Applied Research in Quality of Life
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-023-10270-0

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Positive Youth Development Approach: a Model Specific to Türkiye

Ömer Ataç[1] · **Müfide Yoruç Çotuk**[2] · **Elizabeth Trejos-Castillo**[3]

Received: 2 October 2023 / Accepted: 28 December 2023
© The Author(s) 2024

Abstract

Positive Youth Development (PYD) has received increasing attention among researchers worldwide and has played an important role in the creation of youth development strategies and policies across many countries. However, previous research in the field of PYD has suggested that separate studies should be conducted for each different context (especially culture). As a result, the need to determine the positive development indicators of young people in their own context has emerged. There is currently a lack of scientific research focused on developing adapting the PYD model specifically to the context of Türkiye. This study aims to test a PYD model applied to Turkish contexts by benefiting from the insights of experts working in the field of youth development. Using the Delphi Method, we determined the indicators/attributes in two consecutive stages with a panel of youth development experts (Stage 1: $n=715$ and Stage 2: $n=334$). In the first Delphi phase, we collected the responses of the participants (3,724 meaningful words, phrases, or sentences) with an open-ended question. In the second Delphi phase, we presented the 17 indicators/attributes we created through the data to the approval of the participants using a 5-point Likert scale. In the second phase, participants reached consensus on all 17 indicators/attributes (over 80% for 5 features and over 90% for 12 features). 56.2% of the participants chose morality, 40.4% the desire to learn, 30.8% responsibility, and 30.2% honesty as the most important indicators. All but two of the 17 indicators in the model (respect and awareness/consciousness) overlapped with one indicator of at least one of the current models in the literature. The findings showed that when determining developmental indicators/attributes for the PYD in Türkiye, the contexts in which young people live (especially culture) should be taken into account. In addition, the findings suggest that trying to adapt only one of the models developed in different contexts directly to young people in other contexts may cause other indicators that are seen as important and needed in their own contexts to be overlooked.

Keywords Positive Youth Development · A model specific to Türkiye · Indicators · Delphi Method · Context

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

Published online: 27 January 2024

Introduction

The Positive Youth Development (PYD) framework emerged towards the end of the twentieth century and spread rapidly in the United States (US) and Western societies in opposition to the deficit-oriented approach by Hall (1904), which dominated youth research at that time (Eccles & Gootman, 2002; Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003; Catalano et al., 2002; Lerner et al., 2005). While the PYD acknowledges the existence of adversities and developmental challenges that young people have, its focus emphasizes their strengths and potential (Benson, 1997). PYD sees young people not as a problem for the society in which they live, but rather as a resource. The PYD approach believes that if young people gain competence, develop their capacities, develop productively and constructively, and be empowered, they will contribute to the world, and would avoid risky and detrimental behaviors as a result (Damon, 2004).

In the last decades, PYD has received increased attention among researchers worldwide in parallel to the US and has played an important role in forming youth development practices and policies. Reasons for such attention include supporting important psychological and behavioral health outcomes, developmental benefits on young people, making a positive contribution to individual and social well-being, and being a viable approach in all contexts (Catalano et al., 2019). However, this situation has led to the need to identify the positive indicators of young people in their own context (Moore, 2017). So, many researchers have tried to generalize the PYD perspective and models for all contexts of young people in the global world since the day they were developed (Gomez-Baya et al., 2022; Syvertsen et al., 2021; Kadir & Mohd, 2021).

Although such models developed in the context of the US can be generalized in different contexts, they may cause us to overlook some of the indicators that young people need in contexts outside of the US, specifically based on cultural differences (Shek et al., 2007). Moreover, the impact of context on young people is undeniable and there is a need to address each community within their own context and culture (de Jesus et al., 2022). In addition to this, during the developmental processes of young people, their behavior, values, social relations, ways of seeing the world, language, and thoughts cannot be fully understood separately from culture (Lansford et al., 2021). However, if PYD models developed in WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic) contexts are to be used for the development of young people in non-Western contexts, we believe that context-specific adaptation is inevitable (Qi et al., 2020). Thus, more research is needed in specific contexts (especially in the cultural aspect) in which young people are involved in order to determine the appropriate developmental PYD framework of each culture (Dimitrova &Wiium, 2021).

Models and Cultural Contexts of PYD

When young people's strengths are supported in their own contexts, they show a healthy development, move away from risky behaviors, and contribute to their

society; as a result, the PYD emerges (Lerner et al., 2005). The strengths and challenges of each group of young people vary according to the contexts of the society in which they live. Therefore, it is important for each society to formulate policies and intervention programs with the PYD models developed within their own context. However, the majority of research on PYD has been focused on young people from WEIRD countries (Dimitrova & Wiium, 2021). For instance, Lerner's (2004) 6Cs PYD model, Catalano et al. (2002) 15 PYDs, and Benson's (1997, 2007) Model of the 40 Developmental Assets Framework (40 DAF) are among these models. The context in which the models are developed is crucial and can bring about changes in metrics and indicators, even though they are developed in the same countries (Taylor et al., 2017). Moreover, the cultural context can influence and create all the contexts and relationships (e.g., family, school, peers, society, belief, ideology, media, politics, etc.) surrounding the development of young people (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Lansford et al., 2021). Despite this, not many studies have integrated different theoretical models, especially with reference to cultural differences (Shek et al., 2021).

Although PYD models and research are evolving and continue to undergo theoretical improvement, it is not possible to define any model as "the best" (Geldhof et al., 2021). This is because every PYD model can only fully reflect the strengths and difficulties of young people in the contexts in which they were developed. When models implemented in a different cultural setting, they may differ from the results declared in WEIRD literature (Wong et al., 2021). Therefore, it cannot be imported directly from one culture and applied elsewhere without considering such contextual characteristics (Koller & Verma, 2017). Researchers must take into account the context, in which young people live, to achieve a generalization of developmental assets because young people in different contexts have different needs and opportunities (Wiium & Dimitrova, 2019). The PYD does not manifest similarly in all cultures, demographics, and environments (Geldhof et al., 2014). Young people in different cultural groups have different styles of relationships with the people and institutions in their ecological systems. Further research into the contexts of young people in different countries can help identify meaningful and important models and indicators for the contexts of those countries (Moore, 2017).

Nevertheless, awareness of the importance of cultural differences in understanding the positive development of young people is gaining attention in many societies. For this reason, many researchers and practitioners from different cultures, just like in this study, continue to research and show interest in PYD to find the most suitable model for their culture by offering new viewpoints/insights (Adams et al., 2019).

Youth Development in Türkiye

This research focuses on the positive development of youth in Türkiye. Its natural location serves as a bridge between the Asian and European continents. It is a candidate country for the European Union (EU), whose population is almost entirely Muslim (Doğan & Doğan, 2022). In Türkiye, the term "youth" refers to the period from childhood to adulthood. According to the Youth and Sports Policy Document (The Ministry of Youth and Sports of Türkiye [GSB], 2013) youth are individuals

between the ages of 14–29. With a population of about 85 million, Türkiye ranks 17th in the world and 2nd in Europe. According to the data of "Youth with Statistics in Türkiye" (Turkish Statistical Institute [TURKSTAT], 2022a), 23.5% of Türkiye's total population (approximately 20 million) is between the ages of 14 and 29. This rate is higher than the EU's 27 members.

Youth in Türkiye experience both strengths and challenges in their unique contexts. The unemployment rate of the youth population, which includes individuals between the ages of 15 and 24, was 19.2% (1.6 million) as of the end of 2022 (TURKSTAT, 2022b) and ranked 15th among Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries (OECD, 2022). Individuals under the age of 17 ranked 2nd in the poverty ranking (OECD, 2021). Drugs and the problems that arise due to drugs in Türkiye are becoming more dangerous in recent years (Kutlu et al., 2017). In parallel, 73.7% of those who started to use drugs in Türkiye were young people between the ages of 15 and 24 in Substance Users Profile Analysis (The Ministry of Interior of Türkiye, 2022). Ektiricioğlu et al. (2020) reported that technology addiction during adolescence varies between 2.3% and 14% in previous research. According to the OECD (2023), individuals between the ages 17 and 19 ranked, had the lowest enrollment rate in secondary and higher education. In addition, 16.49% of individuals between the ages of 15 and 24 are neither in the workforce nor in education/vocational training, meaning that Türkiye ranks last in both statistics (TURKSTAT, 2023). During the 2023 World Happiness Report, Türkiye ranked 106th among 137 countries (Helliwell et al., 2023). On the other hand, in the "life satisfaction" survey conducted by TURKSTAT (2022c), 48% of young people between the ages of 18 and 24 reported that they were happy. Young people cited their families (68%), children (16%), and parents (4%) as sources of happiness. Such a strong declaration of connection within the family can be considered a powerful potential source for PYD results (Lerner et al., 2005). Similarly, according to the World Health Organization (WHO) data, Türkiye ranked last in the 15–24 age group in 2019 in terms of suicide rate (WHO,2021). Türkiye ranked 48th in the 'very high development' category among 191 countries in the Human Development Index (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2022). In addition, Türkiye was ranked 73rd (at the High Youth Development Level) among 181 countries in the "Global Youth Development Index" (The Commonwealth, 2021). It was ranked 20th in the "Global Youth Welfare Index", which includes 30 countries selected by the International Youth Foundation (IYF) according to population size (IYF, 2017). According to the World Bank (2021), it is classified as an upper-middle-income country.

Such global and local statistics reveal that the contexts affecting the development of youth in Türkiye vary greatly from those in other countries. In examining the diverging in these contexts, it is important to focus on "Youth Development" for two distinct fields: practice and research.

For implementation the understanding of "Youth Development" refers to the psychological, physical, spiritual, emotional, social, moral, and mental development of young people in the Youth and Sports Policy Document (GSB, 2013). In general, "Youth Development" is trying to be provided by social, cultural, educational, scientific, and physical activities organized in line with the interests, desires, and abilities

of young people in their free time in Youth Centers Regulation (GSB, 2022). These activities are mostly carried out by the GSB, which is the responsible public institution, as well as the municipalities and NGOs (Lüküslü & Osmanoğlu, 2018). However, today, institutions and organizations in the field of practice still do not base their work on a scientific theories or models, and do not implement a program developed in this context. Therefore, they don't examine or evaluate these works with a measurement tool in which validity and reliability are accepted; they do not share their results with the public (Aykara & Albayrak, 2016).

On the other hand, in the field of research, the subject of "Youth Development" is not addressed by researchers as an autonomous (main) field in Türkiye. The main reason for this cause may be that there are still no academic programs related to the "Youth Development" field at any university in Türkiye (Council of Higher Education of Türkiye [YÖK], (2023a). Although youth research in Türkiye has recently increased significantly, researchers in disciplines (particularly developmental/social psychology, guidance and psychological counseling, education and the socio-cultural sciences particularly sociology), which are likely to conduct in-depth research in "Youth Development", do not see this field as a permanent discipline. Researchers often focus briefly on the "youth development" field in their own research, without abandoning their own discipline. Thus, youth research, by using quantitative methods, hinders the deep understanding of contextual, socio-cultural, and various other characteristics of youth development (Demir, 2012).

In addition to these gaps in the fields of implementation and research related to "youth development", there is a more serious issue: the gap and disconnection between the two. In fact, this problem is new and not only for Türkiye. The connection between research and practice, especially in the areas of family and human sciences, is often weakly related (Zeldin, 2010). While researchers emphasize that the scientific knowledge base is not used efficiently enough by practitioners, practitioners often complain that knowledge is not produced to address the practical needs of the practice base by researchers (Small, 2005). However, this situation in Türkiye shows that there is no relationship between research and practice as opposed to a gap, since in the "Journal of Youth Research" of the Ministry of Youth and Sports, which was established in 2013, and on "Google Scholar", we come across a miniscule amount of research, especially when we search for articles under "Youth Development".

This study aims to mobilize policymakers in the field of youth development in Türkiye and to take the first step towards establishing the bridge between research and practice by initiating cooperation with universities. Thus, the bridge could increase the number of researchers focusing on "Youth Development" in the future. This way, "Youth Development" research in Türkiye will capture new perspectives, theories, methodologies, and models. Eventually, "Youth Development" may emerge as an independent field of research in Türkiye.

To date, most of the PYD models have been developed in a WEIRD context. However, PYD research is shifting towards qualitative research, theory, and model development in cultural contexts that may have international implications all over the world (Martin & Alacaci, 2015). There has been a growing number of recent studies showing the need for PYD in Türkiye, albeit in a limited fashion (Wiium

et al., 2019; Kagitcibasi et al., 2020; Dost-Gözkan et al., 2021; Fernandes et al., 2021). These studies are generally quantitative, focus on the introduction of the PYD, and include the evaluation of the opportunities and difficulties of young people in Türkiye in terms of the indicators of the models developed in WEIRD contexts. In addition to this limited number of studies, there are also similar research studies (e.g., master thesis or PhD dissertations) conducted by researchers from various universities in Türkiye (YÖK, 2023b). In addition, some of the studies consist of the adaptation of existing models into Turkish (Kılıç & İnce, 2016; Sarıcaoğlu & Eroğul, 2021). When these studies are examined, we find there are a lack of research that create models and indicators within the scope of the PYD approach for Turkish contexts (Martin & Alacaci, 2015).

In Türkiye, the perception of young people as a "threat" and their acceptance as a "problem" area continued until the beginning of the year 2000, especially by central government institutions and local authorities (Çetintürk & Küçük, 2019). Following the re-establishment of the Ministry of Youth and Sports in 2011, the National Youth and Sports Policy Document (GSB, 2013) was published. This document emphasizes the need to support the strengths of young people, their role as a resource for their communities, and the importance of their healthy development. As a result of this policy document, a change of mindset occurred in the field of "youth development" (Akay, 2022). Although it is not clearly stated that the PYD approach is followed in Türkiye, it is possible to see the traces of the approach in specific documents: (1) To accept young people as a resource: The Ministry of Youth and Sports Organization and Duties Law (GSB, 2011), and the Turkish National Youth and Sports Policy Document (GSB, 2013), (2) To Focus on the Strengths of Young People: Youth Centers Regulation (GSB, 2022), (3) To Support the Healthy Development of Young People: Youth Centers Regulation (GSB, 2022), (4) To encourage young people to contribute to their communities: Republic of Türkiye 11th Five-Year Development Plan, (Strategy and Budget Directorate, 2019).

Despite all these promising statements, there is no explanation of how these goals will be realized. It remains unclear which scientific theories or models these studies are based on, also which programs will be developed within this scope which will be implemented in the future, with which measurement tools these studies will be examined and evaluated, and how the results will be shared with the public (Aykara & Albayrak, 2016). In addition to, geographically and culturally, Türkiye is located in a unique and strategic part of the world between East and West, but the direction of many researchers is to compare the strengths and challenges of young people in Türkiye with the models developed by WEIRD researchers. Indeed, young people in Türkiye may have more assets and needs for certain PYD opportunities and challenges. Therefore, we recommend that the researches on the PYD in Türkiye are directed towards developing models, programs, and practices.

Current Study

The present study highlights the significance of employing pertinent and context-specific indicators and characteristics of PYD for young individuals across diverse

contexts. This is important because the PYD is an approach characterized by contextual characteristics (especially culture). The first aim of this study is to reveal the indicators/characteristics that a well-grown young person in Türkiye should have in the perspective of the PYD from the insights of adults working in the field. The second aim is to explore whether or not the PYD model proposed for Türkiye will be different from the models developed mostly in the US context and other global studies. The proposed model was expected to provide similar indicators to existing models, and to reveal more important and unique indicators for their context. This study is the first study conducted in Türkiye where a model was developed in the field of PYD by creating a wide consensus area with the Delphi Method. In this respect, the study helped fill a gap in the literature, because none of the limited number of available studies in Türkiye had previously focused on this field. In addition, this study discusses whether it would be more efficient to adapt the PYD models, developed in the WEIRD context, to different cultures or to develop a new PYD model for each culture. Finally, the study promotes cooperation in the field of PYD by providing recommendations for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers in Türkiye.

Method

Sampling and Participants

Consistent with sampling and recruitment procedures aligned with the Delphi Method, participants for this study were selected to ensure that they have knowledge and experience in this area (Lund, 2020). Skulmoski et al. (2007) added three other features for participants: having capacity and willingness, allocating time to the Delphi process, and having strong communication skills. In this study, only two criteria were identified for recruiting participants: (1) working in the field of practice or research on youth development, (2) being an adult between the ages of 22 and 59. For this context, both criterion sampling and snowball sampling methods (Hult Khazaie & Khan, 2020) were used together to reach the maximum number of participants in this study. Cognitive diversity in the participant group is important for the reliability and validity of the findings. It can also have a decisive influence on whether decisions can later be adopted and whether they are enforceable (Niederberger & Spranger, 2020). For this reason, special efforts were made to allow the recruitment of participants from all geographical regions in Türkiye. Therefore, we received assistance in all regions of Türkiye to reach more people (academics, experts, trainers, teachers, youth center managers, volunteers, youth leaders/employees, and bureaucrats) who meet the criteria from the key people who work in NGOs, public institutions, and municipalities in this field. In addition, we shared the surveys with groups on social media apps (Facebook, WhatsApp, etc.).

At the end, the first Delphi phase was held from June 4 to November 19, 2021. 1004 people responded to the first-stage survey across Türkiye. However, in the first stage data analysis of 715 participants, who met the criteria gave a meaningful answer to the research question. The participants were usually employed at youth centers of public institutions, local governments, and NGOs, schools, and

universities in this field. Most of the participants were men (64%). In this study, while the participants were recruited from all 7 regions of Türkiye. The highest participation in parallel with the population density was from the Marmara Region (47%). 87% of the participants had undergraduate and graduate degrees, while about one-third were teachers, academics, and trainers (37%). 52% of participants were working in the public institutions, while 53% were "young adults" aged 22–40. The second Delphi phase took place from May 5 to August 4, 2022. Of the 715 respondents who participated in the first phase, 334 (46%) responded in the second Delphi survey. In the analysis of this study, data obtained from people who participated in both stages were included.

Study Design

In this study, the Delphi Method was chosen for two main reasons. Firstly, this method allows for the collection of experience and observations of the experts working and researching in the youth development field in all seven geographical regions of Türkiye. Secondly, the method helps to reach a consensus based on these views about the PYD indicators specific to Turkish contexts (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). This study was approved by a university human subjects board in Istanbul, Türkiye.

The Delphi Method is a method used to make predictions about the future, reveal expert opinions, and reach a consensus (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). It is a survey used to organize and share opinions through feedback (Bardecki, 1984) and allows for exploring ideas reliably and creatively or generating appropriate information to make decisions (Adler & Ziglio, 1996). The Delphi Method is a flexible approach that contributes to transforming personal opinions and preferences into group consensus (Hasson et al., 2000) and the emergence of different creative ideas (Şahin, 2001). The method is used by researchers as a structured group communication process in which complex topics and ambiguous, incomplete information are evaluated using an iterative process through experts (Turoff & Linstone, 2002; Ekren, 2021).

According to Dalkey and Helmer (1963), key elements of this method are: (1) repeated individual questioning of a panel of experts, (2) anonymity among the panel of experts, and (3) interspersed feedback of opinions. Rowe and Wright (2001) additionally included the Statistical Analysis of Group Responses as the fourth element. The Delphi Method covers a process in which participants continue until the consensus on the proposed solutions is reported. Most researchers (Lund, 2020; Belton et al., 2019; Humphrey-Murto & de Wit, 2019; Linstone & Turoff, 2011) have described the following similar stages of this method: (1) Identification of the research problem, (2) Selection of the expert group in which the study will be conducted, (3) Sending the first-round survey to participants, (4) Implementation of structured serial questionnaires for experts, (5) Analyzing the questionnaires with appropriate methods and giving feedback to the experts, and (6) Reporting on the compromise situation.

Initially developed by the RAND Corporation (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963) for military/technological forecasting, this method has been a well-established approach to information gathering and predicting/estimating, which has proven to deliver

valuable results in a wide range of areas of expertise (Winkler & Moser, 2016). Today, the Delphi Method is used in almost all disciplines, and it is emphasized that it has an acceptable level of validity for conducting scientific research (Lund, 2020). This method has become a widely used in hundreds of studies in many fields: mainly Health Care (Diamond et al., 2014), Business, Education, Engineering, Technology, Environment, Information & Management, Leisure and Tourism, Social Science, and Law (Flostrand et al., 2020). Moreover, the Delphi Method continues to be popular day by day and is recommended for further use (Humphrey-Murto & de Wit, 2019). In this study, the Delphi Method was chosen because of the limited PYD research in Türkiye, the difficulty of logistically bringing together the relevant experts, and the clash of views on the research (Nasa et al., 2021). This method also allows to bring together collective intelligence in these challenging situations and to compromise on issues/research questions.

Defining Consensus

In Delphi studies, the reporting of how to reach a consensus or terminate a study is predetermined (Diamond et al., 2014). Therefore, there is no generally accepted definite definition for consensus (Williamson et al., 2021). Also, consensus is one of the most controversial topics of the Delphi Method (Barrios et al., 2021). Some researchers prefer to end their study according to the number of predetermined stages, while others prefer to end according to the predetermined consensus criteria (Von Gracht, 2012). Schmidt et al. (1997) argued that ending the Delphi process based solely on a predetermined number of laps could lead to invalid and meaningless results. In addition, according to Diamond et al. (2014), in Delphi studies aimed at consensus, a clear definition of what constitutes consensus and threshold values that specify when consensus will be reached should be provided on a priori basis. Since it is aimed to reach a consensus in this study, central tendency (e.g., mode, median, and mean), and dispersion (e.g., range and interquartile range) were defined as an "a priori" consensus.

Delphi Stages and Pilot Testing

This study involved a two-round Delphi process in which only online surveys (google forms) were used. In the first Delphi stage, the "Informed Voluntary Consent Form" and the "Semi-Structured Questionnaire (Survey 1)" were used as data collection tools. Survey 1 is a semi-structured questionnaire that includes a complete and comprehensive definition of the "problem" and an open-ended research question. This questionnaire was piloted to approximately 20 people who were selected in accordance with the sampling, in order to determine the deficiencies in the questionnaire, to find out how the participants understood them, and whether the answers given to the research question were of the desired quality. The feedback received from the participants was evaluated by the researchers and Turkish teachers. Also, necessary corrections were made, and the final version of the survey was given. The data collection process in the first Delphi stage was conducted between June 4th and

November 19th, 2021. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants through an online questionnaire. The participants filled out a voluntary consent form which was valid for the entire study. The survey in the first Delphi stage had only one open-ended research question: What indicators (attributes) do you think a well-grown young person has? There were also four questions about the participants' socio-demographic characteristics and an additional three questions to determine how they chose to get involved in the field of youth development. It was explained to the participants that there was only one research question, and that they were trying to determine what characteristics a well-grown young person should possess. It was stated that they could answer this question using either short answers or long sentences with explanations. They were asked to briefly explain the items when deemed necessary and not limit themselves when responding.

In the second Delphi phase, a structured 5-point Likert scale questionnaire (Survey 2), which included a complete and explanatory definition of the "problem", was used. It was reviewed by researchers to identify deficiencies, spelling errors, and how to understand the questionnaire. By evaluating the feedback received from the researchers, the necessary corrections were made to Survey 2 and the final version of the survey was completed. The second Delphi stage ran from May 5th to August 4th, 2022. The data obtained in the first Delphi stage were analyzed by a thematic coding method using the program MAXQDA. The categories obtained as a result of the analysis were determined as items of the second Delphi stage. The survey consisted of a total of 17 items. In the second Delphi stage, participants were asked to scale items to determine the characteristics of a well-grown young person using a 5-point Likert scale. Participants were asked to select one of the following choices in their statements ("1" Strongly Disagree, "2" Disagree, "3" Undecided, "4" Agree and "5" Strongly Agree). In addition, an extra question was created on the survey for participants. This question was: "Please choose the three most important items for you from these 17 indicators".

Data Analysis

In the first stage of the study, the data obtained from the answers given to the open-ended question was analyzed with MAXQDA, which is a data analysis software for qualitative and mixed methods. The data on the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants were analyzed with SPSS Statistics 29 analytical software. About 99% of respondents gave a meaningful answer to the research question. The content analysis of the data from the answers was transferred, constructed, and analyzed in four stages (Eysenbach & Kohler, 2003; Miles & Huberman, 1994): (1) Coding the data: The meaningful expressions (such as words, sentences, paragraphs) in each participant's answer to the research question are listed. At the end, 3734 expressions appeared. (2) Finding codes, categories and themes: Frequently repeated words (21 items) were identified among the expressions. These words were categorized. (3) Arrangement of codes, categories, and themes: Each of the 3734 expressions were individually coded into 21 categories. (4) Definition and interpretation of the findings: The categories with

very low coding were combined with other relevant categories to determine the final 17 items.

In the second stage of the study, the participants responded to a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire and their responses were analyzed with SPSS Statistics 29 analytical software. In this context, central trend and distribution measures including percentiles, mean, median, first quartile, third quartile, and inter-quartile range were analyzed to evaluate the second-stage data in order to determine whether the participants agreed on the items. Finally, factor analysis was performed to facilitate the understanding and interpretation of the relationship between the substances. At the end, the frequency analysis of the three most important substances for participants was determined.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

In the first stage of the Delphi survey, a total of 1,004 individuals responded. From this pool of respondents, only the data of 715 participants who satisfied the specific criteria outlined in the initial Delphi stage, (namely, "working in the field of practice or research on Youth Development" and "being an adult aged between 22 and 59") were included in the analysis. These eligible participants were then invited to participate in the subsequent stage of the Delphi survey via e-mail. Individuals who failed to meet the established criteria or provided repetitive or incomplete responses ($n=289$) were excluded from the study. The second stage of the research included 334 participants, who were identified through a combination of e-mail invitations, social media promotions, and key informant interviews. This number represents the count of individuals who responded to both stages of the study. Throughout both stages of the study, a preponderance of participants identified as male (Stage 1: 64.2%, Stage 2: 64.1%). Slightly over half of the participants were classified as young adults (Stage 1: 53%, Stage 2: 52.7%). The study included participants hailing from all regions of Türkiye, with the Marmara Region representing the largest proportion of respondents in both stages (Stage 1: 47.3%, Stage 2: 53.3%). The overwhelming majority of participants held a bachelor's degree (Stage 1: 59.3%, Stage 2: 55.7%) and a postgraduate degree (Stage 1: 28%, Stage 2: 37.8%). In the initial stage, participants identified 74 distinct professions, with roughly one-third of respondents reporting that they worked as teachers or academics (Stage 1: 30%, Stage 2: 32.7%). More than half of the participants were salaried employees (Stage 1: 52.6%, Stage 2: 54.2%) who engaged in both practice and research (Stage 1: 68.7%, Stage 2: 73.1%) at public institutions (Stage 1: 52.7%, Stage 2: 59.6%). The demographic characteristics of the sample are displayed in Table 1.

Delphi Stage 1

During the first stage of the Delphi survey, each of the 715 participants' responses to the research question was recorded, including any meaningful parts such as terms, phrases, or sentences. The resulting dataset consisted of 3,734 entries, which

Table 1 Descriptive statistics for participant Delphi stages

Baseline characteristic	Stage 1 N = 715		Stage 2 N = 334	
	n	%	*n*	%
Gender				
Male	459	64.2	214	64.1
Female	256	35.8	120	35.9
Age				
Emerging Adults (22–25)	110	15.4	39	11.7
Young adults (26–40)	379	53.0	176	52.7
Middle-aged adults (41–59)	226	31.6	119	35.6
Geographic Region				
The Marmara Region	338	47.3	178	53.3
The Central Anatolia Region	88	12.3	35	10.5
The Mediterranean Region	22	3.1	11	3.3
The Aegean Region	38	5.3	22	6.6
The Southeastern Anatolia Region	84	11.7	15	4.5
The Black Sea Region	58	8.1	24	7.2
The Eastern Anatolia Region	87	12.2	49	14.7
Highest educational level				
Secondary school	3	0.4	-	-
High school	38	5.3	9	2.7
Associate degree	50	7.0	13	3.9
Bachelor's degree	424	59.3	186	55.7
Master's degree	131	18.3	80	24.0
Ph.D.	69	9.7	46	13.8
Profession				
Teacher	144	20.1	61	18.3
Academic	71	9.9	48	14.4
Student	32	4.5	11	3.3
Youth Leader	66	9.2	30	9.0
Coach	59	8.3	21	6.3
Youth Worker	48	6.7	21	63
Instructor	52	7.3	17	5.1
Specialist	27	3.8	18	5.4
Volunteer	39	5.5	18	5.4
Youth Centre Manager	38	5.3	30	9.0
Other	139	19.4	59	17.7
Fields of work				
Theoretical (Research)	51	7.1	25	7.5
Applied (Practice)	173	24.2	65	19.5
Both	491	68.7	244	73.1
Sector				
Public	377	52.7	199	59.6
NGO's	192	26.9	89	26.6

Table 1 (continued)

Baseline characteristic	Stage 1 N = 715		Stage 2 N = 334	
	n	%	*n*	%
Local Government	93	13.0	20	6.0
Private Sector	53	7.4	26	7.8
Types of work				
Professional	376	52.6	181	54.2
Volunteer	263	36.8	115	34.4
Both	76	10.6	38	11.1

included examples such as "honesty" or "he always tells the truth, even if it goes against his interests". To streamline the data analysis process, the most frequently recurring words ($n = 21$) were identified and filtered from the dataset. These words appeared a total of 2,320 times in the initial responses. The most frequently recurring words were utilized as a basis for identifying the categories that would be used in the coding process. The top four most common words were respect (10.30%), morality (9.91%), value (8.36%), and honesty (6.42%). These recurring words were cross-referenced with existing models in the literature, and as a result, 21 categories were identified and used for coding during the first stage of analysis. The 3,734 expressions and sentences collected were individually categorized into one of 21 categories. The categories that received the highest number of codes were commitment to learning (10.58%), cognitive skills (10.55%), positive values (9.75%), and behavioral skills (8.86%). The frequency of word usage and corresponding category codes are displayed in Table 2.

Delphi Stage 2

In the first Delphi phase, the views expressed by the participants were listed in bullet points and grouped under 21 categories (see Table 2). The Second Delphi Survey was created from a total of 17 items by excluding four categories (Education, Health, Benevolence, and Emotional Skills) that were inadequately coded and included in different categories in the models in the literature.

The survey items were adapted to a 5-point Likert scale to facilitate scaling. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 for 'completely disagree' to 5 for 'totally agree'. After analyzing the completed responses in the second stage, it was determined that 334 participants who had participated in the first stage also took part in the second stage. To evaluate the consensus among participants on the items, central trend measures such as percentiles, mean, median, first quartile, third quartile, and interquartile range were computed using the SPSS 29 software, as presented in Table 3. The analysis showed that the total sum of percentiles for items rated as "agree" and "strongly agree" was over 80%. The median score for these items was either 4 or 5, with an interquartile range (IQR) of less than 1.2, and an average score of over 4. Thus, in

Table 2 Categories, coding references, and frequently repeated words

Category	$N=3734$		Coding reference	Frequently repeated words	$N=2320$	
	n	%			*n*	%
Commitment to Learning	395	10.58	40 Developmental Assets of Search Institute	Respect	239	10.30
Cognitive Skills	394	10.55	15 PYD Model of Catalano et al.	Morality	230	9.91
Positive Values	364	9.75	Frequently Repeated Word / 40 Developmental Assets of Search Institute	Value	194	8.36
Behavioral Skills	331	8.86	15 PYD Model of Catalano et al.	Honesty	149	6.42
Awareness / Consciousness	263	7.04	Frequently Repeated Word	Homeland/Country	141	6.08
Social Skills	249	6.67	40 Developmental Assets of Search Institute	Confidence	120	5.17
Morality	217	5.81	Frequently Repeated Word / 15 PYD Model of Catalano et al.	Awareness/Consciousness	116	5.00
Respect	214	5.73	Frequently Repeated Word	Responsibility	110	4.74
Commitment And belonging	169	4.53	The 6Cs PYD Model of Lerner et al.	Working	110	4.74
Spiritual	164	4.39	Frequently Repeated Word / 15 PYD Model of Catalano et al.	Environment	100	4.31
Character	153	4.10	Frequently Repeated Word / The 6Cs PYD Model of Lerner et al.	Society	96	4.14
Contribution	151	4.04	The 6Cs PYD Model of Lerner et al.	Research	87	3.75
Honesty	118	3.16	Frequently Repeated Word / 40 Developmental Assets of Search Institute	Culture	84	3.62
Confidence	107	2.87	Frequently Repeated Word / The 6Cs PYD Model of Lerner et al.	Sensitivity	81	3.49
Future Planning	103	2.76	15 PYD Model of Catalano et al.	Productivity	77	3.32
Competence	96	2.57	Frequently Repeated Word / The 6Cs PYD Model of Lerner et al.	Spirituality	76	3.28
Responsibility	96	2.57	Frequently Repeated Word /40 Developmental Assets of Search Institute	Reading	72	3.10
Education	51	1.37	Frequently Repeated Word / 5 Promises of America's Promise Alliance	Query	69	2.97
Health	46	1.23	5 Promises of America's Promise Alliance	National	60	2.59
Helpfulness	36	0.96	Frequently Repeated Word	Aim/Goal	59	2.54
Emotional Skills	17	0.46	Eccles and Gootman (2002) / National Research Council and Institute of Medicine	Education	50	2.16

the study, it is seen that the participants reached a consensus on all items in terms of all kinds of consensus criteria. According to the percentile analysis, the highest consensus was reached on the item Commitment to learning (99.7%), followed by honesty (98.8%), respect (97.9%), awareness/consciousness (96.4), and responsibility (96.1%), respectively.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was conducted to examine the factor structure of the 17 items pertaining to the new PYD model. Prior to the analysis, several criteria were evaluated to ascertain the suitability of the data for factor analysis. The analysis revealed that all 17 items exhibited a minimum correlation of 0.3 with at least one other item, indicating a favorable degree of factorability. Moreover, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.92, exceeding the commonly recommended value of 0.6, and Bartlett's test of sphericity yielded a significant result ($\chi 2\ (136) = 2365.79$, p (,000) < 0.05). Furthermore, the commonalities of all items exceeded 0.3, further affirming their shared common variance. Based on these overall indicators, it was concluded that factor analysis was an appropriate technique for all 17 items (Neill, 2008).

In the final stage, the remaining 17 items were subjected to principal components factor analysis using both Varimax and Oblimin rotations. The analysis demonstrated that three factors accounted for 55.67% of the variance, with the Oblimin

Table 3 Participants' level of consensus on indicators of positive youth development

Items	Q1	Q3	IQR	Mean	Median	Mod	Percentiles
Commitment to learning	4	5	1	4.67	5	5	99.7
Honesty	5	5	0	4.74	5	5	98.8
Respect	4	5	1	4.67	5	5	97.9
Awareness / Consciousness	4	5	1	4.55	5	5	96.4
Responsibility	4	5	1	4.60	5	5	96.1
Character	4	5	1	4.58	5	5	95.8
Positive values	4	5	1	4.62	5	5	95.8
Cognitive skills	4	5	1	4.47	5	5	95.2
Morality	4	5	1	4.60	5	5	94.9
Confidence	4	5	1	4.44	5	5	94.0
Behavioral skills	4	5	1	4.39	4	5	93.7
Contribution	4	5	1	4.32	4	4	91.0
Social skills	4	5	1	4.31	4	5	88.3
Future planning	4	5	1	4.25	4	4	87.1
Competence	4	5	1	4.22	4	4	86.8
Spiritual	4	5	1	4.22	5	5	80.2
Commitment and belonging	4	5	1	4.09	4	4	79.6

Percentiles represent the total percentages of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" options on the 5-Likert Scale

rotation yielding the most distinct factor structure. Except for one item (Positive Values) with a cross-loading above 0.3, all other items exhibited primary loadings above 0.4, indicating strong factor associations. The factor loading matrix for the ultimate solution is presented in Table 4. The results overall indicated the existence of three discernible factors that underlie participants' responses to the abbreviated version of PYD items, which were moderately internally consistent.

The first factor comprised seven items that were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, which explained 41% of the variance and exhibited factor loadings ranging from 0.45 to 0.83. The second factor consisted of five items that were also measured on a 5-point Likert scale, explaining 49% of the variance, with factor loadings ranging from 0.40 to 0.84. The third factor consisted of five items that were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, explaining 55% of the variance and exhibiting factor loadings ranging from 0.37 to 0.76.

After conducting factor analysis and identifying the factors, the factor loadings for each variable were scrutinized. The fundamental structures encapsulated by these factors were delineated, taking into account the overarching structure and concept that the variables collectively portrayed. Subsequently, labels were assigned

Table 4 The factor analysis

The Model of PYD			Items	Factor loading		
40 DAF	6 C's	15 PYDs		1	2	3
			Factor 1: Personal Development			
		✓	Future Planning	**0.831**	0.054	−0.110
	✓	✓	Commitment and belonging (Connection)	**0.772**	0.153	−0.177
	✓		Competence	**0.767**	−0.155	0.222
	✓		Confidence	**0.732**	−0.065	0.058
	✓		Contribution	**0.564**	0.072	0.220
✓		✓	Social Skills	**0.530**	0.123	0.279
✓	✓		Responsibility (Caring)	**0.450**	0.231	0.157
			Factor 2: Ethical and Moral Values			
		✓	Morality	−0.038	**0.845**	−0.067
			Respect	−0.035	**0.772**	0.087
	✓		Character	0.042	**0.587**	0.128
		✓	Spiritual	0.414	**0.581**	−0.179
✓			Honesty	0.036	**0.402**	0.370
			Factor 3: Lifelong Learning Desire			
✓			Commitment to Learning	−0.137	0.087	**0.760**
		✓	Cognitive Skills	0.167	−0.085	**0.673**
			Awareness / Consciousness	0.173	0.063	**0.593**
		✓	Behavioral Skills	0.428	0.064	**0.473**
✓			Positive Values	0.177	0.224	**0.373**

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization. The factor loadings with the highest magnitude for each factor are presented in bold

to the factors with the intention of rendering them conceptually meaningful and in alignment with the variables exhibiting strong loadings on each factor. Particular attention was paid to guarantee that the designated names corresponded to established theoretical frameworks or concepts within the relevant field (Table 4).

Analysis of the Most Important Indicators

Participants were requested to choose the three items in the second Delphi phase that were most significant to them. According to the analysis of the replies, Morality (56.28%) was the most important indicator for more than half of the participants. Following this, respectively, the three most essential items were commitment to learning (40.41%), honesty (30.83%), and responsibility (30.23%). On the other hand, each of the 17 items examined in the data analysis obtained from the participants overlapped with the indicators of at least one of the current PYD models. The Most Important Three Items Analysis and Model Comparison are displayed in Table 5.

Discussion

The PYD approach initially emerged in the US, and PYD models were developed in the context of American youth themselves. However, most of the PYD work to date has been conducted with adolescents in the WEIRD countries. PYD research outside the US has struggled to test the local applicability of PYD models originally developed and translated for American youth. Even if such an approach produces evidence supporting the global generalizability of the models, it may cause some situations to be overlooked for young people in other cultural contexts (Chai et al., 2020; Dimitrova & Wiium, 2021). So as societal contexts change, addressing the unique challenges and opportunities facing young people using only one of the available PYD models may not be productive or effective. Developing new models that consider their own context, particularly culture, can help provide more effective health and development support to young people. There has never been a scientific study in Türkiye that focuses on developing a new model of PYD in their context. This study has created a broad consensus using the Delphi Method and proposes a new PYD model specific to their context. In this respect, the study provides an important contribution to the existing knowledge by pioneering to researchers and practitioners in Türkiye.

The first aim of the study is to reveal the indicators/characteristics that a well-grown young person in Türkiye should have in terms of the PYD perspective from the consensus of adult experts working in the field. In this respect, the study is the first to report the developmental indicators needed by young people in Türkiye. The indicators in the proposed model also highlight characteristics (such as morality, integrity, commitment to learning, responsibility, and spirituality) that are important and needed for the culture to which it belongs. Some studies and documents conducted in Türkiye have revealed the importance and need of

Table 5 The most important three items analysis and model comparison

Items	$N=334$		The Model of PYD		
	n	%	40 DAF	6 C's	15 PYDs
Morality	188	56.3			✓
Commitment to learning	135	40.4	✓		
Responsibility (Caring)	103	30.8	✓	✓	
Honesty	101	30.2	✓		
Spirituality	76	22.8			✓
Character	68	20.4		✓	
Respect	66	20.4			
Awareness / Consciousness	57	17.1			
Confidence	55	16.5		✓	
Positive values	34	10.2	✓		
Cognitive skills	32	9.58			✓
Social skills	23	6.88	✓		✓
Competence	19	5.68		✓	
Behavioral skills	13	3.89			✓
Commitment and belonging (Connection)	13	3.89		✓	✓
Future planning	13	3.89			✓
Contribution	6	1.79		✓	

Considering the characteristics that a well-grown youth should have, which of the following indicators (attributes) would be the MOST IMPORTANT three (3) items for you? The results of the answers to the question

these indicators by referring to the same indicators. For example, according to the "Türkiye Youth Survey 2021" report conducted by Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung (2022), young people aged 18–25 reported elements such as "My family (96.6%), being honest (96.6%), being moral (96.6%), being educated (96.6%), my religion (96.6%)" as important or very important. In another study by Acun et al. (2013), parents reported that traits such as honesty, respect, responsibility, and belonging/commitment were important to their children. Some indicators in the proposed model were in line with some of the root values of "justice, friendship, honesty, self-control, patience, respect, love, responsibility, patriotism, benevolence" in the curriculum of the Ministry of National Education of Türkiye (2022).

There are very few studies on young people in Türkiye that examine the PYD models developed for young people in different contexts. However, it is also a matter of debate whether the developmental assets that young people living in Türkiye need in different contexts are indicators of only one of these models. Therefore, the second purpose of the study is to investigate whether the PYD model proposed for Türkiye will be different from the models developed in the US context. The model proposed in the study was expected to provide similar indicators to existing models, as well as reveal more important and unique

indicators for their context. Items and areas whose importance and need are prioritized provide opportunities to focus interventions on the areas ranked as most important for youth development (Ettinger et al., 2021). In parallel, each of the 17 indicators of the proposed new model coincides with the indicator of at least one of the existing PYD models (Table 5). For example, Lerner's 6Cs, which include Connection (Commitment and belonging), Competence, Caring (Responsibility), Confidence and Contribution (excluding Character), were loaded on Factor 1. The promotion of beliefs in the future, bonding, and social competence in Catalano's 15 PYD model were loaded on Factor 1. The promotion of moral competence and the cultivation of spirituality were loaded on Factor 2, while the promotion of cognitive and behavioral competence was loaded on Factor 3. On the other hand, Commitment to Learning and Positive Values, which constitute the internal assets of the 40 DAF, were loaded on Factor 3, while Social Skills were loaded on Factor 1 (Table 4). On the other hand, apart from the indicators in the current models, "respect and awareness/consciousness" emerged as a unique indicator. As a result, the indicators revealed by this study show that a mixture of indicators of different PYD models is needed. On the other hand, if any model in the literature were to be adapted to Turkish for young people in Türkiye, too many indicators that were pointed out as important by experts would have been overlooked.

Originally developed in English in the US, the PYD models (notably 6Cs and 40 DAFs) have been adapted to many countries and languages through a series of laborious language and cultural adaptation steps. We argue that this may not be efficient and effective for two reasons. First, there is a possibility that an improved model for WEIRD bindings, as we discussed above, will cause some important indicators to be overlooked when adapting to other contexts. That is, young people in different contexts may need some indicators that differ from those in the adapted model. This may lead to the fact that the developments that are seen as important in that culture cannot be captured on young people due to overlooked indicators. Second, as Scales et al. (2017) explain, adapting a model to another language or culture is a laborious task due to article translation, differences in scale and structure, and management challenges that affect response variability and validity. With these challenges, even if the indicators are translated into another language, they may have lost their meaning or lost their value in the context in which they were developed. Therefore, the risk of the indicator becoming different has emerged. In addition, some indicators that are seen as positive in the context in which they are developed may not be seen as a positive situation in the adapted culture. For example, indicators to priorities one's own self are not a very welcome feature in societies with strong life ties. For these reasons, we argue that the models that emerge from each culture are more efficient and effective for the development of young people. Developing a new model for PYD can help promote inclusivity and equality, taking into account the diverse needs, experiences and backgrounds of young people. This allows all young people around the world to have access to resources and opportunities that support their development.

The institution responsible for the policies that promote the positive and healthy development of such a large young population is GSB in Türkiye. Although the GSB does not follow any theoretical point of view, it does implement programs that

"support the personal and social development of young people, promote the discovery of their talents, promote well-being, and include preventive activities to protect young people from addiction and harmful habits". However, it seems very difficult for GSB to bear this burden alone. To tackle this task, the support of stakeholders from various sectors, including young people, families, educators, researchers, practitioners, civil society and policy makers, is needed. For example, the 4-H program (nearly 6 million youth), the largest youth development program in the US, collaborates with more than 100 universities to evaluate the impact of their program and better understand youth development (National 4-H Council, 2023). On the other hand, in Annual Report 2021 state that the youth centers affiliated to the GSB, which has approximately 2.5 million members, do not have such cooperation with universities and lack communication (GSB, 2021). In addition to university collaboration, many federal agencies involved in youth development in the US also encourage and fund collaboration between research and practice to advance the field (Dymnicki et al., 2016). On the other hand, while GSB in Türkiye funds scientific research projects specific to the subject of "Sports Research" (Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye [TÜBİTAK], 2021), it does not have a fund to promote research in the field of "youth development". Following the PYD's point of view can be a facilitating factor for both the ministry, organizations working with young people, and society itself. This can encourage collaboration and partnership and give a more comprehensive and coordinated understanding of work to support young people. The first step of this cooperation may be the opening of the first academic programs in the field of "youth development" by making a protocol between the GSB and certain universities. Thus, both while training practitioners and researchers to work in the field, more researchers can choose the field of youth development as the main discipline for themselves. This may increase the number of studies focusing on "Youth Development" in the future. Thus, the bridge between research and practice can be established and they can feed each other. In this way, "Youth Development" research in Türkiye can capture new perspectives, theories, methodologies and models. Eventually, "Youth Development" may emerge as an independent research area in Türkiye.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions

This study has several strengths and limitations. The implementation of the Delphi Method in the study facilitated reaching a significant number of experts in the field. In this regard, the inclusion of 715 participants in the first round and 334 participants in the second round signifies the attainment of an exceptional number of participants (Diamond et al., 2014). Moreover, all indicators of the developed model were derived from the responses provided by these participants to the open-ended question in the initial stage of the study. Consequently, the study was completed with the expected duration of two stages and achieved a high percentage of consensus. Furthermore, the participation of individuals from diverse professional backgrounds, encompassing both theoretical and practical domains, as well as their engagement from various geographical regions, supports the validity and

generalizability of the research (Nasa et al., 2021). Additionally, the study bridges the gap between the existing literature and PYD in the Turkish context and offers new perspectives and ideas for future research. In contrast, participants' expertise was recognized solely based on their responses to the three professional knowledge questions in the survey. However, further efforts could have been made to substantiate their expertise. Despite the fact that the study covers the whole of Türkiye and includes participants from all regions, the majority of participants were concentrated in the Marmara region, in line with the population distribution. Moreover, the study predominantly consisted of male participants. One of the most important reasons for this is that the COVID-19 pandemic has led to extensive disruptions in daily work, covering professional, educational and social fields. As a result, such perturbations may have had an impact on the tendency of women or individuals unaffiliated with academic institutions to participate in the study due to changes in their daily schedules and hierarchical preferences. Simultaneously, the female demographic in particular experienced a disproportionate impact attributable to increased care giving obligations in the midst of the pandemic, thereby affecting their accessibility or tendency to participate in research efforts. Due to the nature of the Delphi Method, nearly half of the participants included in the initial stage analysis did not participate in the second stage of the study. Future studies can aim to obtain more precise evidence to determine participants' expertise. This study exclusively incorporates the perspectives of adults in the field. However, in future research, it would be valuable to include the perspectives and approval of young individuals in the proposed model. Additionally, there is a significant need for measurement invariance studies conducted on young individuals, utilizing scales appropriate to the model's indicators, to establish the validity and generalizability of the model.

Conclusion

Previous research in the field of PYD has suggested the necessity of conducting separate studies for each distinct context. The current study aims to investigate whether the model developed for PYD within the Turkish context differs from existing models. In this study, we present a new PYD model based on consensus obtained from an expert panel through a Delphi application conducted in Türkiye. Furthermore, the study is innovative in its utilization of the Delphi Method, which involves direct feedback from experts in the field of youth development, to develop a novel PYD model. In this regard, the Delphi Method emerges as a technique that can be preferred for the development or adaptation of new models, providing context-specific conceptual coherence for PYD, and guiding the formulation of PYD strategies. Moreover, this PYD model, developed based on theory, existing models, and expert opinions, can serve as a guiding framework for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers in Türkiye working towards the development and implementation of programs from a PYD perspective. However, it should be noted that the validity and reliability of the model's indicators and structure have not been established. Further research is needed to examine the contribution of the proposed PYD model to the positive development of young individuals. Therefore, the recommended next steps

involve conducting experimental studies using the model and evaluating its psychometric properties. In conclusion, this study presents an examination based on PYD within the context of Türkiye. Alongside future directions, it provides significant insights to researchers and practitioners seeking a theoretical framework for understanding the strengths possessed by young individuals in Türkiye. In addition to this first step, future studies should aim to provide definitional, theoretical, and methodological clarity to the structures of PYD within Turkish contexts and examine its predictors, correlations, and outcomes. Such studies will prove useful in comprehending and promoting positive outcomes and development among young individuals in Türkiye.

Funding Open access funding provided by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK). This study is being funded by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK) as part of the 2214-A International Research Fellowship Program for conducting research abroad.

Declarations

Competing Interest The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

Acun, İ, Yücel, C., Önder, A., & Tarman, B. (2013). Değerler: Kim Ne Kadar Değer Veriyor? *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6*(1), 180–197. https://doi.org/10.12780/UUSBD144

Adams, B. G., Wiium, N., & Abubakar, A. (2019). Developmental assets and academic performance of adolescents in Ghana, Kenya, and South Africa. In *Child & Youth Care Forum* (Vol. 48, pp. 207–222). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-018-9480-z

Adler, M., & Ziglio, E. (1996). *Gazing into the oracle: The Delphi method and its application to social policy and public health*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Akay, H. (2022). Yerel Yönetimler ve Gençlik Politikaları: Erbaa (Tokat) Belediyesi Örneği. *Türk Kamu Yönetimi Dergisi, 3*(1), 32–43. https://www.tujpa.com/index.php/journal/article/view/42. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Aykara, A., & Albayrak, H. (2016). Olumlu Gençlik Gelişimi Yaklaşımı Açısından Spor Etkinliklerine Katılımın Gençlere Yansımaları. *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet, 27*(1), 77–100. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tsh/issue/38633/448503. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Bardecki, M. J. (1984). Participants' response to the Delphi method: An attitudinal perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 25*(3), 281–292. https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-1625(84)90006-4

Barrios, M., Guilera, G., Nuño, L., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2021). Consensus in the delphi method: What makes a decision change? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 163*, 120484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120484

Belton, I., MacDonald, A., Wright, G., & Hamlin, I. (2019). Improving the practical application of the Delphi method in group-based judgment: A six-step prescription for a well-founded and defensible process. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 147*, 72–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.07.002

Benson, P. L. (1997). *All kids are our kids: What communities must do to raise caring and responsible children and adolescents*. Jossey-Bass.

Benson, P. L. (2007). Developmental assets: An overview of theory, research, and practice. *Approaches to Positive Youth Development, 33*, 58. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446213803

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Harvard University Press.

Catalano, R. F., Skinner, M. L., Alvarado, G., Kapungu, C., Reavley, N., Patton, G. C., & Petroni, S. (2019). Positive youth development programs in low-and middle-income countries: A conceptual framework and systematic review of efficacy. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 65*(1), 15–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.01.024

Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M., Ryan, J. M., Lonczak, H. S., & Hawkins, J. D. (2002). Positive youth development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of positive youth development programs. *Prevention and Treatment*, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.1037/1522-3736.5.1.515a

Çetintürk, V. E., & Küçük, H. (2019). Gençlik Politikalarında Karşılaştırmalı Bir Değerlendirme: Türkiye Ve Finlandiya Örneği. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari. *Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, *24*(2), 263–284. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sduiibfd/issue/53004/704253. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Chai, X., Wang, J., Li, X., Liu, W., Zhao, G., & Lin, D. (2020). Development and validation of the Chinese positive Youth Development Scale. *Applied Developmental Science, 26*(1), 127–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2020.1712206

Dalkey, N., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science, 9*(3), 458–467. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.9.3.458

Damon, W. (2004). What is positive youth development? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260092

de Jesus, M. C., Dutra-Thomé, L., & Pereira, A. S. (2022). Developmental assets and positive youth development in Brazilian university students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 977507. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.977507

Demir, İ. (2012). The development and current state of youth research in Turkey: An overview. *Young, 20*(1), 89–114. https://doi.org/10.1177/110330881102000105

Diamond, I. R., Grant, R. C., Feldman, B. M., Pencharz, P. B., Ling, S. C., Moore, A. M., & Wales, P. W. (2014). Defining consensus: A systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 67*(4), 401–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.12.002

Dimitrova, R., & Wiium, N. (2021). *Handbook of positive youth development: Advancing the next generation of research, policy and practice in global contexts* (pp. 3–16). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70262-5_1

Doğan, M., & Doğan, Ö. S. (2022). Türkiye'nin Jeopolitiği. *Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi, 5*(2), 320–339. https://doi.org/10.33712/mana.1159064

Dost-Gözkan, A., Kozina, A., Stefenel, D., & Wiium, N. (2021). External developmental assets and positive identity among emerging adults in Norway, Romania, Slovenia, and Turkey. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 656972. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.656972

Dymnicki, A. B., Le Menestrel, S., Boyd, M. J., Lauxman, L., Oberlander, S. E., & Osher, D. M. (2016). Developing a federal research agenda for positive youth development: Identifying gaps in the field and an effective consensus building approach. *Journal of Youth Development, 11*(1), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.5195/jyd.2016.430

Eccles, J., & Gootman, J. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development. Committee on community level programs for youth*. National Academy Press.

Ekren, G. (2021). İşletme ve Yönetim Araştırmalarında Delphi Metodunun Kullanımı. Geçmişten Günümüze Metodoloji Çalışmaları (p. 39).

Ektïrïcïoğlu, C., Arslantaş, H., & Yüksel, R. (2020). Ergenlerde çağın hastalığı: Teknoloji bağımlılığı. *Arşiv Kaynak Tarama Dergisi, 29*(1), 51–64. https://doi.org/10.17827/aktd.498947

Ettinger, A. K., Ray, K. N., Burke, J. G., Thompson, J., Navratil, J., Chavis, V., & Miller, E. (2021). A community partnered approach for defining child and youth thriving. *Academic Pediatrics, 21*(1), 53–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2020.04.011

Eysenbach, G., & Kohler, C. (2003). What is the prevalence of health-related searches on the World Wide Web? Qualitative and quantitative analysis of search engine queries on the internet. In *AMIA annual symposium proceedings* (Vol. 2003, p. 225). American Medical Informatics Association. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14728167. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Fernandes, D., Pivec, T., Dost-Gözkan, A., Uka, F., Gaspar de Matos, M., & Wiium, N. (2021). Global overview of youth development: Comparison of the 5 cs and developmental assets across six countries. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 685316. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.685316

Flostrand, A., Pitt, L., & Bridson, S. (2020). The Delphi technique in forecasting–A 42-year bibliographic analysis (1975–2017). *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 150*, 119773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119773

Geldhof, G. J., Bowers, E. P., Boyd, M. J., Mueller, M. K., Napolitano, C. M., Schmid, K. L., & Lerner, R. M. (2014). Creation of short and very short measures of the five cs of positive youth development. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 24*(1), 163–176. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12039

Geldhof, J. G., Olsen, S. G., & Thogmartin, A. A. (2021). The morning sun shines brightly: Positive youth development in a global context. *Handbook of Positive Youth Development: Advancing Research, Policy, and Practice in Global Contexts*, 567–577. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-70262-5

Gomez-Baya, D., Santos, T., & de Gaspar, M. (2022). Developmental assets and positive youth development: An examination of gender differences in Spain. *Applied Developmental Science, 26*(3), 516–531. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2021.1906676

GSB, The Ministry of Youth and Sports of Türkiye. (2013). *The Turkish National Youth and Sports Policy Document*. https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2013/01/20130127-8-1.pdf. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

GSB, The Ministry of Youth and Sports of Türkiye (2022). *Youth Centers Regulation*. https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/mevzuat?MevzuatNo=39538&MevzuatTur=7&MevzuatTertip=5. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

GSB, The Ministry of Youth and Sports of Türkiye (2011). *The Ministry of Youth and Sports Organization and Duties Law*. https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/File/GeneratePdf?mevzuatNo=638&mevzuatTur=KHK&mevzuatTertip=5. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

GSB, The Ministry of Youth and Sports of Türkiye (2021). *Annual Report 2021*. https://sgb.gsb.gov.tr/Sayfalar/3765/3396/faaliyet-raporlari.aspx. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Hall, G. S. (1904). Adolescence in literature, biography, and history. https://doi.org/10.1037/14684-008

Hasson, F., Keeney, S., & McKenna, H. (2000). Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 32*(4), 1008–1015. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.t01-1-01567.x

Helliwell, J. F., Layard, R., Sachs, J. D., Aknin, L. B., De Neve, J. E., & Wang, S. (Eds.). (2023). *World Happiness Report 2023* (11th ed.). Sustainable Development Solutions Network. https://worldhappiness.report/ed/2023/. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Hult Khazaie, D., & Khan, S. S. (2020). Social psychology and pandemics: Exploring consensus about research priorities and strategies using the Delphi method. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 23*(4), 363–371. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12442

Humphrey-Murto, S., & de Wit, M. (2019). The Delphi method—more research please. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 106*, 136–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.10.011

IYF, International Youth Foundation. (2017). *Global Youth Wellbeing Index 2017*. https://iyfglobal.org/library/2017-global-youth-wellbeing-index. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Kadir, N. B. A., & Mohd, R. H. (2021). The 5Cs of positive youth development, purpose in life, hope, and well-being among emerging adults in Malaysia. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.641876

Kagitcibasi, C., Baydar, N., & Cemalcilar, Z. (2020). Supporting positive development in early adolescence: A school-based intervention in Turkey. *Applied Developmental Science, 24*(2), 170–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1457962

Kılıç, K., & İnce, M. L. (2016). *Sporda Pozitif gençlik gelişimi ölçeklerinin 8 14 yaş grubu çocuk ve genç sporcular tarafından anlaşılırlığının incelenmesi*. Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 213–225. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/bsd/issue/53483/711934. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Koller, S. H., & Verma, S. (2017). Commentary on cross-cultural perspectives on positive youth development with implications for intervention research. *Child Development, 88*(4), 1178–1182. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12873

Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. (2022). *Turkish Youth 2021*. Foundation Office Turkey. https://www.kas.de/en/web/tuerkei/single-title/-/content/turkish-youth-2021-1. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Kutlu, Ö., Örselli, E., & Babahanoğlu, V. (2017). Türkiye'de Gençlerin Uyuşturucu Ile Mücadele Politikaları Hakkında Düşünceleri. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5*(11), 125–158. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/genclikarastirmalari/issue/66481/1040756. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Lansford, J. E., French, D. C., & Gauvain, M. (2021). *Child and adolescent development in cultural context*. American Psychological Association.

Lerner, R. M. (2004). *Liberty: Thriving and civic engagement among America's youth*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452233581

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., & von Eye, A. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth-grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 25*(1), 17–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604272461

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (1975). *Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading.

Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (2011). Delphi: A brief look backward and forward. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 78*(9), 1712–1719. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2010.09.011

Lüküslü, D., & Osmanoğlu, B. (2018). Youth work in Turkey: A sector newly emerging and marked by political competition. *Social Sciences, 7*(2), 31. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci7020031

Lund, B. D. (2020). Review of the Delphi method in library and information science research. *Journal of Documentation, 76*(4), 929–960. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4469908

Martin, R. A., & Alacaci, C. (2015). Positive youth development in Turkey: A critical review of research on the social and emotional learning needs of Turkish adolescents, 2000–2012. *Research Papers in Education, 30*(3), 327–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2014.963828

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.

Moore, K. A. (2017). Commentary: Positive youth development goes mainstream. *Child Development, 88*(4), 1175–1177. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12874

Nasa, P., Jain, R., & Juneja, D. (2021). Delphi methodology in healthcare research: How to decide its appropriateness. *World Journal of Methodology, 11*(4), 116. https://doi.org/10.5662/wjm.v11.i4.116

National 4-H Council, Nation's Cooperative Extension System and USDA (2023). *4-H Programs*. https://4-h.org/about/. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Neill, J. (2008). *Sample factor analysis Write-Up: Exploratory factor analysis of the short version of the adolescent coping scale*. Centre for Applied Psychology, University of Canberra.

Niederberger, M., & Spranger, J. (2020). Delphi technique in health sciences: A map. *Frontiers in Public Health, 8*, 457. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00457

OECD, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Poverty Rate*. https://data.oecd.org/inequality/poverty-rate.htm. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

OECD, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *Youth Unemployment Rate*. https://data.oecd.org/unemp/youth-unemployment-rate.htm. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

OECD, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Enrolment rate in secondary and tertiary education (indicator)*. https://data.oecd.org/students/enrolment-rate-in-secondary-and-tertiary-education.htm. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Qi, S., Hua, F., Zhou, Z., & Shek, D. T. L. (2020). Trends of positive youth development publications (1995–2020): A scientometric review. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 17*(1), 421–446. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-020-09878-3

Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). What exactly is a youth development program? Answers from research and practice. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*(2), 94–111. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0702_6

Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (2001). Expert opinions in forecasting: the role of the Delphi technique. *Principles of forecasting: A handbook for researchers and practitioners*, 125–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-306-47630-3_7

Şahin, A. E. (2001). Eğitim araştırmalarında delphi tekniği ve kullanımı. (Delphi technique and its uses in educational research). *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 20*, 215–220.

Sarıcaoğlu, A., & Eroğul, A. R. Ç. (2021). Gelişim Güçleri Profili'nin Türkçeye Uyarlanması ve Psikometrik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi. *Okul Psikolojik Danışmanlığı Dergisi*, *4*(1), 35–66. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/opdd/issue/63251/869667. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Scales, P. C., Roehlkepartain, E. C., & Shramko, M. (2017). Aligning youth development theory, measurement, and practice across cultures and contexts: Lessons from use of the developmental assets profile. *Child Indicators Research, 10*, 1145–1178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-016-9395-x

Schmidt, K., Montgomery, L. A., Bruene, D., & Kenney, M. (1997). Determining research priorities in pediatric nursing: A Delphi study. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing, 12*(4), 201–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0882-5963(97)80002-4

Shek, D. T., Siu, A. M., & Lee, T. Y. (2007). The Chinese positive youth development scale: A validation study. *Research on Social work Practice, 17*(3), 380–391. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731506296196

Shek, D. T., Sun, R. C., & Chai, C. W. (2021). Chinese positive Youth Development Scale. In *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research* (pp. 1–4). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_3557

Skulmoski, G. J., Hartman, F. T., & Krahn, J. (2007). The Delphi method for graduate research. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *6*(1), 1–21. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ807652. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Small, S. A. (2005). Bridging research and practice in the family and human sciences. *Family Relations, 54*(2), 320–334. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40005257. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Strategy and Budget Directorate of Türkiye. (2019). *11th Five-Year Development Plan (2019–2023)*. https://www.sbb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/On_Birinci_Kalkinma_Plani-2019-2023.pdf. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Syvertsen, A. K., Scales, P. C., & Toomey, R. B. (2021). Developmental assets framework revisited: Confirmatory analysis and invariance testing to create a new generation of assets measures for applied research. *Applied Developmental Science, 25*(4), 291–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2019.1613155

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development, 88*(4), 1156–1171. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12864

The Commonwealth. (2021). *Global Youth Development Index*. https://youth-development-index.thecommonwealth.org/. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

The Ministry of Interior of Türkiye. (2022). *Substance Users Profile Analysis*. https://www.narkotik.pol.tr/kurumlar/narkotik.pol.tr/TUB%C4%B0M/Ulusal%20Yay%C4%B1nlar/Turkiye-National-Drug-Report-2022.pdf. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

The Ministry of National Education of Türkiye. (2022). *Values Education Activity Book*. https://www.meb.gov.tr/degerler-egitimi-etkinlik-kitabi-yayimlandi/haber/28204/tr. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

TÜBİTAK., Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye. (2021). *Call for Sports Research*. https://tubitak.gov.tr/sites/default/files/20689/spor_arastirmalari_cagri_metni.pdf. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

TURKSTAT, Turkish Statistical Institute. (2022a). *Address-based population registration system results*. https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Adrese-Dayali-Nufus-Kayit-Sistemi-Sonuclari-2021-45500. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

TURKSTAT, Turkish Statistical Institute. (2022b). *Labor Force Statistics, QIV: October - December, 2022*. https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Isgucu-Istatistikleri-IV.-Ceyrek:-Ekim---Aralik,-2022-49385. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

TURKSTAT, Turkish Statistical Institute. (2022c). *Life Satisfaction Survey*. https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Yasam-Memnuniyeti-Arastirmasi-2022-49691. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

TURKSTAT, Turkish Statistical Institute. (2023). *Youth with Statistics, QIV: October - December, 2022*. https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Istatistiklerle-Genclik-2022-49670#:~:text=Gen%C3%A7%20n%C3%BCfus%20ya%C5%9F%20grubuna%20g%C3%B6re,ya%C5%9F%20grubunda%20yer%20ald%C4%B1%C4%9F%C4%B1%20g%C3%B6r%C3%BCld%C3%BC. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Turoff, M., & Linstone, H. A. (2002). The Delphi method-techniques and applications.

UNDP, United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *Human development report 2021-22: Uncertain times, unsettled lives: Shaping our future in a transforming world*. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2021-22. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Von Gracht, D. (2012). Consensus measurement in Delphi studies: Review and implications for future quality assurance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 79*(8), 1525–1536. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2012.04.013

WHO, World Health Organization. (2021). *Suicide Worldwide in 2019: Global Health Estimates*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240026643. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Wiium, N., & Dimitrova, R. (2019). Positive youth development across cultures: Introduction to the special issue. In *Child & Youth Care Forum* (Vol. 48, pp. 147–153). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-019-09488-7

Wiium, N., Dost-Gözkan, A., & Kosic, M. (2019). Developmental assets among young people in three European contexts: Italy, Norway and Turkey. In *Child and Youth Care Forum*. Springer, US, 48, 187–206.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-018-9446-1

Williamson, C., Kelly, P., Tomasone, J. R., Bauman, A., Mutrie, N., Niven, A., & Baker, G. (2021). A modified Delphi study to enhance and gain international consensus on the physical activity messaging Framework (PAMF) and Checklist (PAMC). *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 18*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-021-01182-z

Winkler, J., & Moser, R. (2016). Biases in future-oriented Delphi studies: A cognitive perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 105*, 63–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.01.021

Wong, P. W. C., Kwok, K. W., & Chow, S. L. (2021). Validation of positive Youth Development Scale and implications for adolescent in Hong Kong community. *Child & Youth Care Forum* (pp. 1–19). Springer US. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1347918. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

World Bank. (2021). *World bank country and lending groups—World bank data help desk*. https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

YÖK, Council of Higher Education of Türkiye. (2023a). *Academic program search robot*. https://yokatlas.yok.gov.tr/lisans-anasayfa.php. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

YÖK, Council of Higher Education of Türkiye. (2023b). *Thesis Center*. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp. Accessed 21 Dec 2023.

Zeldin, S. (2010). Integrating research and practice to understand and strengthen communities for adolescent development: An introduction to the special issue and current issues. *Applied Developmental Science, 4*(S1), 2–10. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS04Suppl_1

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Authors and Affiliations

Ömer Ataç[1] · Müfide Yoruç Çotuk[2] · Elizabeth Trejos-Castillo[3]

✉ Ömer Ataç
omer.atac@gsb.gov.tr

Müfide Yoruç Çotuk
mcotuk@marmara.edu.tr

Elizabeth Trejos-Castillo
elizabeth.trejos@ttu.edu

[1] Health Sciences Institute, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Marmara University, İstanbul, Türkiye

[2] Department of Sports Management, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Marmara University, İstanbul, Türkiye

[3] Human Development and Family Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA