



EURYKA

Reinventing Democracy in Europe: Youth Doing Politics in Times of Increasing Inequalities

Guidelines for the Analysis of Policy Documents (Deliverable 1.1)

Workpackage 1: Policy Analysis

Workpackage Leading Institution: UU

Submission due date: February 2017

Actual submission date: March 2017



This document consists of guidelines for **assessment of institutional arrangements, public policies and practices towards promoting youth participation (online and offline) and inclusion**. The UN Children’s Rights Charter (article 12) notes that children (and young people) have a right to participate in making the decisions that affect their lives and requires adults to listen to them and give their opinions due weight in decision making. In addition, European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life (May 2003), notes that youth participation should not be an end in itself, but a means of achieving positive changes in young people’s lives.¹ These international guidelines form a basis for assessing the institutional arrangements, public policies, initiatives and practices towards youth participation and inclusion in this project.

For the sake of clarity, the youth is considered here as young adults – 18-35² years old, although the policies and initiatives analysed might also target younger cohorts (e.g., education policies, school organization). Participation in politics is seen in a broad sense, referring to the ways young people engage in forming the opinions and taking actions to bring about social change (cf. Cammaerts et al. 2016:4). The United Nations General Assembly sees youth participation in four separate areas (1995):

- in employment and work in general, to economic development, eliminating poverty, building a stable economic situation in a society, a region or for young people as a group;
- in politics, which relates to authorities and governments, public policies, exercising power, the influence on the distribution of resources at different levels;
- in the life of a local community, addressing local problems and challenges;
- in culture, which relates to different forms of art and expression (visual arts, music, film, dance, etc.).

The following guidelines help country teams to assess institutional arrangements, public policies and practices so that the result of the WPs is a comparative dataset of indicators which describe youth participation and inclusion in nine countries under study. These indicators will be complemented by the statistical measures which describe youth participation and inequality in the examined countries, for example youth unemployment, general Gini index (see example of Table 1

¹ http://partispace.eu/cms/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Have_your_say_en.pdf

² The range can be obviously discussed. UNESCO defines youth as of age 15-24, while in studies about political activism look at young adults at age of 18-35 (e.g., Smets 2016).

and Table 2 in appendix). This data will be taken from sources like the Quality of Government, OECD, Eurostat, and Youth Development Index.³ This part is fixed by the UU. All data will be presented in the final integrated report and

The policies, practices and instructional arrangements of interest for WP1 are the ones which define two dimensions of a structure which could be called as “*youth participatory and inclusion regime*”. This is a set of general opportunities for political activism (often known as political opportunity structure) and inclusion of different vulnerable groups in society at large. The idea is similar to the well-known *welfare state regimes* (Esping-Andersen 1990), *citizenship regimes* (Koopmans 2005) or the *youth unemployment regimes* (Cinalli & Giugni 2013), which describe the characteristics of different institutional settings. For example, the youth employment regime describes which kinds of opportunities young people have for participation in labour market. The *youth participatory and inclusion regime* is defined by two dimensions (see Figure 1). The first refers to **opportunities**, which is defined by policies and regulations which promote or hinder youth participation. The second refers to **social inclusion** and describes whether the system addresses or exaggerates, or even creates, societal inequalities (e.g., decreases or increases poverty among already vulnerable groups like minorities, people with disabilities, immigrants). In order to determine the youth participatory and inclusion regime for every country, we have listed a set of indicators and sub-indicators, which all are evaluated in terms of opportunities and inclusion on a scale from +1 to -1.

³ See report at <http://cmydiproduct.uksouth.cloudapp.azure.com/sites/default/files/2016-10/2016%20Global%20Youth%20Development%20Index%20and%20Report.pdf>

Figure 1. Dimensions which define the youth participation and inclusion regimes

Social inclusion	Opportunities		
	Closed (-1)	Neutral/ ambivalent (0)	Open (+1)
Address inequalities (+1)	No opportunities for your participation but the issues of inequalities are well-addressed		Large opportunities for youth participation and the issues of inequalities are well-addressed (high inclusion)
Neutral/ambivalent (0)			
Exaggerate or create inequalities (-1)	No opportunities for youth political participation and the system exaggerates/creates inequalities		Large opportunities for youth participation, but the system exaggerates/creates inequalities (low inclusion)

Every **indicator** should be described by maximum 1 page and each team should **suggest** a numeric score to summarize each evaluation. The score is from -1...0...1 (with a step 0.25), where -1 refers to total closure of opportunity structure and +1 refers to total openness. In the case of social inclusion, -1 refers to exaggeration and creation of inequalities and +1 to a system which addresses and works for decreasing various inequalities (i.e. maximum social inclusion). If the policy, regulation, initiative or institutional arrangement lacks any extra positive or negative effects for young adults or vulnerable groups or if there is no information available for this specific indicator, then the suggested score should be 0 - “neutral/ ambivalent”.

When suggesting the score, one could always start with the neutral position and investigate whether the condition mentioned as an indicator or sub-indicator is fulfilled. If the required policy, institution or initiative is present and fully implemented (or is well-functioning) then the suggested score should be 1, but if the indicator is present and has not been implemented or is not functioning well in practice, then the suggested score should be either 0.75 or 0.25, depending on the degree of implementation. If the condition is not fulfilled (e.g., age of candidates at parliamentary election is over, and not below 18), then the proposed score should be -1. The score could be zero when there is no information about it or the situation is somewhere between the two extremes (for example, the age of candidates is 18 or above).

If there is no pre-given list of sub-indicators, as is often the case for evaluation the social inclusion, then the proposition of a score could be based on some average value of evaluated policies. For example, if there are three policies which all address the inequalities of vulnerable groups then the

score is 1, but if there are two policies which exaggerate the inequalities and one which addresses these, then the proposed score for the indicator could be -0.75. Thus, every time some legislation, policy, initiative or institution is considered to hinder the opportunities of young people or to exaggerate inequalities, the score should be negative rather than positive. If the team considers that some sub-indicators are more important than other sub-indicators in their particular country, then this must be mentioned in the description.

It is obvious that all the scores will be somewhat arbitrary and based on teams' judgment, but this will be handled by using **a relative score** in the final integrated report. Based on provided descriptions and scores the countries will be ordered, and eventually the score +1 is given to country(ies) which provide the most open opportunities for, for example, electoral participation of young adults. The country(ies) with the "worst" conditions will get the score -1.

In addition to these scales, the analysis has to account for within-country variation which is particularly relevant in federations and countries with strong regional autonomy (Germany, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK). If there are **significant well-known regional differences**, it is suggested to code these regions separately and describe it together with the general description of the indicator. For example, if electoral participation is more open in Scotland than in England (due to the fact that 16 years old had a right to participate in the independence referenda), then the UK team would have two separate measures for this particular indicator (1.a for Scotland & 1.b for England). If regional differences are not very large, then this should be mentioned in the description but separate coding of the indicator is needed.

List of indicators:

No	Indicator	Sub-indicator	Description	Opportunity score	Social inclusion score
1	Electoral participation	a. Voting age		Voting age is <18 for some (e.g., local) elections; age for candidates is <18 for some (e.g., local) elections	Any policy, program or initiative which addresses the problems of vulnerable groups electoral participation (e.g., voter registration) increases the score; (e.g., if there are rules which help people with disabilities, or if there are gender or minority quotas). Restrictions for voting, like the ones for people in jail, would decrease the score. A system which does not address nor exaggerate inequalities = 0.
		b. Political parties		Simple versus complicated rules for setting up a political party; political parties have/ do not have youth branches.	
		c. Voter registration		A simple system for voter registration or a system which has a complicated system for voter registration after moving.	
		d. E-voting		opportunity for electronic voting (i.e. no need to go physically to voting-booth).	
2	protest participation⁴ (off-line)			Every legal or formal restriction for protest mobilization (high fees, complicated bureaucracy, organizers kept responsible if the event turns violent or disruptive, prohibition of covered faces) decreases the score. Very strict rules against graffiti would also decrease the score. If the opposite applies, e.g., lower fees for youth groups, the score should increase	Any policy or initiative which addresses the problems of vulnerable groups (e.g., lower fees for groups representing people with disabilities or if there are state-agencies which help migrants with required paperwork for mobilization) increases the score; hinders for vulnerable groups decrease the score
3	civic participation	a. Funding		Presence & functioning of national funding schemes which support youth groups or youth oriented groups (e.g., Scouts), both the very formal and more loose organizations	Presence and functioning of policies or state initiatives which simplify civic activism of vulnerable groups increases the score. Are there any national training programs for

⁴ Here you could have a look at the LIVEWHAT project's report D.2.3 (the section about political rights)

		b. space, room		Presence of any national or many local programs or initiatives which provide space for youth or youth oriented groups	teaching how to run or organize civil society organisations for ethnic minorities or people with disabilities? Rules which hinder LGTB groups decrease the score.
		c. registration, rules		Simple rules for registration and maintaining of a civil society organization	
4	Internet & Communication Technology (ICT) use⁵	a. electronic/digital systems		Presence of a national electronic systems, which is used for communication with state authorities (e.g., applying for welfare services via website, e-health or e-school systems)	Presence & functioning of national policy that schools teach ICT skills increase the score. Presence of state-funded programs for ITC courses for vulnerable (poor, disabled) groups increase the score. If state's main websites do not have the function for automated reading [for blind people] the score decreases .
		b. Social media		If more than half of the national agencies (e.g., government departments) have a Facebook pages/use Twitter, it increases the score (less than half decreases score).	
5	Education and school governance	a. school elections		Presence & functioning of elections at (public) schools for pupils' representatives (by class or the for entire school); ; mock-elections (voting for political parties) at primary schools	Totally free primary (not pre-school), secondary, and higher education increases the score, while costs at each level decrease the score. ⁶ A system where pupils with disabilities can study at the same school with other pupils increase the score; national initiatives for increasing higher education of disabled groups increase the score. Challenges for LGTB groups at school/university decrease the score.
		b. university elections		Elections at university for student representatives	
		c. School governance		Inclusion of pupils' or student representatives to school/university governance is well implemented and functioning	

⁵ Here we can use different statistics for the real use of ITC from the EU and OECD, so there is no need to discuss these in description (see e.g., <http://www.oecd.org/sti/broadband/oecdbroadbandportal.htm>)

⁶ Here one can have a look at the Livewhat report (Deliverable 2.2 and 2.3)

6	Civic education ⁷			Presence and functioning <i>compulsory</i> civic education in public and private schools increases the score. The more age groups are covered, the higher the score. The score could be decreased if there are known problems of providing civic education (e.g., lack of teachers, frequently changing literature).	If civic education curricula and content addresses the issues of inequalities the score should be higher, otherwise it should be lower; if civic education is accessible to vulnerable groups (e.g., pupils with disabilities), then score should be higher
7	Youth agency ⁸	a.youth law		Presence & functioning of a specific law/ policy regulating youth related issues (youth law)	If the youth law or other relevant law regulating youth issues addresses issues of inequalities such as poverty, unemployment or if the youth agency deals with issues of inequalities, then the scores for addressing inequalities is higher.
		b.youth agency		A state authority or agency for youth issues (e.g., in Sweden there is The Swedish Agency for Youth and Civil Society).	
8	Labour market policies ⁹	a.Youth employment policy		Presence & functioning of a specific policy about youth employment (focus on <u>keeping</u> youth at work)	If the present labour market policies are also generally more inclusive of vulnerable groups (immigrants, people with disabilities, former criminals etc.), this increases the score. E.g., financial incentive structures for employers to hire vulnerable groups. Policies which hinder the participation of vulnerable groups in labour market (bureaucracy for hiring) decrease the score.
		b.youth employment agency		Presence & functioning of a specific state agency for dealing with the issues of youth employment	
		c.access to labour market		Policies, initiatives which promote the <u>access</u> of young people to labour market; e.g., specific programs for aiding youngsters leaving foster care/ care houses to find employment. Focus on getting youth to work)	

⁷ Some useful info is in Hoskins et al. (2015) “Civic Competence of Youth in Europe: Measuring Cross National Variation Through the Creation of a Composite Indicator” Social Indicators Research, 123:431–457. DOI 10.1007/s11205-014-0746-z

⁸ Information could be found at <http://www.youthpolicy.org/nationalyouthpolicies/> for every country

⁹ In addition to Livewhat reports, some useful info could be found at <http://www.style-research.eu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/STYLE-Working-Paper-WP10.1a-Tracing-the-interface-between-numerical-flexibility-and-income-security-for-European-youth-during-the-economic-crisis.pdf>

9	Unemployment policies		A policy which simplifies the lives of or provides help/ opportunities for young unemployed - unemployment benefits, financial incentive structures for employers to hire young unemployed.	Policies which address the unemployment status of vulnerable groups increase the score.
10	Housing policies		Presence and implementation of any specific policy or state agency addressing the housing problems of young people increases the score. (e.g., simple rules for loans, special housing-allowances for young people). Policies decreasing the opportunity to find housing and policies which increase real estate prices and rent decrease the score. Specific national program for young homeless people should increase the score.	If housing policies are also generally more inclusive of vulnerable groups (people with disabilities, migrants, former criminals etc.) then even the scores for addressing inequalities are higher. Policies decreasing the housing mobility and high real estate prices (including rent) decrease the score.
11	Transport policies		Presence and implementation of following policies increase the score: -any specific scheme which lowers the costs of transportation for young people - a policy in favour of the bicycle roads (lines)	If these schemes also address vulnerable groups (e.g., poor, disabilities) then the score for addressing inequalities should also be higher. Good/ bad accessibility of public transport for disabled people increases/ decreases the score.
12	Family policies	a.birth control	Presence and implementation of - legal and free abortion - public funding for condoms, birth control bills etc.	If these policies also address vulnerable groups (minorities, migrants, drug-addicts), it should increase the score.
		b.parental leave	Family allowances/ parental leave is available to teen-families	

		c.Children's rights		A legislation requiring to account for children's voice in separation process (protection of child's rights)	
13	Health policies	a.youth clinique		Presence and functioning of public youth medical centres	If these policies also address vulnerable groups (minorities, migrants, drug-addicts), it should increase the score.
		b.psychological aid		- state funded phones for young people/ children in trouble	
		c.gambling		Policy prohibition of gambling <18	
		d. alcohol		Policy prohibiting selling alcohol to <18	
14	Culture initiatives	a.subsidies		Presence & implementation of any specific scheme which lowers the costs of cultural events (theatre plays, cinema, museums) for young people	If these also address minorities, migrants, disabled people, then the score for addressing inequalities should also be higher.
		b.cultural education		Presence & functioning of public schools/classes for learning to play an instrument, theatre classes etc. for children and young adults.	
15	Religious initiatives			State (not church) support for youth religious activism <i>regardless</i> the religion increases the score.	If these also address minorities, migrants, disabled people, then the score for addressing inequalities should also be higher.
16	Penitentiary regulations¹⁰			The minimal criminal responsibility age below European average (14 years) decreases the score, higher number increases the score.	If these policies also address vulnerable groups (people with disabilities, minorities) it could increase the score.

The materials required for writing the country report and evaluating the indicators could be chosen by country teams, but these should be noted in the report and stored (in a form of .zip file that could be uploaded to intranet).

¹⁰ Some useful info at <https://www.crin.org/en/home/ages/europe>

References

- Cammaerts, B., Bruter, M., Banaji, S., Harrison, S., & Anstead, N. (2016). Introduction: The Challenge of Youth Participation. In *Youth Participation in Democratic Life* (pp. 1-15). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Cinalli, M., & Giugni, M. (2013). New challenges for the welfare state: The emergence of youth unemployment regimes in Europe?. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 22(3), 290-299.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). 4 The Three Political Economies of the Welfare State. *International journal of sociology*, 20(3), 92-123.
- Hoskins et al. (2015) "Civic Competence of Youth in Europe: Measuring Cross National Variation Through the Creation of a Composite Indicator" *Social Indicators Research*, 123:431–457.
- Koopmans, R. (Ed.). (2005). *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe* (Vol. 25). U of Minnesota Press.
- Smets, K. (2016). Revisiting the political life-cycle model: later maturation and turnout decline among young adults. *European Political Science Review*, 8(02), 225-249.

Appendix for the final integrated report will be filled by the UU team.

From the EU report “Evaluation of legislation, policy, and practice on child participation in the European Union” (2015)¹¹ we know that UNCRC Article 12 have been included into the national constitution (Germany, Spain, Poland), mentioned in a specific Children’s Act (Poland, Sweden, UK) or reflected in a wider set of legislation (France, Italy, Greece, Sweden).¹² There are following regional and municipal child and youth structures:

Table 1. Child and youth councils and boards

Country	Type of forum	Founded	Age	Coverage
Germany	youth parliaments/youth council	1985		Partial, local
Greece	Local Youth Councils	2006	15-30	Partial
France	Children’s Town Councils	1979	7-25	2500 country wide
Italy	Youth Municipal Councils	1997		Partial
Poland	Youth Advisory Boards Youth Councils	1990		Partial, local mainly
Spain	Municipal Forum of the Principality of Asturias for Children Rights			Region Asturias
Sweden	Youth Councils		0-17	Every municipality
UK	Youth Councils			?

Table 2. some simple indicators for the latest measurement year

	YDI Score 2016	Youth unemployment	Youth illiteracy	Youth turnout last elections	Number of <30 in parliament	Gini coefficient	...
France	0.795						
Germany	0.894						
Greece	0.662						
Italy	0.726						
Poland	0.681						
Spain	0.776						
Switzerland	0.837						
Sweden	0.810						
UK	0.837						

Sources:

¹¹ The document includes many great examples from different countries and could be used as a source for country reports.

¹² Switzerland is not covered by EU reports, so here we would need extra knowledge