. Program implementations are based on budget allocation, feedbacks from previous programs and suggestions from officers in the state. Moreover, in managing programs at schools, it is important that the Second Strategic Thrust of the National Education Blueprint 2006-2010 in developing human capital is referred to, which is: *‘...by giving attention to value systems, disciplinary aspects, character, morals and resilience of students. This is to produce students who are competent, innovative and creative’* (National Education Blueprint 2006-2010).

Since Young Partner's membership is only open for those from age 15-25, majority of them are mostly students in schools and/or colleges/universities. This means YP programs are acknowledged by the Ministry of Education at the national levels and education offices at the district levels, down to schools in the country. According to Officer1:

“YP is also collaborating with the Ministry of Education in a program called School Young Partners with the support from Ministry of Youth and Sports and Ministry of Education that allocate some budget for 2565 schools in Malaysia.”

The programs at school levels are based on the original programs structured at the districts office in the state and passed down to schools. The state education department and district education office are informed on the programs schedule so they can coordinate with the education offices' own programs. Teachers who handle co curriculum activities are usually informed by District Education offices about YP programs and schools can use the budget allocated. It is important that to ensure such programs are handled successfully, inputs from YP and Education departments are needed to secure the quality of the programs and achievements of objectives.

At such any programs for School YP can be organized at any places depending on the needs, as long as the students are given opportunity to involve in the programs. However, schools must follow the objectives, vision and mission of the programs and should abide by the principles of YP movement, which is the inclusion of all races in the programs as stressed by Officer 2:

“There are a few YP principles that schools must adhere to, for instance, once the logo is used, the programs should involve diverse ethnic groups with a minimum cost of implementing”.

In order to effectively implement the policy, programs must be developed accordingly and a timeframe must be set toward achieving the policy's stated goal and the formulation must involve a highly participatory process involving youth in schools. In short, the participation must involve all ethnic groups as formulated in

the policy, which is the aspiration of national policy towards unity.

Therefore, in Young Partner Policy, the implementation was derived from the government agenda to reduce negative behaviours among youth so that they become more competitive, disciplined, and skilful and live a healthy lifestyle. In achieving the objectives, the policy framework is seen as a top-down input whereby the programs and activities are implemented without needing to raise questions whether new intervention from the top have any effect (Hill, 1997). This is equivalent to the statement given by the officer that:

“Under the Ministry of Youth and Sport, we have one policy department in making all policies on sports and youths and those involved sit together with the top management and the Deputy Director General to determine the age group for the Young Partners policy. So the brainstorming started there”.

This indicated the vertical approach policy and organizational process by Malaysian government in promoting Young Partner Lifestyles among youth so they are able to spend quality leisure time. It is done with the help of government through collaboration with other ministries and NGOs who have knowledge relevant to the YP needs. So the question asked should be “how is this problem perceived, and by whom, and in what way do they try to get support for action by drawing attention to the problem of youth and their leisure time?”. This is “social construction” through policy process whereby YP was implemented to address the problem (Colebatch, 2002). This is in line with the function of organized leisure as according to Smith (1991), as cited in Pawelko and Magafas (1997, p. 28-39):

“Participation in organized recreation provides for the constructive use of free time and develops skills for the management of discretionary time and thereby reduces the need for, and the costs of, providing other governmental and social services that deal with the management of antisocial behaviors after they occur.”

Based on the research findings and discussions presented, it recommended that students in all schools should be given the opportunities to participate in related programs offered by YP according to their needs and social backgrounds. Teachers can help to identify students’ needs for leisure through needs assessment questionnaires that can be developed and used throughout the country. This can be done during Physical and Health Education class or other relevant subjects in school where leisure can be embedded in the curriculum. Participation in YP can be channeled through school co- curriculum activities so students have more choices and freedom to choose. Assessing youth needs help to provide input in the planning of organized recreational or leisure programs so their participation is not only that the activities are fun and enjoyable but also meaningful and provide educational elements relevant to the government aspirations. This may necessitate a paradigm shift away from offering just “fun, games and sports” types of activities, but to be replaced with leisure engagements which offer the possible attainment of meaningful developmental outcomes. Thus, free time and leisure provision should be based on the needs of youth in the community and not to adopt a ‘one fit for all’ policy leisure provision.

The analysis for YP policy is to improve current performance or to correct a deficiency of a program. The recommended process may include identifying the population and develop strategies for improvement. It is advisable to consider the size of the population for the program or policy and the participant group to ensure the effectiveness of program planning and implementation.

In view to the policy implementation, government should also consider the horizontal approach whereby the process takes into account not only active participations of government officials and leaders in defining the objectives, but also the participants and other agencies to give inputs on the overall program services, across organizational boundaries also within them. So the decision making is seen as a collective voice not just from “the authorities”. So people who are involved in the policy area develop special knowledge about it and share it with other experts, who have different ideas but may be addressing similar problems during policy process. Thus, the flow may run both ways: top-down and bottom up, where participants and officers at the lower levels, from schools for instance, may pass directions and ideas with the approval of the higher authority at state level. This way, satisfactory level from the planning to the evaluation process can be increased through inputs from various stages.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, to achieve effective program implementation, YP policy making must begin with the identification of the members, their needs, preferences in leisure activities and choices in relation to their socio economic backgrounds, as well as the benefits derived. With the analysis of the implementation, YP

organized program is seen as a continuous effort in achieving policy objective among youth in realizing the national aspiration in Malaysia.

REFERENCE LIST

- Asma, A. (1993). *Understanding The Malaysian Workforce*. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Institute of Management.
- Barnes, G. M., Hoffman, J. H., & Welte, J. W. (2006). Adolescents' time Use: Effects on substance use, delinquency and sexual activity. *Journal Youth Adolescence* 36: 697-710.
- Beggs, B. A., & Elkins, D.J. (2010). The Influence of Leisure Motivation on Leisure Satisfaction. [*LARNet; The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research*](#).
- Byrne, T., Nixon, E., Mayock, P., & Whyte, J. (2006). Free-time and leisure needs of young people living in disadvantaged communities. Research Working Paper Series 06/02, funded under the Combat Poverty Agency's Poverty Research Initiative.
- Caldwell, L. L., & Darling, N. (1999). Leisure context, parental control, and resistance to peer pressure as predictors of adolescent partying and substance use: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31, 57-77.
- Caldwell, L. L., & Smith, E. A. (2006). Leisure as a context for youth development and delinquency prevention. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 39, 398-418.
- Chapin, F. S. (1974). *Human activity patterns in the city: Things people do in time and in space*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Colebatch, H. K. (2002). *Policy* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- DeGraaf, D. G., Jordan, D. J., & DeGraaf, K. H. (1999). *Programming for parks, recreation, and leisure services: A servant leadership approach*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing
- Eccles, J.S., Barber, B.L, Stone, M.& Hunt, J. (2003). Extracurricular Activities and Adolescent Development. *Journal of Social Issues*, 59: 865-89.
- Edginton, C. R. (1978). Organizational goals – what directors think they should be. *Recreation Canada*, 5(36), 33-35.
- Godbey, G. (1999) *Leisure in your life: An exploration*. 5th ed. Venture Publishing
- Gordon, W. R., & Catalbiano, M. L. (1996). Urban and rural differences in adolescent self-esteem, leisure boredom, and sensation seeking as predictors of leisure time usage and satisfaction. *Adolescence*, 31, 883-901.
- Hastings, M. (1984). *A comparison of municipal parks and recreation directors' perceptions of organizational goal importance in 1976 and 1984*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon
- Howat, G., & Edginton, C. (1986). A study of the goals for Australian local government parks and recreation. *Australian Parks and Recreation*, 22(4), 12-15
- Hutchinson, S. L., Baldwin, C. K., & Oh, S.S. (2006). Adolescent coping: Exploring adolescent's leisure-based response to stress. *Leisure Sciences*, 28(2), 115-131.
- Kraus, R. (1978), *Recreation and Leisure in Modern Society* 2nd ed, p. 37. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear
- Larson, R., & Verma, S. (1999). How children and adolescents spend time across the world: Work, play, and developmental opportunities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 701-736.
- Mahoney, J. L., & Stattin, H. (2000). Leisure activities and adolescent antisocial behavior: The role of structure and social context. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), 113-27.
- Melnick, M. J., Miller, K. E., Sabo, D. F., Farrell, M. P., & Barnes, G. M. (2001).
Tobacco use among high school athletes and non-athletes: Results of the 1997 Youth Risk Behavior Survey. *Adolescence*, 36, 727-748.
- Osgood, D. W, & Anderson, A. L. (2004). Unstructured socializing and rates of delinquency. *Criminology*, 42,

519-549

Pawelko, K. A. (1997). *Leisure wellbeing among adolescent group: Time, choice and self-determination*. National Recreation and Park

Smith, C. (1991). *Overview of Youth Recreation Programs in the United States*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development

Torkildsen, G. (1992). *Leisure and Recreation Management*. Chapman & Hall.

Wikström, P. H., Oberwittler, D., & Treiber, K. (2012). *Breaking rules: The social and situational dynamics of young people's urban crime*. Clarendon Studies in Criminology. Oxford University Press.