

**Mariela Lazi**  
Universiteti "Aleksandër Xhuvani"  
Elbasan/Shqipëri

## **Analysis on youth development status and conditions in Elbasan region, in Albania**

### **Abstract**

*The main purpose of this article is to provide an overall descriptive analysis of key psychological dispositions related to resilience and well-being of youths in Elbasan region in Albania. The strength-based approach presented by Search Institute's Development Asset Framework was selected to better serve this purpose. In this framework the institute has produced the Development Asset Profile. DAP is a research-based framework that identifies 40 elements of young people's positive growth and development. DAP will be used as an assessment tool that seeks to picture how youths in Elbasan are experiencing those 40 Developmental Assets. Assets are considered to be crucial "building blocks" of a healthy development for all youth. In this article we will present the assessment results by stressing the power of development assets and the role that everyone may play in building these assets.*

*This article summarizes the extent to which youth experience the Developmental Assets within schools in the targeted geographical area. Therefore, the data analysis and interpretation will provide a detailed overview of the state of development assets among young people, aged between 12 and 18 years old, in schools in Elbasan area, in 2 different moments in time. The purpose of this mixed methods triangulation design study was to explore how "non-formal education" methods and life-skills curricula has affected targeted youth's overall level of Developmental Assets over time. Actually, to accomplish this longitudinal study, around 300 youths has been engaged twice in answering DAP survey questions: once during the first cohort of measurement in 2011 and then after 3 years, during the second cohort of measurements that took place during November–December, 2013. This longitudinal study seeks to provide a general analysis according to the development of eight assets categories (support, empowerment, boundaries and expectations, constructive use of time, commitment to learning, positive values, social competencies and positive identity) before and after a 3 year programme intervention targeting youths in Elbasan area.*

*The article concludes by analyzing and interpreting findings and DAP scores and at the same time is trying to analyze pros and cons of using DAP for a longitudinal study.*

**Key words:** *development assets profile, longitudinal study, strength-based approach, youth positive development.*

## 1-Introduction

Albania is a transition country facing many challenges including the development of adequate education, health and social services that will enhance the well-being of its population. Albania has one of the highest birth rates and is the second youngest country in Europe (after Kosovo) and its youth population is close to 70% of the total .

The young people in Albania face many difficulties that may reflect violent and inappropriate living conditions that unfortunately are leading to frequent cases of their engagement in risky behaviors and other developmental problems. Actually, in our country there is a huge need to be more focused on young people and their development, by researchers and different developmental practitioners.

Obviously, there is more need to intensify and better coordinate our efforts to foster young people toward a more productive adulthood. It is imperative that a supportive environment should be created for them along the way. Research indicates that a better sense of self-worth, self-confidence together with continuous external support (support from family, school and community) are considered to be essential factors leading to positive youth development. To foster the creation of such supportive and caring environment, those engaging with youth should at first gain a more adequate understanding of the actual conditions our youths are living in, at a given place and during a particular period of time.

And then, those engaged in this field, should join forces and coordinate actions and interventions, promoting positive development by ensuring that our youths feel valued, cared for, loved and protected and feel comfortable while growing in healthy environments and safely accessing all the services available to them.

## 2-Theoretical background

### ***2.2-What is 'Youth development' all about?***

Researchers have defined 'Youth development' as:

"...the ongoing growth process in which all youth are engaged in attempting to meet their basic personal and social needs to be safe, feel cared for, be valued, be useful, and be spiritually grounded, and to build skills and competencies that allow them to function and contribute in their daily lives" (Pittman, 1993, p. 8).

Based on this definition, 'youth development' can be described as a natural process all adolescents and youths need to go through on their way to adulthood. The actual experiences of adolescents and youths during this journey are supporting them to succeed in their adult life. Youth development approaches encompasses interventions strategies that attempts to meet their needs, to have adequate education and life skills, to feel valued and useful, to be cared for and protected and to be psychology and spiritually grounded.

Therefore, this process requires the engagement of other people around them, thus, family, school and community must be engaged. Thus, youth development could be defined as a combination of all of the people, places and services contributing in creating this supportive and productive environment that will encourage them developing into worthy, valuable and competitive and competent

adults of tomorrow.

Actually, youth development approaches and theoretical background are particularly new in the development field. Until 1980s, young people have been implicitly or explicitly considered “as problems to be solved” (Benson, 2006; Roth, Brooks-Gunn, Murray & Foster, 1998). Basically, this approach was mainly motivated by a “problem identification” angle (e.g. school drop-outs, substance abuse, violence, juvenile delinquency, etc.) On identification, different prevention programs were designed to mitigate those problems.

Findings and lessons learned generated by this approach interventions, was further used to make continuous adjustments to interventions designed by relevant entities around provision of different social services. (Lerner et al. 2005; Benson, 2003; Granger, 2002). Indeed, it is very important to engage in providing the right support to mitigate or reduce problems, but prevention programs should also consider linking with other youth development programs and approaches, in order to properly meet young people’s needs.

At the beginning of 1990’s, researchers acknowledged the need to support youth develop across different areas, by taking into consideration cognitive, psychological, moral, social, cultural, vocational and physical wellbeing. In this regard, researchers started to broaden the range of intervention strategies that addressed young people by highlighting the importance of promoting positive elements of human development (Pittman et al. 2003).

Alternative youth development approaches are trying to connect the efforts of building and developing assets with the concept of Resilience as a component of Positive Youth Development Approaches. Resilience could be defined as the ability to respond adequately to prominent and/or perceived dangers and to develop normally even under adversity circumstances.

As well, Resilience is theorized to be “an inborn developmental wisdom that naturally motivates individuals to meet their human needs for love, sense of belonging, respect, identity, power, mastery, challenge, and meaning” (WestEd, 2002, p. 2; Benard, 2004). This conceptual framework is interlinked with the development assets framework as it is anticipated, that through supporting youth to reinforce their external resources can help to meet youths’ basic developmental needs, which, in turn will enhance internal assets . (Benard,2004; Benard & Slade, 2009). One of the key conceptual ideas inspiring this approach is considering youth as contributors to their own development. (Roth et al. 1998; Benson, 2006).

However, it is generally agreed that there is a need to see all those approaches as complementary of each other. Without withdrawing completely from the problems’ prevention and reduction approach, especially in terms of addressing emergent needs and problematic situations, the main focus could be on promoting young people positive aspects, by building their internal and external assets, toward fostering better resilience, which, in turn will enable them to grow up healthy and reach successfully adult age. Therefore, Building Resilience and Strengthening Asset based approach will be the overall guiding approach in this article. The development assets and their relationship with the component of resilience are considered to be crucial in protecting a young person from involvement in “risky” behaviors, as well, in contributing to improved health, psycho-social and academic

outcomes.

Therefore, assessing those assets at different stages of youth development could be considered a good indicator of their internal and external developmental conditions and could be used to monitor how youths are doing on their development journey. By building on these data, it is possible for those working with youths to compare response patterns and identify needs for interventions according to different contexts.

However, this is rarely done in Albania, since it is unlikely that most professionals engaged with youths, have access to the resources needed to properly understand local situation and develop interventions accordingly. Therefore, this paper could be considered an attempt to draw attention of different practitioner's and researcher (as school teachers, school psychologists, and other professionals) not only on youth related issues and developmental challenges, but also to introduce these progressive assessment resources, that could be used to understand local contexts, living conditions and situation in which our youngsters grow and develop.

## **2.2-Methodology**

The study utilized a triangulation mixed-methods research approach. A combination of different research methodologies has been used in this regard. A quantitative research component included a pre and post survey using the Developmental Asset Profile (DAP) and the qualitative portion consisted of one-on-one in depth interviews and focus group discussions. As well, secondary data were collected since the research design stage, from different local and national level Governmental and Public Institutions. Using such information gathered from suitable qualitative and quantitative methods provided more accurate information according to the particular research questions and indicators.

The Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) was used to determine the level of assets in each of the eight areas, prior to the initiation of a particular intervention aiming at enabling positive youth development in Elbasan region and also asses the DAP results after the projects interventions has been completed. DAP is developed by Search Institute , based on the Development Asset framework and validated for the Albanian context.

DAP was administered individually as any other self-reported type of survey. DAP is an assessment instrument that contain forty (40) concrete, common sense, positive experiences and qualities essential to raising successful young people. DAP consists of the 8 individual asset categories grouped in 4 external, and 4 internal categories. DAP can generate scoring of each of individual assets as well as a total assets score category.

Researchers from Search Institute, in their effort to identify variables of a strength based approach to healthy development have been engaged in designing the framework of "development assets" (Benson 2006). According to them, "development assets" are "building blocks" that all young people needs, in order to grow up healthy and successfully.

Therefore, DAP questionnaire was selected to assess the actual status and then to monitor the development of these assets through time, with the same targeted youths within their schools. Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) was used as a survey tool with young people to understand their perceptions about the external and internal assets in their community in 2 different moments in time (Time 1 first measurements cohort on 2011 and Time 2 second measurements cohort on 2014). During the research design stages, it was envisioned to use DAP as a “before” and “after” measurement tool.

By doing so, it was intended to be able to establish an initial-baseline level in terms of development assets and then be able to track change over time. It was anticipated that this tool could provide meaningful information in terms of articulating the impact that the 3 years programme intervention that has been implemented with targeted youths within the selected schools in Elbasan, had achieved.

During the first cohort of measurements that took place in 2011, DAP was considered to be appropriate for such purposes, as it was designed to be a longitudinal study measurement tool, performed twice with the same children in the same schools. DAP was supposed to involve repeated measurements and observations of the same variables over long periods of time, even more than 3 years.

As such, it was suggested to be appropriate for this kind of longitudinal research study. Anyway, it was very difficult to link these changes to any particular intervention within selected schools, therefore, a more rigorous research design, employing qualitative methods was needed. Additional, qualitative methods as Focus Groups Discussion has been used to understand better trends, patterns and children’s perspectives on the DAP scores during the second measurement in Elbasan area. Findings and learning from this study will enable future researchers and professionals while designing interventions and programming to understand if and how, “non-formal education” interventions employing life-skills curricula methodologies, are contributing in strengthening assets to help young people improve internal and external conditions in order to have better resilience and reach their full adulthood potential.

### ***2.3-Sampling strategy***

The overall sampling strategy that has been used in all the measurement in this report was designed to enable us to understand the actual level of assets for children and youths in a given community at a particular moment. In Elbasan area, a random sample of children and youths aged 12 to 18 was selected. It was anticipated that by this sample methodology, we would have been able to provide children’s perspectives on changes in their community after using “non-formal education” interventions and life-skills curricula within their schools.

The main instrument used to collect quantitative data was DAP (Development Assets Profile). To accomplish this study, around 300 youths has been engaged twice in answering DAP survey questions: once during the first cohort of measurement in 2011 and then after 3 years, during the second cohort of measurements that took place during November –December, 2013. DAP is a self-report assessment instrument standardized for Albanian young people, 11-18 years of age, consisting of 58 questions used to create a profile around the “development assets” of those

youths.

As well, the qualitative component consisting of in-depth student interviews and focus group discussions were completed with different participating youths in Elbasan area, to help determine if designed non-formal education interventions did facilitate youth asset development.

### **2.4-DAP Scoring Methods**

On each occasion when the Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) was administered, participating youths were required to answer fifty-eight questions by selecting from a simple four-point response scale for all its items (Not at all or Rarely / Sometimes / Often/ Always). Questions that were answered with “not at all or rarely” receive a score of zero.

Those questions that were answered as “somewhat or sometimes” were scored with a score of one. A score of two was used if the young person selected the “often” choice. Finally, a score of three was given if youths selected “always.”

The assessment yielded quantitative scores for each of the eight asset categories and was considered to be a useful descriptive tool. As mentioned earlier, the survey items can be grouped and interpreted according to eight assets’ categories (1.support, 2. empowerment, 3. boundaries and expectations, 4. constructive use of time, 5. commitment to learning, 6. positive values, 7. social competencies and 8. positive identity), by providing in this way useful information on the state of development assets among youth in Elbasan area. Scoring levels include “low,” “fair,” “good,” and “excellent.”

The eight asset category scores were compiled and categorized into “levels” as follows: Low=0-14, Fair=15-20, Good=21-25 and Excellent=26-30.

These levels were also used for the “external” and “internal” categories. The “total” score as by categories used the following levels: Low=0-29, Fair=30-40, Good=41-50 and Excellent=51-60.

The assessment was administered in the field by a team of researchers, composed by 5 students of the Faculty of Education in “Aleksander Moisiu” University of Elbasan. The data drawn from the DAP assessment instrument was later analysed and interpreted as by the stipulated guidelines of Search Institute. It took on average 50 minutes to administer DAP with young people – this time includes not only completion of DAP survey by youth but also a warm up exercise and instruction provided at the beginning of the process.

Results from Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) questionnaire, were entered into a Microsoft Excel spread-sheet according to eight asset categories scores as well as the internal, external, and total scores. After screening for validity and recoding any problematic responses, DAP surveys data has been scored and then analysed using Excel according to each asset in each category.

### **3-Research Questions and Indicators**

The purpose of this mixed methods triangulation design study was to explore how “non-formal education” interventions and life-skills curricula affects youth’s overall level of Developmental Assets. DAP survey measurements are carried out to measure well-being and assets in children and youths. Quantitative data were obtained by using a pre and post assessment.

Specifically, the Developmental Asset Profile (DAP) was used to determine the impact of “non-formal education” interventions and life-skills curricula” in the overall levels of developmental assets experienced by targeted children and youths.

Additionally, detailed research questions was developed based on composition of several youth well-being indicators as by stipulated DAP guidance described in the table 1: Additional Research Questions – DAP Indicators.

In this table, additional research questions are framed as indicators with a specific definition and are linked consequently with a detailed description of the “Developmental Asset Framework” related to each of the assets. Developmental Asset Profile (DAP) was used to determine if “non-formal education” employing life-skills curricula methodologies had increased the overall levels of developmental assets experienced by targeted youths.

#### **3.1-DAP Research Participants Demographics**

Table 2 gives a more in-depth description of the participants by sharing demographic data, desegregated by ethnicity groups and gender. For more information please see Table 2 - DAP Research Participant Demographics – Gender and Ethnicity, at the end of this article. The quantitative research sample included a total of 603 youths that has been engaged in the DAP survey in Albania. Specifically, as noted in the chart below, from 603 young people that filled out DAP survey, 380 were females (63% of the youths engaged) and 223 (37%) of them were males.

Of the 603 youths, only 7.5% of the young people engaged belong to ethnic minority groups, such as Roma and/or Gypsy. The majority of this population has been reached out during the second cohort of measurement, where 24 Roma and Gypsy youths was engaged. Only 9 youths from minority groups was reached during the first cohort in Elbasan area. As noted in the table 2, a total number of 33 other young people (9 during the first cohort of measurements and 24 during the second cohort of measurements) of this community were reached in Elbasan areas.

It should be mentioned that in these areas was very difficult to involve more young people because of their nomadic nature.

As well, difficulties in involving those youths in the study are connected with a lack of adequate statistics and demographic data regarding these communities in the respective authorities and state structures. Therefore, in terms of most vulnerable children, the “Snow Ball” sample methodology was used to reach out and include those belonging to those communities in this study.

Actually, we need to mention here that many of the children that were reached during the first cohort of measurements were impossible to be reached again during the second cohort of measurement, which happened 3 years later. Therefore, it was decided to identify and select new youths belonging to these categories, that was latter on engaged in non-formal education initiatives, to make sure that a representative sample of children and youths from these communities is included in the survey. The table 3 summarizes the age demographic composition of the DAP quantitative survey sample. As we can notice, during the first cohort of measurements most of the children were from 11 to 14 years of age.

Actually during the second cohort of measurement, which happened 3 years later, children's age grow to be between 15 to 18 years old. This is e a very important demographic component that should be taken under consideration during data analysis and interpretation. For more information please see Table 3 - DAP Research Participant Demographics – Age, at the end of this article.

## **4-Quantitative Results**

### **4.1-Discussions and Results**

Some of the most significant findings will be explained below. Surprisingly, form the first measurement cohort T1 to the second one T2, the results of the total DAP scores went down rather than an expected increase. As noted in the table 4, the total assets score in development assets profile was 44 during the first cohort of measurements T1 and it actually decreased to be 40, during the second cohort of measurements T2. We can notice, as well, that during the first cohort, 58% of children scored 'good' and 17% scored 'excellent'; whereas at the second cohort, 41% scored 'good' and 14% scored 'excellent'.

In the table 4 below, all the DAP results will be presented next to their relevant Research questions and DAP measurement indicators. As well, each of the assets scores that have decreased, is indicated below. See Table 4: Research questions and DAP measurement indicators results, for more information.

As well, in the table 5 below high DAP scores are defined as consistent response of "Often" and "Always" while low DAP scores are defined as consistent response of "Rarely" or "Sometimes". Actually, on each occasion that the Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) was administered, the data generally showed high positive responses with children reporting high scores.

Even if DAP scores slightly decreased during the second cohort of measurements, trends from qualitative data gathered suggest that children have been reporting an increased quality of well-being since the 2011. See Table 5: DAP Results desegregated by gender, for more information

There was a significant difference between girls and boys on the scores, with higher percentage of girls reporting high DAP scores in comparison to boys.

Therefore, it is a need to desegregate data and analyse separately responses for children depending on their gender and non-formal programme type of interventions could be more focused on these differences.

## 5-Discussion

As mentioned earlier in this article, after the quantitative data obtained through DAP questionnaire was analyzed, during the second cohort of measurements the need to explore farther and validate findings, especially in terms of impact analysis, emerged. Therefore, additional (FGDs) Focus Groups Discussions has been organized to be able to generate qualitative triangulation data on this matter.

After the quantitative analysis of DAP score, the Focus Groups Discussions and the individual interviews was slightly modified to be able to bring some more information on the reasons why DAP scores were lower than 3 years ago.

By matter of facts, there are several factors that could contribute to the lowering of DAP scores and it is unclear as to the precise reason in this context. Different FGDs has been organized with young people that took part in DAP survey, to validate the findings and to explore further the reasons behind DAP scores.

Youths has been presented with the results from the quantitative DAP survey and was asked to validate the quantitative findings (questions like “do you agree with the results?” and “why do you think that your friends are rating this things lower now compared to 3 years ago?” has been asked to them). The value of the discussion resulted in a deeper understanding of children’s and youth’s views about assets in their communities and their ideas has been analyzed together with DAP quantitative data.

During data interpretation stage both qualitative and quantitative findings and various factors have been analyzed together, to better understand DAP scores. There were mentioned several factors that could have contributed to the lowering of DAP scores.

All youths that took part at the DAP survey during the first cohort of measurements, was aged 13-18 years old and after 3 years their age were 16-21 years old. If we consider age, even as a standing alone factor, could be a very significant component in lowering of DAP scores. Actually, research show that older youths tend to be more realistic (and sometimes even much more pessimistic) while assessing and evaluating their own psycho-social reality, therefore their level of satisfaction according to those assets might have decreased.

As far as DAP is a self-report survey it is mostly based on individual perceptions of respondents according to these assets. As young people become more aware of what assets mean to them their self-reporting of internal and external assets have decreased.

Participating youth have perceived a greater sense of deprivation according to their reality and the situation of assets in their community, as a result of their engagement in different non-formal programme type of interventions, aiming mostly at making children and youths more aware around problematic issues and challenges in their realities.

As well, interventions were focused on strengthening assets to enable youngsters to succeed in their life. Therefore, young people have become more aware of what

assets they need, throughout the 3 years of interventions. As well, during the first cohort of measurements when DAP was administered, many youths respondents did not had any chance to “experience the need” for the existence of different assets and their value. As they mention during FGDs, many “developmental assets” was particularly new “concepts” for them.

The administration of the DAP assessment during the first cohort was conducted with children who were subsequently involved in different non-formal education and life-skills type of activities and interventions.

Targeted children since the first measurements had the opportunity to learn and be engaged in different non-formal education type of interventions and life skills curricula. As well, they have been brought together in several working groups within the school. They were engaged in student government structures that were dealing mostly with child-led type of initiatives, addressing services related to their schools, mostly based on the “child friendly school” methodology.

As well, other participating youths have been engaged in “peer educators” groups that have been working mostly on community service related issues – one intervention strategy based on the “life skills” curricula methodology. Additionally, many of them have been largely engaged in different summer activities as youth volunteers and/or as participants.

Therefore, at the second cohort of measurement, even if relevant discussions was held in terms of qualitative methods, it was not possible to connect the DAP findings with any specific programming intervention and/or particular activities.

Anyway, youths admitted that after participating in various “non-formal education” and awareness raising activities, they had a better understanding of the “real meaning” of different assets and therefore they might have perceived a greater sense of deprivation when asked again around them, during the second cohort of DAP measurements. Consequently, deeper understandings of these assets have resulted in lower scores.

As well, to be able to interpret these findings correctly, the fact that the time span between the first cohort of measurements and the second cohort of measurement was approximately 3 years, should be taking under consideration.

Researchers suggest that depending on the intensity of programming to which targeted youths are exposed, even a once a year surveying might be too infrequent to actually pick up positive changes that are occurring closer to the end of a short term project or intervention experience. Without a booster sessions after a project intervention, research suggests that initial gains often dissipate over time.

Thus, if the same targeted youths was surveyed at Time 1 in 2011 and then at Time 2 after 3 years, not immediately after the project intervention occurred, actually, it might be very difficult to see positive change simply because the initial gains eroded over time. Therefore, in this case any kind of conclusions around the effectiveness and the impact of the “non-formal education” type of programming might be irrelevant of incorrect.

Consequently, at the end of the qualitative data gathering process it was generally agreed that it is not possible to make impact analysis, based on the nature of data generated in this regard. Since the first cohort of measurements was conducted, only now tools and sampling guidance are developed on how, when, and with who to administer DAP, by Search Institute. Of course, those sampling guidance could be better utilised to increase the effectiveness of using this measurement tool for longitudinal type of studies, in the future.

## **6-Conclusion**

Even if it was not possible to articulate any impact analysis in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of the “non-formal education” type of interventions, it should be mentioned that actually, on each occasion that the Developmental Assets Profile (DAP) was administered, the data generally showed high positive responses, with children and youth reporting high scores. Therefore, even if there is no opportunity to promote any single “best model” or “right way” for launching and sustaining a school-wide asset building interventions and initiatives, however, certain dynamics appear to be essential.

The fact that the assets that have the lower scores was in the categories of “constructive use of time” “empowerment” and “positive identity” which indicate the need for building further these assets. Therefore, asset based interventions in Albania, generally require a proper representation of all the social systems and voices within the education system and in a larger community scale, always including youths, not only to gather information but also in planning and taking the lead in mobilizing the school and community’s asset-building capacities.

Both qualitative and quantitative data suggest that assets are crucial for the healthy development of youth, regardless of their school environment, community size, geographic region, gender, economic status, race, or ethnicity.

This article summarizes the extent to which Elbasan youths experience the Developmental Assets in two different moments in time. Even if, age is a very important factor in lowering DAP scores; anyway assets have a very strong relation with youth behaviour, resilience components, school and education outcomes and the overall well-being.

As noted earlier in this article, there was a significant difference between boys and girls and children not belonging to any minority groups and those from Roma/Gypsy minorities on the scores and girls report high DAP scores in comparison to boys. These results triangulated with qualitative results and secondary data reviews are compelling:

The more assets our adolescents have, the better. Youth with high asset levels are less likely to engage in high-risk behaviours (such as violence, school drop-outs, drugs abuse, suicide, etc.), and more likely to engage in thriving behaviours (such as helping others, doing well in school, and taking on leadership roles).

**REFERENCES**

Appleton, J., Christenson, S., & Furlong, M.J. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45, 369–386

Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A., Jr. (2006). Positive youth development: Theory, research, and applications. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., pp. 894–941). New York: John Wiley.

Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A. Jr. (with Hong, K. L., & Roehlkepartain, E. C.). (2006, November). Positive youth development so far: Core hypotheses and their implications for policy and practice. *Search Institute: Insights & Evidence*, 3(1), 1–13. Retrieved November 25, 2008.

Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., & Mannes, M. (2005). Developmentally-attentive communities. In R. Lerner & C. Fisher, *Applied Developmental Science Encyclopedia* (pp. 357–360). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Grobe, T, Niles, J and Weisstein, E (2001) *Helping all youth succeed: building youth development systems in our communities*. Boston, MA and education,commonwealth Corporation, 2001.Center for youth development.

Furlong, M., Ritchey, K., Lindsey, M. O'Brennan *Developing norms for the California Resilience Youth Development Module: internal Assets and school Resources subscales*, *The California School Psychologist*, 2009, Vol. 14 (pp 35-46)

Flanagan, Constance A., Lonnie R. Sherrod. "Youth Political Development: An Introduction." *Journal of Social Issues* 54.3 (1998): 447-56

Lerner, Richard, et. al. (2005) *Positive youth development: a view of the issues*. *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 2005, p10-16.

Leffert, N., Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Sharma, A., Drake, D., & Blyth, D. A. (1998). Developmental assets: Measurement and prediction of risk behaviors among adolescents. *Applied Developmental Science*, 2(4), 209–230.

Mannes, Marc, Roehlkepartain, Eugene C. and Benson, Peter (2005) *Unleashing the power of community to strengthen the well-being of children, youth, and families: an asset building approach*. *Child Welfare League of America* 233-250.

Pittman, K. J., O'Brien, R and Kimball, M., *Youth Development and Resiliency Research:*

*Making Connections to Substance Abuse Prevention*, February, 1993.

Scales, P. C., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (2004). Service to others: A gateway asset for school success and healthy development. In National Youth Leadership Council, *Growing to greatness: The State of Service-Learning Project* (pp. 26–32). St. Paul, MN: National Youth Leadership Council.

Scales, P. C., Roehlkepartain, E. C., Neal, M., Kielsmeier, J. C., & Benson, P. L. (2006). Reducing academic achievement gaps: The role of community service and service-learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 29(1), 38–60.

Scales, P. C., & Sesma, A., Jr. (2003, August). Developmental Assets reduce the driving plus alcohol mix. *Health in Action*. Kent, Ohio: American School Health Association

**Endnotes**

Sources: Council of Europe, Youth policy in Albania, July 2010; Facts about Albania (2009). According to Benard & Slade, external resource assets are e.g., support from teacher, parents, peers and other community members etc. According to Benard & Slade, internal assets are e.g., ability to solve problems, self-worthiness and self-esteem or the ability to empathize and connect with others. Search Institute is a US-based independent, nonprofit, nonsectarian organization whose mission is to provide leadership, knowledge, and resources to promote healthy children, youth and communities. Search Institute Website <http://www.search-institute.org>

<b>Research Questions - Development Assets Profile Indicators</b>				
<b>DAP Total score Indicators</b> - measuring the mean total score within all the asset categories				
<p><b>Internal Assets</b> - measuring 20 internal assets that reflect internal values, skills and beliefs that young people need to fully engage with and function in the world around them. This type of wisdom is necessary for young people to make responsible decisions about the present and future measure internal qualities that guide positive choices and foster a sense of confidence, passion, and purpose.</p> <p>This framework includes 4 categories:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Social Competencies,</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Positive Identity,</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Commitment to Learning</b></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><b>Positive Values,</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Social Competencies,</b>	<b>Positive Identity,</b>	<b>Commitment to Learning</b>	<b>Positive Values,</b>
<b>Social Competencies,</b>	<b>Positive Identity,</b>			
<b>Commitment to Learning</b>	<b>Positive Values,</b>			



<p>Indicator 6 *The strength of <b>empowerment</b> asset category as reported by youth (boys and girls) 12-18 years of age</p>	<p><b>2. Empowerment</b> —valuing of young people by their community; having opportunities to contribute to others. For this to occur, they must be safe and feel secure.</p>
<p>Indicator 7 *The strength of <b>boundaries and expectations</b> asset category as reported by youth (boys and girls) 12-18 years of age</p>	<p><b>3. Boundaries and Expectations</b> —Young people need to know what is expected of them and whether activities and behaviors are "in bounds" and/or "out of bounds."</p>
<p>Indicator 8 The strength of the <b>support</b> asset category as reported by youth 12-18 years of age.</p>	<p><b>4. Support</b>—Young people need to experience support, care, and love from their families, neighbors, and many others. They need organizations and institutions that provide positive, supportive environments.</p>

**Table 2 - DAP Research Participant Demographics – Gender and Ethnicity**

	Elbasan T1		Elbasan T2		<i>Total</i>			
	Total	Female	Total	Female	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male%</i>	<i>Female %</i>
Gender	296	190	307	190	<b>603</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>36.98%</b>	<b>63.02%</b>
	Non-minority	Minority	Non-minority	Minority	<b>Non-minority</b>	<b>Minority</b>	<b>Non-minority %</b>	<b>Minority %</b>
Ethnicity	287	9	283	24	<b>570</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>94.53%</b>	<b>5.47%</b>

**Table 3 - DAP Research Participant Demographics - Age**

<i>Age</i>	<i>Elbasan 1</i>	<i>Elbasan 2</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Total %</i>
11	59	0	59	9.8%
12	50	6	59	9.8%
13	60	6	66	10.9%
14	59	34	93	15.4%
15	18	40	58	9.6%
16	19	62	81	13.4%
17	25	75	100	16.6%
18	6	77	83	13.8%
19	0	5	5	0.8%
20	0	2	2	0.3%
<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b>13.36149</b>	<b>16.3355</b>	<b>14.8485</b>	
<b><i>Total</i></b>	<b>296</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Table 4: Research questions and DAP measurement indicators results.**

<b>DAP indicators.</b>	<b>Elbasan T1 results</b>	<b>Elbasan T2 results</b>
<b>DAP total assets score indicator:</b> The strengths of the assets in which youth live, learn and work as reported by youth	Total assets score in development assets is “ <b>good</b> ”44 points	Total assets score in development assets is “ <b>fair</b> ” 40 - <b>decreased</b>
	16.9% of children scored excellent in total development assets score	13.7% of children scored excellent in total development assets score - <b>decreased</b>

category as reported by youth 12-18 years of age.	50% of children scored “good” in <b>positive values</b>	33.9% of children scored “good” in <b>positive values - decreased</b>
	17% of children scored “excellent” in <b>positive values</b>	15.5% of children scored “excellent” in <b>positive values - decreased</b>
Indicator 5 *The strength of <b>constructive use of time</b> asset category as reported by youth (boys and girls) 12-18 years of age	Total score in category of <b>constructive use of time</b> is "fair" (17points).	Total score in category of <b>constructive use of time</b> is "fair" (18points).
	17.6% of children scored “good” in <b>constructive use of time</b>	11.1% of children scored “good” in <b>constructive use of time - decreased</b>
	5.4% of children scored “excellent” in <b>constructive use of time</b>	16.6% of children scored “excellent” in <b>constructive use of time</b>
Indicator 6 *The strength of <b>empowerment</b> asset category as reported by youth (boys and girls) 12-18 years of age	Total score in category of <b>empowerment</b> is "good" (21points).	Total score in category of <b>empowerment</b> is "fair" (20points).- <b>decreased</b>
	37.5% of children scored “good” in <b>empowerment</b>	32.2% of children scored “good” in <b>empowerment - decreased</b>
	14.5% of children scored “excellent” in <b>empowerment</b>	12.4% of children scored “excellent” in <b>empowerment – decreased</b>
Indicator 7 *The strength of <b>boundaries and expectations</b> asset category as reported by youth (boys and girls) 12-18 years of age	Total score in category of <b>boundaries and expectations</b> is "good" (25points).	Total score in category of <b>boundaries and expectations</b> is "good" (22points). - <b>decreased</b>
	28.7% of children scored “good” in <b>boundaries and expectations</b>	30.3% of children scored “good” in <b>boundaries and expectations</b>
	54.1% of children scored “excellent” in <b>boundaries and expectations</b>	27% of children scored “excellent” in <b>boundaries and expectations – decreased</b>

Indicator 8 The strength of the <b>support</b> asset category as reported by youth 12-18 years of age.	Total score in category of <b>Support</b> is "good" (24points).	Total score in category of <b>Support</b> is "good" (21 points). - <b>decreased</b>
	37.8% of children interviewed scored "good" in the category of <b>support</b>	28.7% of children interviewed scored "good" in the category of <b>support</b> - <b>decreased</b>
	45.6% of children interviewed scored "excellent" in the category of <b>support</b>	21.2% of children interviewed scored "excellent" in the category of <b>support</b> - <b>decreased</b>

Table 5: DAP Results desegregated by gender.

Group	% High DAP scores	% Low DAP scores
All Girls	74.0	26.0
All Boys	65.0	35.0