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What is the PIDOP Project?

• PIDOP is a *multidisciplinary research project* funded by the European Commission under the Seventh Framework Programme

• There are *nine research teams* participating in the project:
  – University of Surrey, UK (Coordinating institution)
  – University of Liège, Belgium
  – Masaryk University, Czech Republic
  – University of Jena, Germany
  – University of Bologna, Italy
  – University of Porto, Portugal
  – Örebro University, Sweden
  – Ankara University, Turkey
  – Queen’s University Belfast, UK

• The project has run for three years from **2009-2012**

• The project formally ends on April 30th 2012

• But – the analysis of data and the writing up of results will be continuing for a very long time to come!
The aims of the PIDOP project

• The project has been examining *the factors which influence civic and political participation* in *nine national contexts*: Belgium, Czech Republic, England, Germany, Italy, Northern Ireland, Portugal, Sweden and Turkey.

• In the project, we have focused on *three different levels of factors*, to see how they impact on civic and political participation:
  - *Macro level contextual factors* (e.g., historical, political, electoral and policy factors)
  - *Proximal social factors* (e.g., family, educational and media factors)
  - *Psychological factors* (e.g., motivational, cognitive, attitudinal and identity factors)

• We have focused our main attention on *four groups of individuals* which the European Commission identified as being *at risk of political disengagement*:
  - Young people
  - Women
  - Minorities
  - Migrants
• The project has been examining the differences, as well as the relationship, between *political* and *civic* participation

• By *political participation*, we mean:
  – Activity that has the intent or effect of influencing either regional, national or supranational governance, either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy, or indirectly by influencing the selection of individuals who make that policy (after Verba, Schlozman & Brady, 1995)

• Under this heading, we are including:
  – *Conventional forms of activity* involving electoral processes (e.g., voting, election campaigning, running for election, etc.)
  – *Non-conventional forms of activity* which occur outside electoral processes (e.g., signing petitions, participating in political demonstrations, displaying a symbol or sign representing support for a political cause, membership of political campaigning organizations, etc.)
• By *civic participation*, we mean:
  – Voluntary activity focused on helping others, achieving a public good, or participating in the life of a community, including work undertaken either alone or in cooperation with others in order to effect change (after Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins & Delli Carpini, 2006)
• Under this heading, we are including a variety of activities such as:
  – Working collectively to solve a community problem
  – Belonging to community organizations
  – Attending meetings about issues of concern
  – Raising money for charity
  – Helping neighbours
  – Consumer activism (boycotting and buycotting)
The objectives of the PIDOP project

The project had five main objectives:

1. To *audit existing theory and research* on civic and political participation in the disciplines of Politics, Sociology, Social Policy, Psychology and Education

2. To *audit and analyse existing policies* on civic and political participation within Europe

3. To *identify empirically the factors and processes which drive civic and political participation* within Europe

4. To *develop a theoretical understanding* of the factors and processes responsible for civic and political participation

5. To *formulate new evidence-based policy and practice recommendations* for key stakeholders at regional, national and European levels
The structure of the project

• The theoretical and empirical work in the project was broken up into a series of separate *work packages*:
  – Work Package 2: Collate and analyse current policies
  – Work Package 3: Development of a political theory of participation
  – Work Package 4: Development of a psychological theory of participation
  – Work Package 5: Modelling existing survey data
  – Work Package 6: Processes in the co-construction of citizenship in different life contexts
  – Work Package 7: Theoretical integration and practical recommendations

• In addition there are two ‘project management’ work packages:
  – Work Package 1: Consortium management and coordination activities
  – Work Package 8: Dissemination activities
Work Package 2

• WP3 was responsible for auditing and analysing existing policies on civic and political participation within Europe, particularly participation among youth, women, minorities and migrants.

• This work package was completed in the first year of the project.

• Some of the findings from WP2 are given in the PIDOP Policy Briefing Paper No. 1 (which you will find in your conference registration packs).

• In addition, if you want to know more about the details and the findings of WP2, please attend PIDOP Symposium 1 which takes place later this morning after the coffee break, which has been convened by Cristiano Bee and Roberta Guerrina – in this symposium, some of the findings from WP2 will be reported and discussed.
Work Package 3

- WP3 was responsible for *auditing existing theory and research* on civic and political participation, particularly in the disciplines of Politics, Sociology and Social Policy.

- WP3 was also responsible for *developing a political theory* of civic and political participation based on macro-level contextual factors (i.e., political, electoral, historical, economic and societal factors).
  - In practice, WP3 has been developing political theories.

- In auditing existing theory and research, WP3 has surveyed the literatures on:
  - The contextual determinants of political participation and political opportunity structure.
  - Political and civic participation in migrants and minorities, women and youth.
WP3 has identified a very large range of macro-level contextual factors which impact on participation

- Degree of **fiscal, administrative and political decentralisation** of the state
- Number of **independent veto points or power centres** in the political system
- **Open vs. closed institutional systems** (number of access points for social movement organizations and other non-state actors to exert influence)
- Presence of **mobilising channels**
- Configuration of and **relationships between actors and parties within the political system** (including degree of political fragmentation, electoral closeness, etc.)
- **Prevailing strategies**: procedures used by members of the political system to deal with challengers (confrontational and polarising vs. facilitative and cooperative)
- **Discursive opportunity structure** (prevailing discourse about acceptability and legitimacy of different forms of action)
• **Rules and design of the electoral system**
  – Proportional representation vs. mixed member proportional system vs. first-past-the-post
  – Whether voting takes place on a rest day or working day
  – Whether voting is compulsory or voluntary
  – Holding concurrent elections
  – Registration requirements
  – Granting of voting rights to third country nationals at local, regional and/or national level

• **Campaign spending**

• **Population** size, concentration, stability, homogeneity and cohesion

• **Rules for granting nationality and citizenship** to migrants

• Levels of **racism and discrimination** against minorities and migrants

• **Treatment of minorities and migrants in the public sphere**, and the availability of consultative channels or bodies

• Availability of **organizational and community networks**

• **Historical longevity of democratic traditions** in a country

• Level of **economic development** of a country

• **Cultural and religious heritage** of the country and of the country of origin
WP3 also examined the inter-relationships between subsets of factors

• Models have been produced of how different subsets of macro and micro factors might inter-relate
• For example, Ondřej Císař and Kateřina Vráblíková have proposed the following model of political participation:
WP3 has also produced a theoretically driven typology of forms of participation

- Joakim Ekman and Erik Amnå have developed a new typology of political and civic engagement and participation – this typology aims to capture all forms of relevant attitudes and behaviour
- The typology considers participation at both the individual level and the collective level
- It also discriminates between latent and manifest forms of political behaviour
- The typology also incorporates a non-participation category, in order to capture the full spectrum of participation
- The non-participation category is further divided into two in order to discriminate between those that are apolitical and those that are antipolitical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joakim Ekman and Erik Amnå’s typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-participation (disengagement)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active forms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual forms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively avoiding reading newspapers or watching TV when it comes to political issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid talking about politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving politics as disgusting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collective forms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate non-political lifestyles, e.g. hedonism, consumerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In extreme cases: random acts of non-political violence (riots), reflecting frustration, alienation or social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life-style related involvement: music, group identity, clothes, et cetera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example: veganism, right-wing Skinhead scene, or left-wing anarcho-punk scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Package 4

- WP4 was responsible for **auditing existing theory and research** on civic and political participation, particularly in the disciplines of Psychology, Education and Political Science.
- WP4 was also responsible for **developing a psychological theory** of civic and political participation based on both **proximal social factors** (i.e., familial, educational, peer group and media factors) and **psychological factors** (i.e., motivational, attentional, cognitive, attitudinal, identity and behavioural factors).
  - In practice, WP3 has been developing psychological **theories**.
- In auditing existing theory and research, WP4 surveyed the literatures on a wide range of different social and psychological factors.
Social factors audited by WP4

- **Family factors** (parental socioeconomic status, parental education, parental ethnicity, parenting style, family communication style, political talk in the family home, parental political party preferences, having a daily newspaper in the home, having a large number of books in the home, parental civic volunteering, etc.)
- **Peer group factors** (positive peer relationships, degree of peer group integration and solidarity, peers' political beliefs and behaviour, etc.)
- **Education factors** (the contents of the school curriculum, open classroom climate, training in letter-writing, participation in school or college councils, school-based community service, etc.)
- **Organizational membership factors** (quantity and quality of participation experiences, whether organizations offer roles, whether organizations provide opportunities for activities such as public speaking, debate and community service, etc.)
• **Media factors** (attending to news on the television and in newspapers, general levels of television watching, internet usage, etc.)

• **Workplace factors** (labour force participation, workplace experiences, trade union membership, etc.)

• **Religion factors** (religious affiliation, religiosity, membership of a place of worship, etc.)

• **Other factors specific to ethnic minorities and migrants** (perceived context of reception, personal experiences of racism and discrimination, involvement in the politics of the country of origin, ethnic group norms and expectations concerning civic and political participation, etc.)
Psychological factors audited by WP4

Cognitive factors

- Political interest
- Political attentiveness
- Political knowledge
- Opinionation
- Political sophistication
- Beliefs about good citizenship
- Beliefs about social justice
- Cost-benefit calculations concerning participation

Efficacy and trust factors

- Internal efficacy
- External efficacy
- Collective efficacy
- Institutional trust
- Trust in politicians
- Trust in form of national government
- Social trust
Motivations and emotions

- Personal motivations for taking political action (e.g., sense of civic duty, personal self-enhancement, etc.)
- Satisfaction derived from acts of participation
- Militancy (willingness/readiness to take action)
- Emotions elicited by civic and political issues (e.g., anger)
- Identity threat
- Personality dispositions

Identifications (both affective and cognitive dimensions)

- National identification
- Ethnic identification
- Religious identification and religiosity
- Gender identification
- Local community identification
- Ideological identification
- Political movement identification
Psychological factors involving perceptions of the social environment

- Perceptions of injustice
- Perceptions of discrimination and exclusion
- Perceptions of barriers to participation
- Perceptions of social norms
- Perceptions of social support, social opinion support and social action support
- Perceptions of personal mobilisation by others
- Sense of community, including:
  - Sense of belonging
  - Sense of personal influence
  - Sense of fulfilment of personal needs
  - Sense of emotional connectedness with others
Forms of civic and political participation identified by WP4 as being linked to specific social and psychological precursors

- Voting
- Other forms of conventional political participation
- Legal forms of collective non-conventional political participation
- Legal forms of individual non-conventional political participation
- Illegal forms of collective non-conventional political participation
- Illegal forms of individual non-conventional political participation
- Net activism
- Volunteering
- Other forms of civic participation
- Political interest
- Political attentiveness

- WP4 has also taken note of Ekman and Amnå’s typology
Theoretical models developed by WP4

• As in the case of WP3, WP4 has also developed a range of theoretical models of participation
• These models focus particularly on the social and psychological predictors of the different forms of participation
Dimensions of a psychosocial model of participation
(Bruna Zani, Elvira Cicognani, Cinzia Albanesi)

BOX 1: PERSONAL & DEMOGRAPHIC
   gender, age, status as immigrant, education, language, SES, religiosity

BOX 3: MOTIVATIONS AND GOALS
   interest, motivations to participation, egoistic vs pro-sociality/altruism, dispositions to be politically active in the future

BOX 4: EMOTIONS
   Negative: dissatisfaction, anger, worry, fear of consequences
   Positive: satisfaction, happiness, well-being

BOX 5: SOCIAL IDENTITIES & SENSE OF BELONGING
   sense of community, strength of identification, perceived discrimination

BOX 6: PERCEIVED POWER/INFLUENCE
   self and collective political efficacy, empowerment, perceived social influence and effectiveness of participation, competences (actual and perceived) for participatory actions

BOX 2: (SOCIAL) CONSTRUCTION OF PARTICIPATION
   knowledge, citizenship conceptions, beliefs, attitudes, trust in political institutions, social representations

BOX 7: PERCEIVED OPPORTUNITIES AND BARRIERS
   barriers to participation, peer, family and religious contexts and subjective norms

BOX 8: ENGAGEMENT & PARTICIPATION EXPERIENCES
   actual experiences (latent and manifest) & their quality
Individual and environmental influences on the development of participation (Nick Emler)

Individual characteristics: Demographics. Psychological characteristics (Ability; Personality; Self-efficacy; Self-concept certainty; etc)
Social characteristics (Network centrality; Group/organisational memberships); Etc

Interest/Civic duty → Attentiveness → Knowledge → Opinionation → Ideological identity → Political actor

Environmental factors: Family environment (socialisation); Education; Opportunity Structure; Community social capital; Mobilization efforts; etc.
An integrative model of the macro and social factors driving political and civic participation (Martyn Barrett)
An integrative model of the psychological factors driving political and civic participation (Martyn Barrett)
Work Package 5

• WP5 was responsible for *analysing existing survey data* in order to identify empirically the factors which drive civic and political participation within Europe

• There were two main sub-goals here:
  
  – To *describe patterns of civic and political participation* across EU member states over time and across key demographic groupings
  
  – To *describe the factors which are related to variations* in these patterns of civic and political participation across EU member states
Surveys used by WP5

- European Social Survey
- Eurobarometer
- International Social Survey Programme
- Comparative Study of Electoral Systems
- World Values Survey

In addition, macro indicators for different countries were taken from:
- Country Indicators for Foreign Policy
- Economist Intelligence Unit/World Values Survey/Eurobarometer
Analyses

• A range of analyses were conducted, including:
  – Basic descriptive statistics
  – Structural equation models examining the demographic and psychological predictors of participation
  – Multilevel models linking these predictors and the participation outcomes to broader structural macro factors
  – Latent class analyses identifying distinct ‘classes’ of political participation
• In all of these analyses, four types of political participation were examined:
  – Voting
  – Other conventional political activities
  – Non-conventional political activities
  – Civic engagement
Predictors

• In the analyses exploring predictors of participation, a range of psychological predictors were examined, including:
  – Interest in politics
  – Attentiveness to political issues and affairs
  – Internal efficacy
  – External efficacy
  – Opinionation
  – Ideological identity
  – Social trust
  – Institutional trust
  – Perceived discrimination
Some of the macro level factors examined

- **Electoral process and pluralism** (elections free and fair, transparent financing of parties, access to public office open to all, etc.)
- **Functioning of government** (extent to which freely elected representatives determine government policy, levels of corruption, public confidence in political parties, etc.)
- **Government and economic efficiency**
- **Government accountability**
- **Rule of law** (independence of judiciary, number of political prisoners, minority legal protection, etc.)
- **Human rights record** (disappearances, torture, minority access to education and professions, freedom of assembly, etc.)
• WP5 yielded a huge amount of findings, far too many for me to report them to you here

• But the really **big punchlines** as far as I am concerned are these:
  – Which predictive paths are significant varies depending on the specific form of participation which is being predicted (voting vs. conventional vs. non-conventional vs. civic participation)
  – Which predictive paths are significant varies depending on demographics (age, gender, majority vs. minority status) but in different ways for different forms of participation
  – Which paths are significant varies across countries, but different macro factors are influential for different psychological factors in different demographic groups for different forms of participation
Some of the other findings from WP5 are given in the *PIDOP Policy Briefing Paper No. 3* (in your conference registration packs).

In addition, if you want to know more about the details and the findings of WP5, please attend *PIDOP Session 5* tomorrow afternoon, when Ian Brunton-Smith will give an extended presentation on the methods and findings of WP5.
Work Package 6

• WP6 was responsible for collecting new data in order to identify the factors which drive civic and political participation within Europe.

• This WP targeted variables which were not always present in the WP5 survey datasets but which are of theoretical importance.

• There were two main sub-goals here:
  – To examine **civic and political participation among members of different age, gender, minority and migrant groups** within each **participating country**, in order to identify the factors and processes which drive participation in these various groups.
  – To examine **differences** in the factors and processes which drive participation in **different national contexts** and in **different demographic groups**.
• In particular, WP6 examined the social and psychological processes involved in the *co-construction of citizenship* in a range of different *life contexts*, including the family, the peer group, education, the media, non-political organisations and political institutions.

• WP6 also examined *forms of participation, demographic variations* in these forms of participation, and the *predictors* of these forms of participation.

• Each team in the consortium collected data in WP6 from both their own local *national group* and from *two ethnic minority or migrant groups* living in their country.
National and ethnic groups studied in each country

- **Belgium**: Belgians, Turks, Moroccans
- **Czech Republic**: Czechs, Roma, Ukrainians
- **England**: English, Congolese, Bangladeshis
- **Germany**: Germans, German resettlers from Russia, Turks
- **Italy**: Italians, Albanians, Moroccans
- **Northern Ireland**: Northern Irish Catholics, Northern Irish Protestants, Chinese, Polish
- **Portugal**: Portuguese, Brazilians, Angolans
- **Sweden**: Swedes, Kurds of Turkish background, Iraqis
- **Turkey**: Turks, Roma, Turkish resettlers from Bulgaria

In all of these groups, data were collected from **two age groups**:
- 16-17 year olds (pre-voting age)
- 18-26 year olds (post-voting age)
The three phases of WP6

• In **phase one** of WP6, **focus groups** were conducted with women and men in both age ranges from all 27 national and ethnic groups

• The focus groups explored the young people’s perceptions of citizenship and participation as they viewed them across a wide range of different life contexts

• The issues explored included:
  – understandings of citizenship
  – perceptions of participation by young people
  – personal and group experiences of participation
  – motivations for participating
  – perceptions of barriers to participation
  – perceptions of the effectiveness of different forms of participation
  – perceptions of young people’s information sources and influences
  – suggestions for promoting young people’s inclusion and civic and political participation
• In **phase two** of WP6, **interviews** were conducted with some of the individuals who had been identified during the focus groups as important sources of influence on the focus group participants.

• These interviews primarily involved parents, teachers and youth workers, as these were the most frequently cited sources of influence.

• The interviews examined:
  – the conceptions of citizenship held by these influential individuals
  – their perceptions of young people’s patterns of participation
  – their perceptions of young people’s motivations for participating
  – their perceptions of the barriers to young people’s participation
  – the practical measures which they themselves take to try to enhance young people’s participation
  – their suggestions for promoting young people’s inclusion and civic and political participation
• In **phase three** of WP6, a quantitative survey was conducted

• On the basis of the theoretical models developed by WP3 and WP4, and the findings which emerged from the focus groups and interviews, a quantitative questionnaire was designed

• This questionnaire was administered to 16-17 year olds and 18-26 year olds in all of the participating countries

• Data were collected from all 27 national and ethnic groups
• The **variables measured** in the survey included:
  – Civic and political participation experiences
  – Political interest
  – Political attentiveness
  – Political knowledge
  – Internal and external efficacy
  – Trust in institutions and in government
  – Motivations and emotions regarding participation
  – Perceived barriers to participation
  – Perceived social norms
  – Social well-being and interpersonal trust
  – Sense of community
  – Strength of national, ethnic and religious identifications, and religiosity
  – Support for minority rights
  – Detailed demographic information about each participant
• Once again, WP6 yielded a huge amount of findings, far too many for me to report them to you here

• I myself think that the most important finding to emerge was that there was enormous variability between different national contexts and between the different national and ethnic groups in each national context

• For example, forms and levels of participation, and predictors of participation, varied considerably, with different patterns being displayed by different sub-groups defined in terms of the intersection between age, gender and ethnicity

• The complexity of these findings are fully consistent with the findings of WP5

• My own view is that this variability poses the most important empirical challenge for the theories that have been developed by both WP3 and WP4: how to explain at a theoretical level the sheer diversity of patterns of influence which we have found in both WP5 and WP6
• Some of the other findings from the second phase of WP6 (the focus group study) are given in the PIDOP Policy Briefing Paper No. 2 (in your conference registration packs)

• If you want to find out about some of the detailed findings of WP6, please attend PIDOP Symposia 2, 3 and 4 today and tomorrow, when the different teams in the consortium will be giving presentations on their WP6 findings
Work Package 7

• WP7 is responsible for:
  – *Developing an integrated multi-level theory* (or theories) of how and why different forms and interpretations of participation develop or are hampered, incorporating reference to macro-level contextual factors, proximal social factors and psychological factors, drawing on the theoretical work conducted by both WP3 and WP4
  – *Formulating new evidence-based policy and practice recommendations* for key stakeholders at regional, national and European levels – these recommendations are based on the findings obtained by WP5 and WP6

• Work on the first objective is not yet complete, and so I cannot report on this yet
• However, work has been completed on the second objective
• The policy recommendations will be formally published next week, when we have a launch meeting at the European Commission in Brussels
Policy recommendations: sneak preview

• The recommendations that we have developed are aimed at four main groups:
  – Politicians and political institutions
  – Media producers and media organizations
  – Ministries of education, educational professionals and schools
  – A range of civil society actors, including youth workers, youth and leisure centres, youth and education NGOs, and leaders of ethnic minority communities
Example recommendations for politicians and political institutions

- Young people should be treated more attentively and with greater respect by politicians and other adults. Politicians need to show young people that they do listen and pay attention to their views on civic and political matters, individually and as a group.

- Politicians and policymakers should view civic and non-conventional forms of participation as equally important as conventional forms of participation, and should address, and provide feedback on, issues which have been raised through these alternative forms of activism.

- National, regional and local governments should ensure that all youth have access to membership of a range of organizations, including youth and leisure centres, sports clubs, cultural centres, local community centres, etc., and should encourage youth to take up membership of these organizations.
Example recommendations for schools

- Because the development of the skills which are required for active citizenship depends not only on the acquisition of knowledge but also on the accumulation of practical experience, students should be given more responsibility in schools through participation in democratic decision-making with teaching staff, so that they learn democracy and participation through their daily practical experience (and not only through formal civic/citizenship education classes).

- All schools should have a school council or parliament, in which elected students may gain experience of representing the concerns of their fellow students and experience of engaging in joint decision-making with teaching staff.

- The implication of the two preceding recommendations is that schools should consider adopting a whole-school approach to the practice of democracy.

- Educationalists who are developing interventions aimed at enhancing levels of political and civic participation should be mindful that different forms of intervention may be required for younger vs. older individuals, women vs. men, and minority vs. majority individuals.
Example recommendations for media organizations

- The news media should represent the participatory actions of young people – such as participation in protests and demonstrations – with greater fairness, respect and seriousness, so that young people can feel that their arguments and positions are being accurately and impartially represented by the news media.

- The news media should not focus exclusively on the negative, disruptive or anti-social incidents that occur at young people’s participation events such as demonstrations, but should instead give equal attention to the positive and well-intentioned character of demonstrations and other social and political participatory efforts by youth.
How to obtain a copy of the full set of policy recommendations after their publication

• You will be able to download the full document which describes all of our policy recommendations, and also indicates the evidence on which each recommendation has been based, from the project website after next week:

  http://www.fahs.surrey.ac.uk/pidop/

• You can also download copies of all our Newsletters and all our Policy Briefing Papers from the project website
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