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Introduction

The purpose of work package 4 was to conduct a secondary analysis of existing surveys on political participation of youth with a focus on study design and survey questions. Specifically, we were interested in looking at how other researchers operationalized political participation and which items proved useful in comparative studies. This information will contribute to the design of the EUYOUPART questionnaire.

This report is divided into two main parts: The theoretical part comprises a theoretical framework for political participation behaviours of youth. It replicates briefly main theories of democracy and summarizes how political participation has been defined so far. The theoretical part concludes with a working definition of “political participation” for EUYOUPART that should help guide the selection of foreground and background variables for the questionnaire (chapter 1).

The empirical part of this report focuses on secondary data analyses of national and international studies on political participation of youth. Whereas there is a considerable amount of youth studies and of studies on political participation, there are very few studies that combine both elements: The number of studies on political participation of youth is limited, even more so on the international comparative level. Chapter 2 thus summarizes results of national data analyses conducted by the consortium members. It looks at studies on politics & youth on the national level and compares results where (near-) identical questions were used.

The search for international studies that contain questions on political participation behaviour as well as a big enough youth sample yielded only a few studies fulfilling both conditions. The most promising research projects in this regard are the European Social Survey (ESS) and the study Citizenship, Identity and Democracy (CID). Since the data of the latter have not been released at the time of our work on WP4, we decided to focus on a secondary analysis of ESS questions (the ESS fortunately includes many items on political participation that originate from the CID).

Therefore, chapter 3 discusses comparability and equivalence of a selected range of ESS variables and yields a comparison of political participation behaviour with a focus on effects of gender, age and occupational status.

In chapter 4, we look at other international research projects that contain a reasonable number of questions on political participation behaviour. The secondary analysis focuses on comparative results on political interest, voting behaviour and civil protest across several international studies.

---

1 For example, most Eurobarometer studies do either barely contain questions on political participation or do have only a small sub-sample of people 15-25 years.
Based on these analyses, chapter 5 summarizes conclusions and implications for the EUYOUPART questionnaire development.
THEORETICAL PART
1 Conceptual framework for EYPT

1.1 Introduction: How important is political participation of youth in the European Union?

The main topic of our work is to advance research on political participation of youth. The inspiration for this project stems from two sources:
1) The realization that comparative research in Europe has to face many challenges, many of which have not been tackled and resolved in a satisfying manner so far in the area of political participation research. European diversity – of cultures, languages and also in research traditions and infrastructures – entails incredible richness, but also particular challenges for the social sciences.
2) An upsurge of interest and awareness by policy-makers on regional, national and the European levels to foster political participation of youth as the basis for stable and vivid democracies in an integrated Europe:
"The European project is itself young, still forming and still being debated. If it is to make progress, it needs ambition and enthusiasm, and commitment on the part of young people to the values on which it is based". (European Commission 2001, p.4).

The discussions of how to foster political participation of youth are particularly interesting in the context of EU enlargement. The European integration brings together nations with different political cultures, traditions and opportunity structures for the political participation of young people – the legal as well as the cultural frameworks across Europe differ decisively.
On top of these factors, recent European history and the bedrock structural and political changes in Eastern Europe mould young people’s understanding and expectations in regard to political participation. These conditions may be in clear contrast to the situation young people in Western European countries find themselves in.
Despite the growing acknowledgement of youth political participation as vital for the development of European governance, there is to date a lack of instruments by which aspects of democratic life and active citizenship of Europe’s youth can be explored.
Furthermore, the social sciences are faced with a number of particular challenges (ranging from methodological issues – e.g. how to establish equivalence – to communication issues in interdisciplinary, intercultural research teams) once they extend the scope of their interest from the national to the trans-national, European level.

EUYOUPART was conceived as a trans-European research project with the clear objective to develop a measurement instrument with valid and reliable indicators to measure political participation of young people (aged 15 to 25 years) in many European countries.

Specifically, we aim to achieve the following objectives:
- to help standardize research on political behavior of young people in Europe
• by creating a standardized measurement instrument which allows to compare political participation behavior
• across cultures and over time
• and thus to contribute to advance the methodology of cross-cultural research in the field of political participation.

Key results of EUYOUPART are expected to contribute to an improvement of the socio-economic knowledge base regarding two pivotal aspects: First, the project will provide data to extensively describe, analyze and compare the extent and levels of political participation of young people in Europe.

Second, on a methodological level, EUYOUPART intends to identify valid indicators for political participation in Europe so as to contribute to improving the instruments of comparative research in the field.

1.2 Background and Objectives of the Theoretical Framework

The goal of the theoretical part of this report is to develop a conceptual framework for EUYOUPART. This framework will serve as the basis for designing the questionnaire: It will guide the selection of items and will help designing scales for indicators for political participation. Moreover, it will outline the context of this research project and should ideally make decisions and reflections transparent that the consortium had.

The theoretical framework will outline theories of democracy that inform our understanding of what political participation of citizens mean and will also define “modes” of participation. The operationalisation of the modes will add to the development of the questionnaire for our quantitative survey. However, the questionnaire development is a process in progress that will involve also results from our qualitative research, as well as a secondary analysis of international as well as ‘best-practice’ national questionnaires.

The goal of EUYOUPART is to develop an instrument of social measurement that serves to test patterns of political participation among youth in European Union member countries. The assessment of patterns of political participation can be accomplished in comparative perspective, by comparing similar measures either over time (for the same country) or across countries (Teorell 2001). The usefulness of the measurement instrument – the questionnaire – depends on its ability to gauge variations across state borders and/or over time.

Several vital social processes and socio-political changes affecting the European area frame the development of our questionnaire. In order to realize our goal, these processes need to be observed:

- From May 2004 on, there will be 25 EU-member states. Their historical and cultural backgrounds, legal environments and political traditions (minorities’ rights, gender differences, national-regional variations) and levels of economic development vary significantly. There will be major differences between the 15 current member states and the 10 new member states.
- The unique characteristic of youth as a social category is the transition from childhood to adulthood. The transition embodies two major transitions: from school to work and from the parents’ family to the own family (cohabitation) with raising own children.
Among European countries there are huge variations in patterns of youth transitions (Berthoud/Iacovou).

- Even though there is a low rate of youth being politically active in terms of conventional party and electoral participation, young adults DO have a high rate of participation in various forms of voluntary and campaigning activities. They do care about certain political issues (like environment, animals, ..) but these are often ignored by mainstream political parties and elected representatives. The questionnaire must above all bear this in mind.

- Ideally, the measurement instrument (questionnaire) should be capable of observing changes over time. It should provide reliable assessment of political participation behavior now and also in 10 or 20 years in the future. The popularity of different modes of political participation activities changes over time. A good example is the participation in protest demonstrations – the events, which once were termed as ‘unconventional or unorthodox’ forms of participation, are recognized as a matter of course today. At present time, changes caused by globalization and the rise of the internet society are the most likely to alter patterns of political participation in the decades to come.

- There is multilevel governance within the European Union and within its member-states. Four levels of political decision-making should be distinguished: local government, national legislature and government, European Parliament and European Commission, and global decision making processes (multilateral treaties and bodies, e.g. WTO, UNO). Additionally, democracy in organizations – at work places (multinational corporations/MNCs), schools, non-governmental and non-profit organizations (NGOs/NPOs) – is an important aspect of political participation. Empirical research shows that political activism is often embedded in non-political organizations.

- The rise of information society, the increasing use of information and communication technology (ICT) at workplaces and schools, in the domains of government, administration, business and the third sector should be taken into consideration. Using ICT is not a technical innovation, it is an innovation of social practices. Initiatives like eEurope, eGovernment, eHealth, eEducation are manifestations of the social transformation under way. The emerging practices will alter significantly the ways how people get involved into political decision-making (Commission of the European Communities 2002 and 2003).

The crucial endeavor undertaken here is to develop a definition for EUYOUPART of “political participation”, as this definition will eventually be the point of reference for many decisions. Yet the understanding of what it means to “participate politically” is culture-bound and changes over time and with the societal and historical context (see chapter 3). It is also rooted in the underlying theory of democracy.

The specific focus of this research project is on the behavioral aspects of political participation (observable activities) and to supplement this focus with context variables.

1.3 Theories of Democracy

All concepts about political participation - i.e., concepts that define which activities are considered as political participation, which are not – are rooted in an (explicit or implicit) understanding of democracy. Moreover, the current predominant model of democracy shapes the political participation opportunities that are offered by governmental bodies.
Thus the fact that we are embedded in the prevalent theory of democracy influences our way of thinking about what is “political” and what is “political participation”. Different theories of democracy lead to a different understanding of what political participation behavior includes, and what “good citizens” should behave like, as theories of democracy define roles for the representative system as well as for the electorate beyond the act of casting a vote. Theories assign roles to “the state” and its elected representatives in relation to the electorate or citizenry.

The following brief discussion of theories of democracy (restricted to the models of the past century as discussed in Western democracies) intends to give an overview about these different schools of thought that resulted in diverse societal understandings of political participation behaviors.

The groups of theories reflected here can be broadly categorized into two sets: The first two models (by Kelsen/Leibholz/Fraenkel and Schumpeter/Downs) represent rather narrow expectations of the extent of political participation: It is mostly reduced to casting one’s vote. All other political responsibility is delegated to the elected representatives. Similarly, the rightwing identity models of democracy reduce the role of “the people” mainly to voting. However, they also propose political participation via direct plebiscites.

The remaining four theories mark the transition from the reduction to voting only to a continuously widened model of democracy: Citizens are not only expected to cast their vote but their participation is encouraged (and envisioned) in more and more areas of society and political representation.

The following overview of different theories of democracy is based on a study by Schaller (2001) and should provide an insight into the meaning of political participation within the different schools of thought.

1.3.1 Pluralistic Representative Democracy (Kelsen, Leibholz, Fraenkel)

In this theory, democracy is characterized by a division of labor between the ruling and the ruled. It is not understood as direct reign of the people but as the responsible reign of elected representatives. These representatives are viewed as decision-makers who exercise maximum control and have maximum responsibility. Elected representatives are central to the pluralistic representative model of democracy, as is the party system.

The people are involved in control but not in decision making. Individuals (citizens) need to organize the representation of their interests through political parties, because political parties are viewed as essential mediators of democracy in the modern state.

Political participation is thus first and foremost participation in elections (casting one’s vote). It also includes being active in parties and interest organizations. However, political participation in the broad sense (including activities beyond the electoral system) is not viewed as a citizen virtue that should be encouraged.
1.3.2 Democracy of Competing Elites (Schumpeter, Downs)/ democratic rule by competing elites

This school of thought regards democracy as a method to reach decisions and to select decision makers. This method is opposed to dictatorship with the central function to select leaders (decision-makers). Democracy thus acknowledges the need for leadership yet views it as division of labor (but not as a process of identification and identity between rulers and ruled). Candidates and their parties compete against each other for the votes of the people. They try to maximize their voter-turnout. Democracy is thus defined by the free competition for free votes and is actualized by decisions based on the majority of votes. It follows essentially market rules: The voters select their preferred leadership product and their choice is based on rational principles (which candidate/party will warrant the maximum individual benefits for the voter?). The people as such is thought to be incapable of articulating a common good because of its general lack of political judgment (Schumpeter). However, rational choices based on complete information is acknowledged as political competency (Downs). The people’s participative task is thus reduced to producing the best elite leadership. Decisions are made by a majority. In this case democracy does not mean “governance by the people” but “government approved by the people”. Parties, as teams of individuals, want to win elections in order to gain office, money and power. Political participation is reduced to voting. Another essential criterion for the demarcation between democracy and dictatorship is the option to control the leadership through voting-out.

1.3.3 Consensus Democracy (Lehmbruch/Lijphart)

The main aim and task of democracy is to provide the integration of conflicting interests. Thus the process of resolving conflicts and of reaching compromises is essential; making decisions simply on the basis of the majority is not enough. The consensus democracy models assume a schism of society into several broad “Lager” or interest groups (cleavages defined by world views, religion, ethnicity, social class etc). The consensus democracy models view democracy as a means to integrate the interests of diverse groups within one society. For example, interest groups are proportionally represented in decision-making structures and influential societal bodies. Therefore, they can advocate their interests and partake in negotiations. Conflicts are thus solved through negotiations and compromises with the expectation to reach stable and peaceful decisions that are supported by all relevant groups concerned. Another main feature of consensus democracy models is the importance of reaching and maintaining an equilibrium of power. Political participation should guarantee political and social integration and bring about consensus among different interests to a large extent. This theory includes the idea of a broad representation of interests beyond voting and campaign work. However, the approach includes a somewhat elitist element: It views participation rather as participation of diverse Lager (= group interests) than as participation of individuals. The interests of one Lager are represented by elites, and individuals need to belong to a specific Lager to be included in the representation.
1.3.4 Theories of Social Democracy (Adler, Bernstein, Kreisky)

The theory of social democracy was part of the ideological construct of the socialist movement. It is strongly rooted in the notion of representative democracy. Social democracy raises the claim to pervade all areas of social life beyond the political democracy of the civil state. Democracy is thus viewed as part of all areas of life: It is vital for economy, schools, universities, communities, etc. The main aim of social democracy is the empowerment and self-determination of all individuals living in one society, which subordinate themselves under the common good. Social democracy promotes co-determination and participation. Broad societal co-determination is a prerequisite for social equality and social freedom. Eventually, social democracy promotes and enforces social justice, which finally should lead to a classless society. Therefore political participation should be realized within all social subsystems as extensively as possible. Theories of social democracy include all societal areas in their understanding of politics.

1.3.5 Left Identity, Participatory Models of Democracy (e.g. Bachrach, Pateman, Pelinka, Barber)

As democracy means the identity of the rulers and the ruled (democratic ideal of identity), participatory models of democracy stress the function of democracy to reduce and (ideally) to discard power differences. Democracy thus means the reduction of existing power relations. Left identity models promote the self-actualization of individuals and collectives. They eventually aim at deepening democracy and at maximizing participation in decision making. Similarly to the model of social democracy, self-determination and empowerment are envisioned. The model assumes that citizens are generally interested in participating. Participation is viewed as dynamic process and development in all areas of the state. Through broad participation the “public good” is thought to be realized best. Thus one of the goals of left identity models of democracy is the democratization of all areas of society (no separation between “public” = political and “private” = non-political areas).

Political participation follows thus a broad concept; instruments of direct democracy are viewed as necessary supplement to the representative democratic system (which is by definition deficient). Participation does not only fulfill a function but is viewed as process of self-determination and self-actualization (the human being as “zoon politikon”).

1.3.6 Right-wing Identity Models of Democracy (e.g. Schmitt, Weber)

The right wing identity model of democracy shares a similar criticism as the left wing model but draws different conclusions about the solution of the problem. The aim of democracy is to guarantee the unity and equality of the people. “The people” is assumed to share one homogenous, natural will that is supposed to be identical with the
common good. Therefore, divergent interests (e.g. of minorities) are regarded as disturbance that need to be eliminated or neutralized.

A strong state is thought to secure the unity of the people and the realization of its homogeneous will. A strong leader is legitimated via direct elections or via acclamation. The people expresses its will directly (e.g. through a movement). A good leader knows the will of the people through permanent contact with the people (basis of trust and responsibility) and thus embodies its will (= identity). Parties and other representations of interest have to subordinate under the will of the people, since pluralism is negated. Right-wing identity models of democracy thus favor a strong executive power and try to warrant the identification between the people and its leader, while safeguarding against the fragmentation of the people’s will through oligarchies (interest groups). Direct plebiscites are used to legitimate the leader & his policies.

Political participation is reduced to voting which only the members of the ethnically-national defined people are allowed to.

### 1.3.7 Civil Society as a democratic concept

The term “civil society” has been on an up rise in the past decade, although the term can be traced back to the very beginnings of Western philosophy. It saw a renewal in modern thinking in the late 18th century during Enlightenment, when the notion of civil society as a domain “parallel to but separate from the state” was developed (Carothers, 1999, p.1). Italian Marxist theorist Antonio Gramsci rejuvenated the term by defining it as a “special nucleus of independent political activity, a crucial sphere of struggle against tyranny” (ibid.).

Today, the notion of civil society remains multifaceted, depending on who uses the term and to which avail. In the American tradition, civil society is connected with communitarian, often religiously motivated actions of communities. Nowadays, proponents of the neo-liberal model of society also use the term “civil society”: They like to think of civil society as alternative provider for formerly state-warranted social services and tasks (e.g., church communities providing shelter and food for refugees because the government is cutting down subsidies for refugee agencies/ refugee funds). Civil society is thought to take over social responsibilities that the “lean state” does not want to provide anymore: “Civil society is all the more important at a time when it is assumed by many that the welfare state alone can look after the needs of the vulnerable” (William Hague, US-Conservative leader, Nov.2000).

Proponents of the political branches of “civil society” like to think of themselves as necessary supplement to counterbalance deficits in governance and policy-making: Civil society as “actor” who fulfils a control function for the state (e.g., the World Social Forum movements), often based on advanced strategic considerations and with high professionalism (e.g. when it comes to lobbying). Thus the term civil society can be understood (and is used) in manifold ways, and this plethora of conceptions in turn shapes the understanding of political participation.

According to Diamond, civil society is an autonomous sphere, which is located between (private) society and the state. It is “the realm of organized social life that is voluntary,
self-generating, (largely) self-supporting and autonomous from the state, and bound by a legal order or set of shared rules” (Diamond 1994). Civil society has the function to realize and to pick out central themes within society which are relevant for the whole society. Civil society should support political parties to enhance the citizens’ political efficacy and their political competency. Civil society offers alternative channels for the aggregation, articulation and representation of interests.

The modes of political participation associated with the notion of civil society depict a wide range of activities, including all kinds of protest activities, lobbying on different levels, cultural and charity activities. While the “active citizen” in civil society may be active on all levels (regional to global), the concept lacks the broader philosophical underpinnings about the individual’s development that the social-democratic models of democracy share.

1.3.8 Special issue: Multicultural democracy as model of national integration (Vetik)

Theories of democracy can also be reviewed under the angle of which place they assign to ethnic minorities. R. Vetik (Vetik 2002) discusses the Estonian model of multicultural democracy (which forms the core of the “Integration Programme of Estonian Society 2000-2007”) in the context of democratic models and identifies the following demarcations:

- In civil society models (as part of liberal democracies), ethnic groups are viewed as part of civil society. They are independent from state power as the state officially supports none of them and does not recognize them as important entities in society. In contrast, multicultural democracy recognizes ethnic heterogeneity but views one ethnic group as titular nationality. The titular group’s language forms the basis for a common communicative and cultural field.

- In consensus democracies (consociational democracy), the lead principle (recognition of diverse interests based on cleavages, aim to integrate interests by creating a balance among group interests and to reach consensus) can easily be applied to multi-ethnic states by making “ethnicity” one of the criteria that define the “Lager”. If ethnicity is acknowledged as one of the defining criteria, members of ethnic minorities become part of the game for distribution (of power, resources, representation). However, multicultural democracy does apply this principle only in the cultural realm, not in the political (e.g. cultural autonomy, but no territorial autonomy).

- In ethnic democracies (a term introduced by Sammy Smooha, 1990), the political and cultural domination of one ethnic group in a given territory is institutionalized (e.g. Israel) – the state is seen as belonging to one ethnic group and protects the culture, traditions and interests of the main nationality. While both ethnic democracy and multicultural democracy recognize the existence of group rights, the latter does not claim domination of the main ethnic group and the same identity.
1.3.9 Summary: Indicators for political participation activities based on the theories of democracy

From the first two models of democracy – pluralistic representative democracy and the competing elites model – and the role that they assign to the citizenry and to political participation, the following set of typical indicators can be derived:

- Participating in elections by casting one’s vote
- Running for office
- Supporting a candidate in a campaign
- Gathering information about political issues
- Being a member in a political party
- Working in parties

These two models follow a rather narrow concept of what political participation is. The consensus model of democracy broadens the concept somewhat by stressing the general importance of representation of interests, beyond the political party system. It thus includes also:

- Membership in interest representations (e.g., trade unions, chamber of commerce)
- Membership in non-governmental organizations (NGOs)

The remaining theories of democracy discussed here stand for a broad understanding of what politics is and thus for broad concepts of what political participation is. They include a growing range of activities (commonly referred to as “unconventional” political participation behaviors, albeit the terminology is somewhat misleading) aside from the ones listed above, e.g.:

- Being a representative at the work place, in student governments, or in boards (e.g. parents’ associations)
- All individual and common activities to express political will on all levels (neighborhood, community, region, state, Europe, global)
- Participating in demonstrations and strikes
- Organizing demonstrations and strikes
- Collecting signatures
- Political street theatre
- Organizing local political clubs/ interest groups/ citizen groups
- Organizing political cultural activities
- Doing information work (e.g publishing or writing in a students’ paper)
- Engaging in political education (seminars, lectures, work shops…)

1.4 How to define “Political Participation”

In thinking about a definition for political participation, there are some crucial steps one needs to observe. First of all, the definition presented here will serve as the basis for a questionnaire, designed to measure political participation behavior of youth in a multi-

---

2 The competing elite models are more restricted: In general, they consider only voting as political participation.
national context. The definition will guide the design and selection of items for the questionnaire. However, a questionnaire can only be the best possible choice of representative and significant items from a range of behaviors.

To reach this goal we need a definition of political participation that is wide enough to include all youth-relevant political activities (also in a cross-cultural context) but narrow enough to warrant the feasibility of the study. In other words, the definition of what is political participation and what is not should result in a list of participatory behaviors that is sufficient and comprehensive, yet restricted.

Second, the definition of political participation depends on the prevalent theory of democracy of the time and the political system in power. Thus it is susceptible to change.

One way to look at political participation is to define it as all citizens' activities that aim at influencing political decisions. However, the definitions of what it is to participate politically have changed over time, in close interaction with the respective understanding of democracy and the citizens' roles in a democratic state. Researchers and scholars - primarily in the field of political science - have repeatedly discussed the definition of political participation, resulting in numerous approaches to grasp the essentials and to draw clear and practicable distinctions.

In his article “Studying political participation: towards a theory of everything?” (Jan van Deth 2001), Jan van Deth provides an excellent overview about the struggle for a valid definition and how the changing definitions translated into surveys with changing areas of activities that were included. According to van Deth’s considerations, there are four broad periods that characterize a continuous expansion of those activities that can be subsumed as “political action repertoire”. Starting from a definition of political participation mainly as voting and campaign activities in the beginnings of the field (1940s, 1950s), the definition was broadened to also include contacting activities between citizens and public officials (later labeled as “conventional participation”) in the 1960s. As a consequence of societal changes in the 1970s that saw an upsurge of public protest activities, “protest and rejection” were also included in the formal repertoire of what it means to participate politically. Finally, as a logical consequence of the broadening of the scope of the (welfare) state - “the disappearing borderline between political and non-political spheres” (p.6) - van Deth observes the development of a “theory of everything” which is reflected in the growing list of activities asked in recent studies: Political participation activities may now also include civil activities such as volunteering and social engagement. The modes of political participation include virtually every type of activity with exception of clearly

---

3 As van Deth points out, these activities have been labelled as ‘unconventional’ modes of participation “because they were not in line with societal norms of the 1970s” (p.6). Although the use of the terms “conventional” and “unconventional” is widespread among participation researchers, we would like to point out that its creation was linked particularly time- and contextbound (going back to the data-analysis of Barnes & Kaase, 1979): Activities that were considered “unconventional” in the 1970s may not be so anymore. Moreover, the question emerges if the so-called “new” forms of participation were actually new to the repertoire of human behaviour (e.g., considering public protest actions by the suffragettes at the turn of the century) or more so to the minds of the persons working on the definition. Or should one benchmark for including behaviours in the definition be its closeness to the societal mainstream repertoire?
private behavior. Following this development, the specific issue arises: How to narrow the field again or how to reduce it to a manageable corpus of data?

Jan van Deth discusses two strategies to deal with this issue: One strategy is to opt for a more substantive and problem oriented perspective. If one is interested in a substantive problem, then one does not need to rely on a general and comprehensive definition of political participation “including everything”. Instead, one focuses on people’s activities in specific processes, which are in the focus of the substantive problem. However, this approach cannot be employed for the purposes of EUYOUPART since our project aims to measure a comprehensive range of characteristic political participation activities of young people in Europe and not a selection of strategies in a specific context. A second strategy to handle the conceptual problems is to approach the reduction by defining non-political instead of political activities and thus to exclude non-political activities from the analysis. Using this approach for defining political participation means actually finding out what is not political and what is not participation.

1.4.1 How others defined Political Participation

If we leave theoretical considerations aside for a moment, we can take a look at how other researchers and scholars approached the task to define political participation and how they resolved it. Classically, political participation has been defined with reference to the state-citizen relationship. The following definitions shall give an overview about existing definitions of political participation:


“... those actions of private citizens by which they seek to influence or to support government and politics” (Milbraith and Goel 1977: 2).

“... those activities by private citizens that are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take” (Verba and Nie 1972: 2).

“... all voluntary activities by individual citizens intended to influence either directly or indirectly political choices at various levels of the political system” (Kaase and Marsh 1979: 42).

“... action by citizens which is aimed at influencing decisions which are, in most cases, ultimately taken by public representatives and officials” (Parry et al. 1992: 16).

“... affords citizens in a democracy an opportunity to communicate information to government officials about their concerns and preferences and to put pressure on them to
respond" (Verba et al. 1995: 37).

“... any dimensions of activity that are either designed directly to influence government agencies and the policy process, or indirectly to impact civil society, or which attempt to alter systematic patterns of social behavior” (Norris 2001: 16).

However different in emphasizing specific aspects of political participation, most definitions share the following four attributes which - according to Jan van Deth (p.5) - are undisputed:

- Political participation refers to people in their role as citizens and not as politicians or civil servants,
- Political participation is an activity (‘action’) – simply watching television or claiming to be curious about politics does not constitute participation,
- Political participation is voluntary, not ordered by the ruling class or obliged under some law or rule,
- Political participation concerns government and politics in a broad sense of these words (‘political system’) and is neither restricted to specific phases (such as parliamentary decision making, or the ‘input’ side of the political system), nor to specific levels or areas (such as national elections or contacts with officials).

1.4.2 How to define Political Participation for EUYOUPART

Upon reflecting on the theories of democracy discussed earlier, it becomes clear that basically all “broader” theories of democracy could be a starting point for our definition of political participation. This means that only the theories that are narrowed down to elitist models should be ruled out. To meet the purpose of EUYOUPART, it seems reasonable to use a broad, but not too broad model of democracy as the basis for the definition (e.g., to exclude the broadest model of democracy that subsumes all social activities as “life politics” under “political participation”). The concept that we choose to operationalize political participation of youth should be broad enough to allow us eventually to reflect our data in the context of different political theories.

To influence the political decision-making process is one feature of political participation that all definitions mentioned above have in common. Furthermore, participation is a voluntary action. To meet the attributes mentioned above, we suggest the following definition of “political participation” for EUYOUPART, derived from a definition by Riepl & Wintersberger (1999, S.226):

“Political participation is a taking voluntary action in an attempt to exert influence on political decision-making processes.”

This definition includes several features and presumptions:
- Participation is considered a special form of social action
- People who participate want to exert influence on political decision-making processes
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The aim to influence political decision-making processes presupposes the existence of a certain conscious intention and purpose by the individual (intentionality).

Upon reflecting on the features of this definition, we would like to illustrate some of the discussions we had in trying to find a definition of political participation that fits the purpose of our study. There are several challenges for the measurement of political participation and - more specifically -, for the formulation of questionnaire items, linked to specific definitions:

Example 1: Purpose/ intentionality
This feature could be useful in making decisions about items, e.g. whether to include “discussing politics” as political activity: If such a discussion is led with the intention to convince someone and to convey political messages (thus to contribute to the societal knowledge about a political measure and to influence decision-making processes via influencing the public opinion), it might be considered an act of political participation. Yet it is hard to measure whether this condition applies: Does each participant in a demonstration participate because she or he primarily pursues a political goal? How about those who participate mainly because it is nice to meet other people who are like-minded but who may have only vague political intentions? And how can you distinguish those with a true political intention from those who are led by other motives?

Example 2: What is “exerting influence on political decision-making processes”? Let’s suppose someone joins in the boycott of the products of a big oil company for environmental and human rights reasons with the intention to make the management change its corporate policies. If the definition above is interpreted with a narrow understanding of politics (associating “political” only to actions in relation to elected political representatives), the boycott may not be considered a political act because it is not directed at decision-making at the governmental level but at the corporate level. However, if the definition of “exerting influence” is broadened to indirect processes or if one reflects the world with a wider understanding of what politics is (see the chapter on “theories of democracy”), this particular behavior should certainly be considered as political.
1.5 Modes of Participation – Subject to Time & Context

Which modes of participation should be selected to capture political participation of youth? Scholars have proposed various ways to structure and categorize political participation activities. For example, Parry et al. (1992) identified six dimensions of political participation, based on empirical analysis: 1) voting 2) party campaigning 3) collective action 4) contacting 5) direct action and 6) political violence. Pattie et al. (2003) distinguish between three dimensions of civic engagement: Individualistic activism, contact activism and collective activism.

The aim to categorize political participation activities is faced with some challenges, as the seminal terminology is itself context-bound: Activities once perceived as unconventional may (have) become a conventional means of expressing political will in due time. Also, some of the activities commonly referred to as unconventional are in fact rooted in a long-standing tradition of political struggle (e.g. members of the Suffragette movement chained themselves to buildings and gates 100 years ago).

However, to be in accordance with the main diction, we will employ the basic structure introduced by Max Kaase and roughly distinguish between

1) institutional/ conventional participation: e.g. voting, involvement in election campaigns, membership in parties and organizations
2) protest politics/ unconventional participation: e.g. demonstrations of all kinds, engagement in new social movements, creative ways of articulating political interests

In their meta-analysis of youth research, Chisholm & Kovacheva (2002) also observe that youth research generally focuses on three basic categories of political participation:

1) involvement in institutional politics
2) protest activities
3) civic engagement (associative life, community participation, voluntary work)

As the third type – civic engagement – exceeds our definition of political participation, we will exclude its modes from our analysis.

Youth is characterized by several attributes that distinguish it from other categories of society. So, too, there are some peculiarities in political participation. For example, youth is more likely involved in protest politics and violence, in life-style politics and political consumerism. Youth also gets more easily involved in activities taking place in their immediate environment, on the level of organizations and local government. At the same time, youth is less prone to take part in conventional participation – elections and political parties. Young people are politically interested, but often into topics that are not addressed by traditional politics and through participatory forms that are not widespread among adults. When discussing modes of political participation, the specifics of youth should thus be given special attention.
1.5.1 Institutional/Conventional Modes of Political Participation

In accordance with the representative or liberal model of democracy, few elected representatives make decisions for the group, for ‘the people’. Conventional modes of political participation refer to those activities that are available to ‘the people’ within the model of representative democracy. Participation in politics is limited to voting, political party related activities, contacting elected representatives and governmental officials.

Participation in elections/voting
Even though the spectrum of modes of political participation has expanded over centuries, elections have remained the central institution of democracy. Historically, voting derived its importance as a mechanism of selecting representatives into national legislature. Today elections are held for selecting also other representatives than legislators: selecting leaders of local governments, organizations, and leaders of supranational government. Acts of plebiscite also include casting a ballot in other occasions than selecting representatives: the people is given the opportunity to express their preferences over issues of local and national importance. In general, the frequency of plebiscite has increased over some 100 years and it continues to increase. Non-voting or casting an invalid ballot on the purpose of protest are tightly related to both voting and protest activities.

While voting is the most frequent citizen activity, it is restricted according to certain criteria, e.g. citizenship or age (for national elections, typically 18 or 19 years). Young people not entitled to vote are thus excluded from the main conventional forms of participation. In this context the youth votes for adult politicians in charge of youth and family affairs and delegates the representation of youth interests to them. But: Not every person or institution pretending to represent the interests of young people has in fact been empowered adequately by young people.

Campaign activity
The participation in election campaigns is the next regular mode of citizen activity in the electoral process. While most political parties entertain youth branches in the form of various youth organizations, it is a general observation in Western democracies that membership numbers in parties tend to decrease. Contributing to electoral campaigns is not an activity that is specific to youth or that is chosen by youth in large numbers. However, it can be considered one of the classics of participation.

Membership in youth organizations and participation in youth centers
Youth organizations are mainly offering leisure-time activities for young people, often have long-standing traditions and close ties with other institutions like political parties or religious communities. In addition to these youth organizations there are a number of other leisure-time oriented associations for young people, like youth centers. All those institutions are directly confronted with youth concerns and often support youth activities by general lobbying.

Contacting
Contacting refers to activities where people meet face-to-face with, call to, send a letter or an email to a public official or some other person in the position of influencing social
Specific structures for youth political participation: Integration in political decision-making processes through youth parliament, youth forums, youth municipal councils, ...

The involvement of young people in political decision-making processes is a relatively new form of youth participation. Youth municipal councils, youth parliament and youth forums or hearings offer young adults the possibility to submit their opinion and raise their specific interests. Types of integration vary greatly (in terms of how councils are organized, to whom they are accessible, and how great their actual impact is). This involvement of young people in the political system is a rather formal type of participation. It has been on the up rise in the past years since the promotion of political participation of youth has become one of the declared goals of the European Commission and the Council of Europe.

1.5.2 Protest Activities/ Unconventional Modes of Political Participation

Elite-challenging and protest actions

Like conventional forms of participation, unconventional forms of participation – protests, demonstrations, boycotts, political strikes, occupations, street blockades, etc. – are an essential part of the democratic process (Dalton 1988, 67). When the people are blocked from exercising political influence through institutionalized participation channels, protest politics stands as an option. This record has persisted to the present (Kaase 1989, 35-36). Labor union and peasant protests are an established part of contemporary politics in the new democracies as well as in advanced industrial democracies. And, the new democracies continue to experience at least modest levels of protest over various political, economic, and social issues.

The potential for protest and other conventional political activities apparently has increased (Jennings and van Deth, 1989). Cross-national comparison also finds that protest levels are higher in more affluent nations (Powell, 1982, 129-32). These trends have led some analysts to argue that a new style of protest is becoming a regular form of political action in democratic societies. Within advanced democratic societies the use of protest has broadened from the disadvantaged to include a wider spectrum of political groups. A wave of student protests swept through Western societies in the late 1960s, making protest an accepted form of political action among the better educated. The sources of protest have shifted from disadvantaged, alienated groups to educated and middle class (Dalton 1996, 69).

The new forms of protest in democratic societies are seldom directed at overthrowing the established political order. Reformism has replaced revolutionary fervor. Modern protest behavior is a planned and organized activity. Protest is simply another political resource for mobilizing public opinion and influencing policymakers (Tilly 1975).

The spread of protest politics not only expands the repertoire of political participation, it also represents a style of political action that differs markedly from conventional politics. Protest can focus on specific issues or policy goals and can convey a high level of political information with real political force. Sustained and effective protest is a demanding
participation mode that requires initiative and cooperation with others (Young-Choul 2001). Participation in unconventional forms is cumulative: Individuals active at any one threshold also generally participate in milder forms of protest.

Involvement in protest is relatively common among youth and less common among senior members of a society. Both life-cycle and generational effects are likely to explain the age-difference.

Action-oriented participation – as protest politics are also called – includes a wide and changing range of activities: Collecting signatures, demonstrations, active engagement in environmental or animal protection groups, political opposition, squatting or information campaigns are examples of action-oriented participation. Some of these forms of participation are not always legal.

Grass-root Participation and Civil Society

Grass-roots participation refers to being a member of and/or participating actively in NGO/NPO organizations. The variety of such organizations is broad: they include environmental organizations, organizations fighting for women’s rights and organizations advocating all sorts of social issues.

At the present time, organizations’ configuration is shifting from hierarchical and formal structures toward informal networks. Likewise, organizational participation is transforming from strict membership toward active participation in ad-hoc groups, which cease to exist once having achieved their goals. However, some of the networks evolving in recent years display a high level of continuity and professionalism.

Citizen involvement in civil society organizations has been associated with many conditions that are said to “make democracy work.” On the one hand, when democracy is working, the costs of collective action will go down, making for a more participatory citizenry. On the other hand, membership in associations is expected to have significant outcomes: (1) social learning effects, as a result of having group activity enhancing those attitudes, knowledge and skills on which democratic practices are based; (2) public sphere effects, by having associations supporting “the social infrastructure of public spheres that develop agendas, test ideas, embody deliberations, and provide voice”; and (3) institutional effects, where voluntary associations give voice to people and help them represent their views to political leaders.

Across a large number of studies, individuals who are members of associations tend to be politically active more often and in more diverse ways than people who are not members of such associations: Through being organized in an association people are more susceptible to mobilization. Through political participation, citizens more effectively hold political leadership accountable and demand a greater degree of responsiveness from them.

Additionally, being active in civil society has been shown to increase the sense that individuals can influence political processes. Through civil society activity, individuals develop civic skills which make them more effective citizens. As individuals become more acquainted with the democratic process, they gain more confidence, which makes them in turn more effective advocates of interests (Uslaner et al. 2003).

Political Consumerism and Life-Style Politics
The concept of political consumerism refers to⁴:

> “Consumer choice of producers and products with the goal of changing objectionable institutional or market practices. It is based on attitudes and values regarding issues of justice, fairness, or non-economic issues that concern personal and family well-being and ethical or political assessment of favorable and unfavorable business and government practice. Regardless of whether political consumers act individually or collectively, their market choices reflect an understanding of material products as embedded in a complex social and normative context which may be called the politics behind products”.

There are basically two forms of political consumerism: Negative political consumerism is when consumers decide not to purchase certain goods for political reasons. They engage in boycotts. Positive political consumerism occurs when consumers decide to follow particular guidance when choosing among products. Often this guidance comes in the form of labeling schemes like eco-labels or fair trade labels. For centuries now, citizens have used boycotts to voice their political demands. Labeling schemes are generally of more recent origin — 1970s and onward. The rise of labeling schemes in the 1990s and 2000s is associated with difficulties in keeping up with transboundary environmental problems and economic globalization.

Evidence shows that particularly women, young, and educated people tend to engage in consumerism. Engaging in organized consumerism can turn out to be a powerful tool to influence business practices and to contribute to the creation of political awareness on the greater societal scale.

**Illegal Modes of Participation and Violence**

We find the distinction between modes of participation using the dimensions legal – illegal controversial. While this scheme can easily be applied from a legal perspective, its explanatory power may be restricted when used to characterize individual behaviors. First of all, it assumes knowledge on the side of the acting person whether a specific activity was lawful or unlawful, which is in some cases not so obvious as one might think (e.g., strike laws). Second, even generally law-abiding citizens may find themselves in situations where they may choose an illegal protest activity – depending on the circumstances. Third, the definition of activities as legal or illegal is done by the state. Comparing activities under this label may thus lead to a diverse categorization of the same activity (this matters depending on what one is looking for: If it is aspired to measure the individual willingness to engage in activities although they are illegal, the comparison may still make sense. However, it does not make sense as a fixed reference point). This is one of the instances where cultural variation may play an important role.

The distinction alongside the dimension violent might be more meaningful.

**Special Issue: Interest in politics, information acquisition and discussion**

Participation in politics, even if limited to voting only, presumes some knowledge of social and political surroundings. Strictly speaking, information acquisition is not a form of political participation as it is defined in this paper. Though reading newspapers, following

---

⁴ http://www.statsvet.su.se/stv_hemsida/statsvetenskap_04/micheletti/consumerism_study_ram.htm
radio and/or TV broadcasts occurs in the context of political participation, it functions as an expression of readiness to engage in some mode of political activity. Therefore it should be treated as a determinant of political participation, as a variable that explains variation in political participation (background variable).

1.6 Operationalisation of Political Participation

As political participation activities are subject to change, depending on time & the bigger societal context, this brief discussion of potential activities can never be exhaustive. The same condition applies to any attempt to capture political participation in a questionnaire. For designing the EUYOUPART questionnaire, we will thus depart from a range of existing and proven items. The list of foreground and background variables (main areas) suggested here is a point of departure for the questionnaire development and will be completed and reviewed in the course of the process.

1.6.1 Foreground Variables

A. CONVENTIONAL FORMS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

a. Voting (including abstention from voting and invalid voting as forms of protest; eVoting) in elections on different organizational levels and in referenda
b. Regular Party Work (attending party meetings, active work within a party-group, contributing to campaigns and to party discussions, contacting officials,)
c. Work in election campaigns (including visiting campaign-events, canvassing, distributing leaflets, donating money, persuade others how to vote)
d. Information work (publishing, writing, contributing to a leaflet/an email/a political news letter; writing letters to the editors; publishing political information on a website,..) MIND: only reading political information or showing interest for political concerns is a background variable!
e. Membership in interest-organizations, which have the aim to influence political decisions (according to the definition of political participation), like the following...
   - Trade Unions
   - Farmers’ organizations
   - Business and employees’ organizations
   - Youth organizations
   - Women’s organizations
   - Pensioners’ organizations
   - Associations for disabled people
   - Social-welfare organizations
   - Charity organizations
   - Environmental organizations
   - Associations for animal rights and animal protection
   - Peace organizations
   - Human rights organizations
   - Associations for Consumer Rights
   - Anti-globalisation organization
B. UNCONVENTIONAL FORMS OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

a. Participating in demonstrations
b. Participating in strikes, street blockades, sit-ins, political street actions
c. Signing petitions, gathering signatures
d. Political consumerism (buying or boycotting certain products for political reasons)
e. Illegal, violent participation (taking part in illegal strikes, demonstrations, to blockade a road, occupy houses, fighting police, damaging property, …)

1.6.2 Background Variables

The following background variables should help to explain, why political participation among youth may differ in different countries.

a. „Lager“ affiliation/political sympathies of parents
b. Political interest (consumption of politics in mass media, political discussions, …)
c. Political education (and additionally: democracy at school, at work, at university)
d. Social activity (help for others, take part in social actions, …)
e. Social trust (anxiety, mistrust, …)
f. Social networking (peer groups)
g. Political efficacy (political self-confidence)
h. Political values, attitudes
i. Political skills (to know what is going on in politics, knowledge about different forms of political participation, …)
j. Self-positioning on the left-right-scale
k. Religious affiliation
l. Pursuit of social advancement
m. Socio-demographic variables
EMPIRICAL PART

In the theoretical part, the conceptual framework for EUYOUPART was introduced. The previous section was the precondition for the statistical analysis following in this part of the report. In the next step, it will also provide the basis for the questionnaire development within the framework of EUYOUPART project. In this part of the report, different empirical national as well as international surveys will be analysed and referred to. The purpose of this analysis is to give an overview of the national and international surveys which are most relevant for the EUYOUPART project. Primarily, the analysis will focus on the most important findings and the empirical constructs used in this surveys regarding political participation. The empirical part is divided into three sections:

- First, the analysis of national data and surveys is included. It is built on eight national reports, which were intended to describe youth political participation in the countries taking part in EUYOUPART. There is an overview on the specific national studies and the main national findings are reported. Both overview and analysis include hints and information on culture-specific items. National questionnaires were used to inform about culture specific indicators for political participation which were used in national studies and research projects.

- The next section is dedicated to the European Social Survey (ESS) – this survey contains also items measuring political participation. The special interest for EUYOUPART is in methodological and measurement issues of the ESS, because this international survey also has to deal with problems of comparability. On the one hand, general and specific information relevant for EUYOUPART is given. The emphasis is on the MTMM-experiment (multi-trait multi-method experiment) conducted by the ESS methodological research group. On the other hand, the structural analysis of important items is reported, which serves as information on the comparability of national patterns of political participation of young people. This structural analysis is supported by a descriptive overview of the variables included in data analysis.

- In the third section, interesting supplementary findings from other international studies are described. The dimensions under investigation include the following: Political interest, voting behaviour, legal and illegal protest activities. The analysis includes different international surveys: ISSP (International Social Survey Programme) - Role of Government III (1996), Youth and History (1994/95), World Value Survey 1990, Eurobarometer December 1990 and Young Europeans and Politics (1997).

The report (and the empirical part) concludes with implications and conclusions for the design of the EUYOUPART questionnaire.
2 Summary report on national data analysis

2.1 Introduction

This document gives an overview about 8 national reports, which were intended to describe youth political participation in the countries which belong to the EUYOUPART consortium. Contributors, striving to prepare perfect national reports, have bent all artificially preset constrictions (in the form of quality guidelines). As a result, the reports have huge variations in content.

The summary report on national studies focuses on the following study information:
- Country, name of the research projects, themes covered in the projects
- Research institution and/or commissioner of a research project
- Brief description of sampling and fieldwork
- Findings: Only one or two studies are selected and only results describing actual behaviour, no attitudes or behavioural intentions are included.

The main criteria for selecting a study was whether the study would give a possibly comprehensive overview on political participation of youth.
In operational terms, each study passed a 2-stage selection process: Firstly, the study was tested for the first criteria – the study should ideally contain a youth sample large enough for analysing sub-groups (e.g. gender, occupational status). Secondly, the study was tested for the coverage of participation modes – the study should give an overview of a possibly wide spectrum of participation modes. If there was no study with a youth sample in the national report, then the second criteria was applied to studies with a sample of the entire population.

There are some ‘blank spots’ in the reports – the national reports did not report all details of each research project.

2.2 Austria

Austrian national report gives an overview of the following two national studies:
- Austrian Youth Value Study 2000
- Democratic Understanding in Austria 1996

2.2.1 Overview on the studies used

Austrian Youth Value Study

Themes:
Importance of politics
Interest in politics, information acquisition from mass media channels, discussion of politics. Participation in citizen initiatives

**Research institution and commissioner:**
Financial support: Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Ministry of Social Security and Generations

**Sample and fieldwork:**
Sample: 1,000 Austrian young people between 14 and 24 years; the data were representative of the age group in Austria. Interviews were conducted in 2000.

**Democratic theories and understanding in Austria**

**Themes:**
Conventional participation
Taking part in citizen initiatives
Participation in protest actions
Organisational activism

**Research institute and commissioner:**
Financial support: Ministry of Science and Traffic

**Sample and fieldwork:**
Target population: whole Austrian population. Sample size: 2,000. Boys and girls between 15 and 25 years old constituted 18.9% of the sample (n=377). Interviews were conducted in 1996.

### 2.2.2 Findings

The Austrian national report gave frequency distributions of the variables and results of factor analysis. Gender differences, age differences and employment status differences were not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>---</th>
<th>Austrian Youth Value Survey 2000</th>
<th>Democratic understanding 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested in politics very interested or somewhat/little interest</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed news in mass media channels at least once a week</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped election campaign</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended election event</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped fundraising campaign</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in a referendum, did not vote</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deliberately, spoiled ballot
Did not vote deliberately 7%
Spoiled ballot 7%
Participated in local/political group 5%
Informed oneself about a political problem in a group 6%
Participated in a citizen activism 3%
Participated in a demonstration 20% 12%
Participated in a roadshow activity 5%
Participated in a strike 9%
Participated in a protest action, blocked traffic 6%
Participated in a protest action, squat tenements, building slots 0.3%
Active member in sports club 26%
Active member in student/youth association 9%
Active member in staff association 6%, 0.3%
Active member in a professional organization
Active member in political party 5%
No association 51%

2.3 Estonia

The national report gave an overview of the following research projects:
- “Civic Education Project” because it focused on young people’s socio-political attitudes and behaviour
- “Estonian Society in June 2002” because of good coverage of political participation
- “The Evolution of Democratic Political Culture in Re-independent Estonia” for the same reason as the previous project

2.3.1 Overview on the studies used

Civic Education Study (CIVED)

Themes:
Organisational participation
Discussion of national and international political events
Following political news in the mass media and Internet

Research institute and commissioner:
The research project was undertaken by International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievements. In Estonia, the project was managed by the Department of Political Science at Tallinn Pedagogical Institute.
Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: all XII grade pupils of general education gymnasium, 18 years old. Interviews took place in spring 2001, weighted sample size 3215.
Two-stage random cluster sample was used: on the first stage, gymnasium was selected, on the second stage, class within the gymnasium was selected. All pupils of the selected class were treated as subjects to be interviewed.

Estonian Society in June 2002

Themes:
Following political news in mass media
Participation in conventional forms and in civic initiatives
Interest in national and international politics
Organisational membership

Research institution and commissioner:
The survey was ordered by Economic and Social Information Department, Chancellery of the Riigikogu.

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: all inhabitants of Estonia aged 15-74. Fieldwork was conducted in June 2002, weighted sample size 1015
Two-stage pseudo-random sampling:
On the first stage sampling point is selected,
On the second stage interviewees are selected by using random route schema
Sample breakdown by age groups:
Below 26 years: 216 (21%)
26-30 years: 82 (8%)
Above 30 years: 298 (29%)

The Evolution of Democratic Political Culture in Re-independent Estonia

Themes:
Interest in politics and information acquisition behaviour
Involvement in conventional (incl. voting) and unconventional forms of political participation
Organisational membership, including political parties

Research institution and commissioner
The project was undertaken by the Department of Political Science at Tartu University. The project was financed by Estonian Ministry of Science and Education.

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: Estonian citizens 18 or older. Fieldwork too place in June 2003, sample size 800. Two stage pseudo-random sampling was used.

2.3.2 Findings

The report gave frequency distributions, factor analysis results and gender differences. The report gave neither age nor employment status differences.

### Participation patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CIVED 2001</th>
<th>June 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested in politics</td>
<td>62% (very, rather interested)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed politics</td>
<td>From 46% to 62%, depending on topic and discussion partner</td>
<td>57% (often, repeatedly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read news about own country in printed press</td>
<td>55% (sometimes, often)</td>
<td>83% (at least once a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read news about other country in printed press</td>
<td>90% (sometimes, often)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed news on TV</td>
<td>94% (sometimes, often)</td>
<td>95% (at least once a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed news on radio</td>
<td>85% (sometimes, often)</td>
<td>77% (at least once a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use internet to obtain news</td>
<td>37% (sometimes, often)</td>
<td>14% (at least once a week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a student council</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared school newspaper</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in youth organisation</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in student exchange</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an environmental organisation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in sports club</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in scouts' organisation</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a religious organisation</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in music&amp;drama club</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in cultural association</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in computer club</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in last parliamentary elections (March 2003)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a political party</td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political participation at least once during last 12 months, June 2003
Followed social focused news and broadcasts in TV and/or radio 97%
Discussed social problems and events with friends and acquaintances 92%
Sent letter or article to printed press 8%
Signed a petition or a public letter 33%
Partaked in a public meeting where some issue is discussed 27%
Gave a prepared speech at a public meeting 8%
Participated in a protest march, picket, strike 10%
Participated in an illegal event (for example, squatting, blocking traffic, demonstration) 2%
Took part in campaign organised by a party, help to prepare and/or distribute campaign materials 8%
Bought a product with an aim of supporting some event, achieving some goal 44%
Donated money to party 3%
Stood/ran for election into local council 5%
Stood/ran for election into parliament 1%
Worked together with others to solve some local community problem 28%
Stood/ran for leadership position in some organisation 12%
Brought a case to court 6%
Sent letter to, call to, meet representatives of state institutions 9%
Sent letter to, call to, meet representatives of local government 25%
Did not vote in local or national elections out of protest 16%
Did not buy some product or service out of protest 15%

Gender differences
CIVED
Girls tend to participate more likely in various cultural organisations, in local/community organisations, in clerical and charity organisations. Boys tend to participate in sports and scouts clubs, in computer clubs, also in international UNESCO club. Boys tend to follow and discuss politics more frequently than girls.

June 2002
Among men, the following forms of participation were more popular:
Acquiring information from Internet
Acquiring information from meetings with public servants
Contacting MP
Defended rights in court
Avoided paying unjust taxes
Contacted consumer protection organization
Interest in internal and in international affairs
Participation in sports club
Party membership
Among women, the following forms of participation were more popular:
Participation in trade union activities
Participation in clerical organization
Participation in music/dance/choir clubs
Participation in gender organizations
June 2003
The following indicators scored higher among men:
Political interest
Participation in protest demonstration
Donating money to party
Working together with other on some local problem
Contacting local government
Using Internet
Taking part in interest group activities was higher among women

2.4 Germany

The report gave an overview of three research projects:
- German Youth Survey 1997
- Jugend 97; 12th Shell Youth Study
- ALLBUS (German General Social Survey) 1998.

2.4.1 Overview on the studies used

Adolescents and Young Adults in Germany

Themes:
Interest in politics, information acquisition behaviour, discussion about politics
Voting and non-voting out of protest
Organisational activism and membership
Political consumerism
Participation in non-violent and violent/illegal protest actions

Research institution and commissioner:
The project was undertaken by German Youth Institute (GYI).

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population in 1997: 16-29 year old German youth. Sample size: 6919.
Sampling method: field staff, three step random selection process. The sample was
disproportional in Western and Eastern-Germany. Interviews were conducted in
1997.

12th Shell Youth Study Jugend 97

Themes:
Interest in politics, information acquisition behaviour (mass media, contacts)
Voting and non-voting out of protest
Organisational membership and activism, including work for a political party and
participation in school/workplace governing bodies
Political consumerism
Participation in conventional forms
Participation in non-violent protest activities

Research institution and commissioner:
Research institute: Psydata/University of Berlin

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: German youth aged 12-24. Sample size 2102, fieldwork conducted in 1996. Quota sampling procedure was employed.

German General Social Survey (ALLBUS)

Themes:
Interest in politics, information acquisition behaviour (mass media, contacts, meetings), discussion
Voting and non-voting out of protest
Political party related activism
Participation in conventional forms
Participation in non-violent protest activities
Participation in violent/illegal actions

Research institution and commissioner:
ZUMA

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: 18 years of age or older, since 91 German and non-German. Sample size: 3234, disproportional West/East Germany. Fieldwork was conducted in 1998. Sampling method: field staff, three step random selection process

2.4.2 Findings

The national report gave frequency distributions and factor analysis results. Gender differences, age differences and employment status differences were not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interested in politics</th>
<th>Jugendsurvey, Youth and Young Adults in Germany, 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18% (very strong or strong)</td>
<td>47% (yes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obtained political info from newspapers</th>
<th>Jugend 97; 12th Shell Youth Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% (very often or often)</td>
<td>52% (daily newspapers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% (city district newspapers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23% (weekly magazines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(very often or often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>% of respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained political info from TV</td>
<td>73% (very often or often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained political info from radio</td>
<td>52% (very often or often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained political info from internet</td>
<td>5% (very often or often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed politics with parents, spouse, schoolmates, friends, colleagues</td>
<td>36%...46% depends on discussion partner (very often or often)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote letters/e-mails to politicians</td>
<td>7% 19% (write letters/post cards to politicians/authorities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote letters concerning political and social topics to newspapers, radio or television stations</td>
<td>11% 18% (express your own opinions in letters to the media (letters to the editor, letters to radio stations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted</td>
<td>44% 47% (voted in last elections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberately not voted</td>
<td>7% 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined and participated in a political party</td>
<td>4% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a function in or participated regularly in a political party</td>
<td>1% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a function in or participated regularly in a local association</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a governing body of a business, school or training center</td>
<td>30% 10% (participated in a governing body such as student council/ labor union’s youth representation/ university government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a function or participated regularly in a labor union</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a boycott</td>
<td>12% 24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an authorized political demonstration</td>
<td>33% 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an unauthorized political demonstration</td>
<td>11% 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a strike supported by a labor union</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a strike not supported by a labor union</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied houses, factories or government offices</td>
<td>3% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in events where property could be damaged</td>
<td>5% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in events, for</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which it was not entirely possible to rule out people getting injured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a citizens’ action group</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of a labor union</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of a trade association</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of a political party</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of a religious organisation</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of a youth association</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of a sports club</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently member of another organisation</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% (participated in a governing body such as student council / university government or other kind of youth representation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 United Kingdom

The national report from UK gave an overview of three research projects:
- Citizen Audit Project
- European Identity Survey
- Young People’s Social Attitudes Survey

2.5.1 Overview on the studies used

Citizen Audit Project

Themes:
- Interest in politics, discussion of politics
- Voting, political party identification, opinions about voting; non-voting
- Democracy at workplace, participation in company management and influencing one’s work conditions
- General opinions on socio-political activism
- Conventional participation
- Local activism (school and medical care system management)
- Participation in civic protest
- Participation in proactive, illegal/violent actions
- Membership and participation in organisations
- Political attitudes: political efficacy, political cynicism, opinions about participation,
Research institution and commissioner:
Not given in the report

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: adults aged 18 or over. Sample size 13,416. Sampling method: stratified random sample. Large majority of the sample was taken from the mailed surveys. The sampling frame for the face-to-face part of the survey was the Postcode Address File, a list of addresses compiled by the Post Office. Data collection period was not given in the report. The best guess would be 2003 (and second part of 2002) because the data were not available yet.

European Identity Survey
The European Identity Survey was a cross-national survey research project, part of which was conducted in UK.

Themes:
Interest in different social issues
Opinions and behavioural plans on voting
Democracy at school
Participation in demonstrations
Membership and participation in organisations

Research institution and commissioner:
Not given in the report

Sample and fieldwork:

Young People’s Social Attitudes Survey
The Young People’s Social Attitudes Survey was conducted as part of a broader British Social Attitudes Survey (BSA).

Themes:
Interest in politics, knowledge of facts about politics, reading news in newspapers
Opinions on voting
Party identification
Democracy at school and at workplace

Research institution and commissioner:
Not given in the report.
Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: youth aged 12-19 years. Sample size: 580. Sampling method: random sampling from the Postcode Address File from a list of all postal sectors in Britain.
Dates of fieldwork not given in the report.

2.5.2 Findings

The report included mostly indicators of political attitudes and behavioural intentions. The report gave frequency distributions occasionally and in incomplete format; most of frequency distributions were missing. The report gave an overview of factor analysis results in literal form.
Gender, age and employment status differences not given in the report.

Young People’s Social Attitudes Survey
Interested in politics a great deal, quite a lot, some 38%
Read daily newspapers at least three times a week 45%

2.6 France

The report gave an overview of three national studies:
• Democracy survey
• CEVIPOF electoral panel survey 2002, T1 and T2
• Sciences Po students survey

Notable effort was made to give an interpretation of survey results, comparisons of results from the three surveys were presented.

2.6.1 Overview on the studies used

Democracy survey

Themes:
Interest in politics
Opinion on importance of voting and actual voting in former elections
Opinion on importance of demonstrations

Research institution and commissioner:
The project was undertaken by CEVIPOF. Financial support came from FNSP, CNRS, CEVIPOF, Governmental Information Service (SIG), National Science Foundation (NSF).

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: French inhabitants aged 18 or older. Sample size: 2148; sample properties: the sample was representative of the French society, except for lower educated (under represented). People aged from 18 to 25 years constituted 15,8% of the sample (N_{18-25} = 341). Interviews were conducted using telephone interviews (CATI) in 2000-2001.

**CEVIPOF electoral panel survey 2002, T1 and T2**

**Themes:**
- Interest in politics, discussion of politics
- Voting in earlier elections
- Participation in civic protest and proactive protest actions
- Organisational membership

**Research institution and commissioner:**
Principal investigator was CEVIPOF.

**Sample and fieldwork:**
T1 denotes a survey before 2002 presidential elections, whereas T2 denotes a survey after 2002 presidential elections.
T1: Target population: French citizens eligible to vote. Sample size T1: 4 107 individuals; the sample was representative of the French population. Quota sampling: gender, age, profession and stratification by region and nature of the city of living. People between 18 and 25 years constituted 11,4% of the sample (N_{18-25} = 469). The data were collected using computer assisted personal interviewing (CAPI).
T2: Target population: registered voters in France. Sample size: 4 017 individuals; the sample was representative of the voters registered. Quota sampling: gender, age, profession and stratification by region and nature of the city of living. 1 822 interviewed people in T2 had already been interviewed in T1. People aged between 18 and 25 years constituted 11% of the sample (N_{18-25} = 444). The data were collected by telephone interviewing.

**Sciences Po Students Survey**

**Themes:**
- Interest in politics, political discussion
- Participation in civic activism, campaigning
- Participation in proactive forms of political participation
- Organisational membership and participation

**Research institution and commissioner:**
Principal investigator was CEVIPOF, financial support from FNSP.

**Sample and fieldwork:**
Target population: not specified, probably students of the Institute for Political Studies. Sample size: 2,450. Data collection: a self-administrated questionnaire was distributed to the students during seminars. Fieldwork dates: 2002-2003

2.6.2 Findings

The report gave frequency distributions and factor analysis results. Gender differences were included occasionally. Age and employment status differences were not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences Po Students Survey</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested in politics very much, somewhat</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed politics with … often, sometimes</td>
<td>… father 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… mother 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… brother/sister 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… teacher 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>… friend 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered on the electoral list</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote a leaflet</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sticked placards</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a political meeting</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a political party</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a trade union</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a demonstration</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised demonstration</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a strike</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a protest action, fought with police</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a protest action, caused material damage</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied public buildings</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of sports association</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of cultural/artistic association</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a religious association</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of an environmental association</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of an anti-globalisation association</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of anti-racism organisation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political interest and violent political action were the sub-themes for which there were statistically significant differences between women and men. Men were more interested in politics than women.

2.7 Finland

Finnish report gave a comprehensive overview of Finnish youth’s opinions on politics as well as of aspects of political behaviour. The report delivered a quite integral view of background of political participation. Strong effort was made to give an interpretation of figures. Unfortunately most of the reported results focused on political attitudes and on behavioural intentions rather than on actual behaviour.

EUYOUPART
Political Participation of Young People in Europe
HPSE-CT-2002-00123
2.7.1 Overview on the studies used

Youth in the general elections 2003

Themes:
Interest in politics, information acquiring behaviour, following news in political campaign
Political party identification, preference in elections, psychological attachment
Voting in earlier elections, motivation and reasons to vote; non-voting, reasons for not voting.
Political consumerism
Participation in civic protest
Participation in proactive, violent actions
Organisational membership and involvement
Meaning of ‘politics’, ‘political’; socio-political values and beliefs

Research institution and commissioner:
Finnish Ministry of Education

2.7.2 Findings

The report gave frequency distributions for a number of variables. Factor analysis results were reported in several sections of the report.
The report did not give gender, age or employment status differences in political participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested in politics very interested, somewhat interested</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with others of the recent elections during the campaign period</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily, almost daily, often</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used website advisors for choosing the right candidate in elections</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in last elections</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote a letter to the editor</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the activities of the local or residents’ associations</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact political decision-makers</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a boycott</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a peaceful demonstration</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in radical direct action including civil disobedience</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in demonstrations that have previously transformed to violent cases</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of student or school organization</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of sports organisation</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of environmental association, association or club on nature or watching animals</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of humanitarian organisation, organisation for the disabled</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of organisation for national defence, reserve organization</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a political youth organisation or political party organisations</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of human rights organisation, peace movement</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of leisure club, e.g. music, photo, or other hobby activities</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member of a trade union 43 %
Member of another organisation 4 %

2.8 Italy

The Italian report gives an overview of the two following surveys:
- Young People in the New Century (IARD 2000)
- Multipurpose sampling survey by national statistical institute ISTAT Multiscopo 2000

2.8.1 Overview on the studies used

Young People in the New Century

Themes:
Organisational membership and participation
Trust in political institutions
Participation in civic protest (demonstration, signing a petition)
Party preference, evaluations of parties
Information acquisition from mass media

Research institution and commissioner:
Financial support: IARD, Fondazione Carialo, Pirelli S.p.A.

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: people aged 15 - 34 years. Sample size: 3000. Sampling procedure: stratification, on levels of region, size of town, sex and age. Fieldwork dates: March and May 2000. Data were collected in face to face interviews.

Multipurpose survey by national statistical institute (ISTAT)

Themes:
Interest in politics, following mass media, discussion of politics
Participation in organisations

Research institution and commissioner:
Principal investigator and financial support: ISTAT

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: Italian households. Sample size: 58 000 individuals from approximately 21 000 households. Sampling strategy: a two stage sampling design. The primary sampling units are the townships (comuni), with probabilities proportional to population size (PPS sampling design). The second stage units are families; all members of a sampled family were interviewed.
Dates of fieldwork: 2000. The data were collected in face-to-face interviews.

### 2.8.2 Findings

The report contained mostly indicators of political attitudes and behavioural intentions. A selection of indicators of actual behaviour was included. The report presented frequency distributions and factor analysis results. However, frequency distributions were deficient in most cases. They did not sum up to 100% so it was impossible to tell what the figures meant. Gender, age and occupational status differences were not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5th Survey on Italian Youth, 2000</th>
<th>ISTAT Household Survey, 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I feel myself engaged in politics’ OR ‘I keep up with political events, but I don’t take part in it politics’</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followed national news on TV very often, enough often</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followed local/regional news on TV very often, enough often</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Followed political debates on TV very often, rather often</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussed politics at least once a week</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtained information about politics at least once a week</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in an electoral campaign meeting in last 12 months</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in an political debate in last 12 months</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donated money to party</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in a meeting of a political party in last 12 months</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did voluntary work for a political party in last 12 months</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in a street demonstration in last 12 months</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in a meeting of a trade union in last 12 months</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participated in a meeting of voluntary organisation in last 12 months</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a meeting of environmental, civil rights, peace organization</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a meeting of a professional association</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated money to an association</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did voluntary work for a volunteer work group</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did voluntary work for a non-volunteer association</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did voluntary work for a party</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did voluntary work for a trade association</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 Slovakia

The report gave an overview of four national studies:
- Research No 4 Political participation of young people of Slovakia
- Research No 2 Election Poll: primary voters and secondary voters 2002
- Research No 1 The Trust to the social institutions and election of president
- Research No 5 Slovak Identity and the European Union

2.9.1 Overview on the studies used

**Political participation of young people of Slovakia**

**Themes:**
Interest in politics, economy and local society, following mass media channels
Trust in political institutions
Political party membership
Organisational involvement

**Research institution and commissioner:**
Institute for information and prognosis in Education, Department for Youth Research. Address: UIP MŠ SR, Staré grunty 52, 842 44 Bratislava, www.uips.sk

**Sample and fieldwork:**
Target population: young people aged 15-26 years, approximately 20% of the population of the Slovak Republic. Sample: 995 respondents in age of 15 to 26 years.
Sampling procedure: free quota selection with random target person in the last stage. The quotas based on sex, age, status, economic activity, nationality, highest education received relation to religion and confession, type of attended school, size of the place of residence and the region of the SR.
The data were collected in standard interviews. Fieldwork dates: April-may 2002.
Voting behaviour of young people

Themes:
Voting/abstaining intention
Reasons for abstaining, voting and party preference
Trust in politicians
Social problems in Slovakia

Research institution and commissioner:
Principal research institution not given in the report. Data collected by FOCUS AGENCY-Marketing and Social Research, Grosslingová ul. č.37, 811 00 Bratislava, Slovenská republika, Focus@gtinet.sk

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: people who had voted on the election day in voting booth. Sample size: 4516, age group 18-24 yrs constituted 16%, age group 25-34 constituted 19% of the sample. Interviewee recruiting: random sample of voters who were leaving voting precinct. Fieldwork dates remain unclear – three dates were given: September 25-26, 1998, April 2002 and August 2002.

The Trust to the social institutions and election of president

Themes:
Voting intention
Politicians’ human and professional qualities
Interest in mass media

Research institution and commissioner:
Department of Media Research Slovak Radio

Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: not given in the report. Sample size: 2426.

Slovak Identity and the European Union

Themes:
Organisational membership and activism
Activism in informal networks of fellows and friends

Research institution and commissioner:
Youth section, Institute for Sociology Slovak Academy of Sciences, Address: Klemensova 19, 841 04 Bratislava, SR. Presentation www.changenet.sk/slyica, www.sociologia.sk/sss
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Sample and fieldwork:
Target population: young people between 15 and 26 living in 8 regional centres of Slovakia. Sample size: not given in the report. Sampling method not given in the report.

2.9.2 Findings

The report included a large number of indicators of political attitudes and behavioral intentions and a small number of indicators of actual behavior. The report gave frequency distributions and factor analysis results. Gender, age or employment status differences were not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research 4</th>
<th>Research 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of a political party</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in politics very much or adequately</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took part in public life regularly or occasionally</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political info from TV</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political info from radio</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political info from printed press</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of a youth organisation</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 The European Social Survey

This part of the report will focus on the **European Social Survey**, which is a "academically-driven social survey designed to chart and explain the interaction between Europe's changing institutions and the attitudes, beliefs and behaviour patterns of its diverse populations" (see www.europeansocialsurvey.org, February 2004). The ESS follows high standards, the whole process (beginning with conceptualization of the survey) is well documented and publicly available.

The special interest for EUYOUPART is on how methodological and measurement issues in regard to capturing political participation of youth have been resolved by the ESS team. The experiences of the ESS team are of particular interest to EUYOUPART since nearly two dozen countries were taking part in "Round 1" of the survey. Dealing with and establishing comparability is therefore also a central topic for the ESS.

In this part of the report, the comparability of the ESS items will be discussed. Those dimensions and items which seem important for political participation will be analysed in terms of structural aspects. The objectives of this process are:

- to learn about which empirical constructs were used in the ESS and may be used for EUYOUPART
- to examine in the ESS-context whether there are dimensions measuring political participation that are comparable cross-nationally
- to examine which items work better (or worse) in an international context

The ESS was chosen for different practical reasons:

- The ESS follows high quality standards, including an extensive documentation of all phases of the survey.
- The data are publicly available and easily accessible.
- International studies usually include only a few questions about political participation and deliver thus very scarce fragments when analysed. The ESS contains a satisfying number of questions on political participation.

In the following section, important general and especially methodological information on the ESS (especially on the MTMM-study) and a brief introduction about the concept of cross-cultural comparability of survey measures will be given. Then the selection of items and countries for the empirical analysis is discussed, followed by a descriptive overview on the most important variables measuring political participation in the ESS and included in further analysis. Next, the testing of comparability of the behavioural variables is described ("involvement patterns"). Chapter 3 concludes with recommendations for EUYOUPART based on the
information on the ESS and empirical analysis of data. The recommendations focus on the development of the EUYOUPART-questionnaire.

3.1 Information on the ESS

The ESS is a social survey containing attitudes, beliefs and behaviour patterns in different field of social life. The participating countries of “Round 1” were: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK.

The following information is based on the extensive documentation of the ESS.5

3.1.1 General information

ESS Round 1 started in June 2001, the fieldwork was completed in December 2002 and first data were released in August 2003; Round 2 runs from June 2003 to June 2005. The survey is planned to be executed biannually.

The main questionnaire consists of two parts: the core questionnaire and rotating modules. The core questionnaire will remain constant from round to round. The rotating modules, each of which will be devoted to a substantive topic/theme, change over time. The rotating modules of Round 1 form sections D and E of the main questionnaire. At each round of the survey, the latter are designed by different multi-national teams of researchers.

The supplementary questionnaire is presented to the respondents at the end of the main interview. There are two parts of the supplementary questionnaires (see www.europeansocialsurvey.org, March 2004):

- First is the 21-item human values scale developed by the Israeli psychologist Shalom Schwartz, to be administered to all respondents.

- The second scale is devoted to measures to help evaluate the reliability and validity of other items in the main questionnaire, using the Multi-Trait, Multi-Method (MTMM) approach.

The main questionnaire is conducted by face to face interviews of around an hour in duration. These are followed by the self-completion supplement.

5 The documentation and articles about general as well as methodological issues of the ESS are available on the ESS-website (see www.europeansocialsurvey.org). The following sources were used:
   a) Development of the questionnaire, November 2001
   b) Design of supplementary questionnaire
   c) ESS documentation report 2002/2003, The ESS data archive, 3rd edition
Core questionnaire

The core module aims to monitor change and continuity in a wide range of socio-economic, socio-political, socio-psychological and socio-demographic variables. It provides background variables for the analysis of the rotating modules. The whole enterprise of the ESS is to measure and explain continuity and change in three broad domains:

1. People’s **value orientations** (their world views, including their religiosity, their socio-political values and their moral standpoints). Specifically, this includes the following topics:
   - Left-right orientation
   - Libertarian-authoritarian orientation
   - Environmentalism
   - Post-materialism
   - Basic human values (Schwartz scale)
   - Satisfaction with democracy
   - Trust in institutions, confidence in the economy
   - Interest in politics, party affiliation and voting turnout
   - Personal and system efficacy
   - Religious orientation, present and past
   - Church attendance
   - Belief in God

2. People’s **cultural/national orientations** (their sense of national and cultural attachment and their feelings towards outgroups and cross-national governance). Specifically, this includes the following topics:
   - Citizenship and national identity
   - National sentiment and patriotism/chauvinism
   - Prejudice towards ‘outgroups’
   - Attitudes towards the EU and other forms of multi-level governance
   - Attitudes towards migration

3. The underlying **social structure of society** (people’s social positions, including degree of social exclusion, plus standard background socio-demographic variables, a few questions about media usage that help to identify the primary sources of people’s social and political knowledge). Specifically, this includes the following topics:
• Respondent and household demographic characteristics
• Education
• Racial/ethnic origin
• Work status and unemployment experience of respondent
• Occupation and SES of respondent
• Economic standing/income of household
• Subjective health status of respondent
• Social trust and networks
• Subjective indicators of poverty
• Experience and fear of crime
• Access to and use of mass media

Rotating module

The purpose of the rotating modules is to provide an in-depth focus on a series of particular academic or policy concerns. For Round 1, the following two issues for the rotating module were selected:

1. Immigration

2. Citizenship, Involvement and Democracy, which investigates the growing problems in most modern democratic societies of political and social disengagement, loss of community, and a decline in trust. The module will attempt to assess which social and political conditions are most likely to encourage greater social and political involvement of citizens. It focuses on the extent and breadth of civic engagement in different societies and investigates its impact. The module covers engagement at both a micro and macro level (‘small’ democracy and ‘big’ democracy) in order to bring out possible links between social and political participation and the impact of both on the health of a democracy.

3.1.2 MTMM-experiment for the evaluation of measurement instruments

The Multi-Trait Multi-Method approach is designed to evaluate measurement instruments. The experiments are conducted to test the quality of measurement with regard to validity and reliability as well as method effects (see Saris 1995).

The pilot stage

Most of the following information is based on the report on the MTMM-experiments in the ESS-pilot studies, by Saris & Gallhofer (2003a).
The supplementary questionnaire of the ESS as well as parts of the main questionnaire was developed to evaluate the measurement instrument in the pilot studies of Round 1. The purpose of conducting MTMM-experiments in the framework of the ESS was to assess data validity and reliability and to test the impact of

- different wordings
- forced choice format vs. agree/disagree format
- diverse numbers of categories
- modes of data collection and the use of show cards.

To identify which format of indicators would be most appropriate, MTMM-experiments were arranged. The ESS pilot survey was conducted only in the Netherlands and Great Britain. The various alternatives how to ask questions (e.g., different scales, position of the question in the questionnaire, etc.) were tested in different areas of the ESS. The ESS questionnaire contains in general the following areas (topics), from which only the first three describe actual behaviours:

1. Media Use
2. Social Contact
3. Political Action
4. Political Efficacy
5. Social Trust
6. Satisfaction with economy/democracy/government
7. Schwartz Values Scale

The design of the MTMM-study- which alternatives were tested in which field of the ESS - is shown in Table 1.
Table 1: The design for the meta-analysis of MTMM designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>MAIN QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media use</td>
<td>Open frequency</td>
<td>7 cat. numeric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 cat. verbal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social contact</td>
<td>7 point high-low</td>
<td>7 point low-high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political action</td>
<td>dichotomous</td>
<td>k/n items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political efficacy</td>
<td>5 point agree/disagree</td>
<td>5 point force choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social trust</td>
<td>11 point scale</td>
<td>5 point scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with economy/democracy/govt</td>
<td>4 point bi-polar</td>
<td>11 point bi-polar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz values scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>importance/feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saris/Gallhofer: Report on the MTMM experiments in the pilot studies and Proposals for Found 1 of the ESS.

The first three topics were chosen to study the effect of different formulations on reliability and validity. The political efficacy items were used to study the quality of the forced choice format compared with the agree/disagree format. The social trust items were used to test the effect of the number of categories. Especially the 11 point (0 –10 points) scale was tested. In the British pilot study this was done with and without a show card. The satisfaction items have the same purpose but now the 11 point scale was placed in the self-completion part of the questionnaire.

For detailed proceedings and results of the MTMM-pilot study the report of Saris/Gallhofer (2003a) should be referred to in full length. In this report, only general recommendations and findings will be summarised. For EUYOUPART, the results related to political participation behaviour are most interesting as well as results from other topics that may be regarded as background variables for political participation. The MTMM-study yielded the following results and recommendations:

- **Political Action:**
  Only eight different items (out of 21 items where people have to indicate whether they did an activity or not) were used and classified into “conventional”, “unconventional” and “new social movement actions”.
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The single-item-method (to use only one item for each kind of question) is worst. The other two measures work equally good (three questions asked how many of $n$ actions the respondent has done in the last 12 month; and sum score was computed over the items which have been specified in the sets of the previous method).

- Media use:
  numeric 7 point scales labels

- Social Contact:
  numeric 7 point scales going from low to high frequency

- Political Efficacy:
  forced choice format (instead of agree/disagree to statement)

- Social Trust:
  11 point scale (or 5 point scale), not forced choice format with 2 categories

- Satisfaction with results of present government: 11 point scale

For various reasons, the ESS-authors are careful to give recommendations. The study was conducted only in the Netherlands and Great Britain. Furthermore, different research questions demand different formulations and/or scales.

“… we would like to make suggestions for the full questionnaire not only for the questions discussed above. In doing so we try to generalize the results from these and previous studies. However, the results can not be generalized in a simple way.” (Saris/Gallhofer 2003a: 15).

However, the following general rules were formulated from the analysis of the ESS pilot-study in Round 1:

- **Number of categories used:**
  use of scales with as many categories as reasonable, but if more than 7 categories, fixed reference points should be provided.

- **Direct questions or statements in a battery:**
  Avoid the agree/disagree format with statements in batteries as much as possible. But don’t use only direct questions, because different formats keep the respondents awake and avoid serious method effects.

- **Mode of data collection:**
  Use of show cards under all circumstances.

- **Don’t know option:**
  Provide a don’t know option in the main questionnaire.

- **Unipolar – bipolar scales:**
  Avoid to use unipolar scales if bipolar scales are also possible.
• Order of the categories (low-high or high-low):
  There is no clear suggestion on this issue, because results look
  contradictory.

Furthermore, it was concluded that further MTMM experiments should be included
in the main questionnaire:

• There should be an estimate of the quality of the measures for languages
  other than English and Dutch.

• Without these estimates of data quality, the results cannot be compared
  across countries.

• Also for English and Dutch it is relevant to see if the results are stable and
  whether the order of the questions plays an important role in the estimates.

The MTMM-study in the main stage

The ESS consortium followed this recommendation and integrated an additional
MTMM study. In this section, the proceeding and results of MTMM-experiments in
the main stage of Round 1 are reproduced and summarised. Most of the following
information is based on the report of Saris/Gallhofer (2003b) “Work package 9 –
Analysis of reliability and validity at the main stage”.

For a better evaluation of the quality of the measurement instrument in different
countries taking part in the ESS, MTMM experiments were built in the final
questionnaire used in all countries.

To conduct the MTMM experiments at the main stage, the main questionnaire is
followed by a shorter supplementary questionnaire. There are two versions of the
supplementary questionnaire in the main stage of Round 1: a face-to-face version
and a version which was self-completed by the respondent at the end of the main
interview. The questionnaire is divided into two sections: GF (human values scale)
and HF (MTMM test questions).

Not all questions of the core questionnaire could be evaluated at once. Only a
number of the most crucial and influential variables was studied. The experiments
were conducted to see if the choices and recommendations of the pilot studies
were a good choice leading to higher reliability and validity of the questions in the
main questionnaire.

In the proposed MTMM experimental design the following crucial factors were
suggested for evaluation and have been evaluated in the pilot study:

• open questions asking frequencies or amounts versus 7 point category
  scales
• dichotomous versus 5 points and 11 point scales
• point agree/disagree items with statements versus direct questions with construct specific responses
• 11 point bipolar scales with show cards or without them
• 4 point bipolar scales versus 4 point unipolar scales and 11 point bipolar scales
• use of agree/disagree batteries compared with direct questions with construct specific responses

The choice of the topics followed the questions from the core questionnaire that were assigned priority for the evaluation of quality. Therefore different experiments were conducted for the topics:

• Media Use
• Political Efficacy
• Social Trust
• Satisfaction with the economy, democracy and government
• Trust in political institutions
• Socio-political orientations

In the data collection the split ballot MTMM design was used in order to reduce the efforts for the respondents and to reduce memory effects. The data of 14 countries were analysed: UK, Ireland, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Czech Republic, Poland, Slovenia, Switzerland and Israel.

The quality of the data was reported by countries (mean reliability and validity coefficients over six experiments in 14 countries) and by topics (mean reliability and validity coefficients for different topics across countries).

Results:

• Mean reliability and validity in countries:
  In most cases the right choices have been made for the main questionnaire. The reliability and validity coefficients of the question in the main questionnaire were higher than the reliability and validity coefficients of the questionnaires in the supplementary questionnaire.
• Mean reliability and validity for different topics:
  If the results are aggregated across topics instead of countries, again
differences in results for different topics occur. Again these results confirm
that the choice for the main questionnaire was rather good.

The results of the MTMM-experiments in the main study of Round 1 “show that the
choices that have been made in order to improve the quality of the questions in the
main questionnaire have in general had a positive effect on the quality of the data.
In most countries the questions used in the main questionnaire are better than
possible alternatives tested in the supplementary questionnaire. The average level
of the quality is also quite good. Over all countries and topics the reliability
coefficient is .858 and the validity coefficient is .966. This result means that of the
total variance of an observed variable with this qualities 68,7% is due to the trait to
be measured. 4,9 % is due to the systematic error and 26.4 % is due to random
measurement error. This is a good result. However it should be remarked that the
quality of the questions varies with the topic studied (…) and with the country
studied (…). This issue should be of concern for the cross cultural analysis even
though the quality of the questions in general is quite good” (see Saris/Gallhofer
2003b: 3f).

For detailed results of the MTMM-experiments in the main study of the ESS, see

For various reasons mentioned above, these results can not be easily generalized
for EUYOUPART. Nevertheless, the MTMM-study was summarized to give an idea
of what has to be decided in the EUYOUPART-project and which items,
formulations, modes etc. were already tested in another context. The results of the
MTMM-studies should be considered in the next step of questionnaire development
in EUYOUPART, especially when dealing with decisions about mode of data
collection, types of questions, number and types of categories.

The MTMM-study focused on testing the effect of different methods and item
characteristics, which can lead to method and item bias. These forms of bias can
affect both levels of equivalence – structural and measurement equivalence- and
therefore cause serious problems with regard to comparability of measures. The
request for comparability will be discussed in the following chapter.

3.2 Concepts of comparability and equivalence

In cross-national research high comparability of concepts and measures is needed.
Therefore major efforts need to be made during the whole research process,
including the development and selection of underlying concepts, the formulation of
the research questions, method selection, data collection and data analysis.
High quality of the theoretical basis and the measurement instrument are required. Reliability and validity requirements in mono-cultural studies are generally known and became standard concepts. However, in cross-cultural and cross-national studies, researchers also need to pay attention to several dimensions of equivalence. Equivalence is a key concept and core-requirement in comparative research. In literature, many forms of equivalence are described.

Timothy P. Johnson (1998) found more than 50 different terms of equivalence and subsumed them into two different types – interpretive and procedural equivalence:

“Although equivalence has multiple dimensions, there seems to be a natural distinction between interpretive and procedural equivalence. While interpretive equivalence is primarily concerned with the subjective cross-cultural comparability of meaning, procedural equivalence, broadly speaking, refers to the objective development of comparable survey measures across cultural groups.” (Johnson 1998: 29f)

In the theoretical part of this report, the basic definitions and concepts of political participation used in EUYOUPART were developed and described. Here, in the empirical part the focus lies on the comparability of measurement instruments in international surveys - thus on procedural equivalence according to the definition of Johnson (1998).

As procedural equivalence includes all types of equivalence which refer to measurement, it is necessary to specify those forms of equivalence which can be tested in the phase of data analysis.

In literature, many forms of equivalence referring to the comparability of measures are described. One of these definitions was developed by Fons van de Vijver who distinguishes three forms on the level of measurement:

“Equivalence refers to the measurement level characteristics that apply to cross-cultural score comparisons; three types of equivalence are defined: construct (identity of construct across cultures), measurement unit (identity of measurement unit), and scalar equivalence (identity of measurement unit and scale origin).” (van de Vijver 1998: 41)

These three types constitute a hierarchical scheme with construct equivalence (also known and related to as functional or structural equivalence) is the basic form of comparability. It means that similar constructs are measured in each cultural group and describes the identity of constructs across cultures. It is possible to test this form of equivalence in the phase of data analysis. There is a variety of methods for testing construct equivalence. Statistical methods which rely on the structure of variables and dimensions can be applied. Most frequently exploratory factor analysis or multidimensional scaling is used for this purpose.
In the context of EUYOUPART, the dimensionality and structural aspects of ESS-indicators measuring political participation will be tested. Therefore it is important not only to distinguish between different forms of equivalence, but also to distinguish between different forms of variables. In the case of measurement and explanation of political participation, foreground and background variables need to be distinguished. According to the conceptual framework of EUYOUPART, foreground variables are behavioural measures covering different conventional and unconventional forms of political participation. Background variables are primarily attitudinal variables which should help to explain political participation among youth (including demographic and socioeconomic variables).

The following analysis focuses primarily on the first types of indicators: foreground variables indicating political participation behaviours.

In general, the research question aims at the construct equivalence in cross-national research. It examines whether the structure of political involvement is comparable for the countries under investigation. The procedure for answering this question is described in the according section below.

3.3 Data analysis of the ESS

In this section, first the selection of dimensions (questions) and countries is explained. Then a descriptive overview on variables measuring political participation (political activities and involvement in organisations) is given, followed by an analysis of patterns of participation respectively patterns of involvement.

3.3.1 Selected dimensions/questions, countries and age-group

For the descriptive overview and the structural analysis, partially different questions were selected: The descriptive overview considers core variables measuring political participation: Voting (B13), party choice (B14) and different conventional/unconventional forms of political participation (B15-B24).

Only a few questions and dimensions were chosen to examine the comparability of measurement of political participation in the ESS. The selection accounted for the following criteria:

- types of variables: explaining vs. explained variables
- dimensions measured by a variety of variables

As briefly mentioned above, the types of variables distinguish between political participation (respectively variables describing and measuring political behaviour) and explaining variables like values, attitudes, interest and different socio-demographics. The latter are considered as background (context) variables and
need to be separated conceptually from the behavioural variables indicating political participation. The distinction between explaining and explained variables in the ESS-questionnaire follows the conceptual framework developed and described in the theoretical part of this report.

The other criterion – the variety of variables identifying one dimension – is a decision which is based primarily on empirical considerations. The test of comparability was conducted only for dimensions measured by a variety of different variables.

A number of items measuring political participation can be found in the ESS-questionnaire. Some variables included in the analysis are part of the ESS-core module which contains a wide range of socio-economic, socio-political, socio-psychological and socio-demographic variables (B15 to B24). Others are part of the rotating module of round 1 “Citizenship, Involvement and Democracy” (E1 to E12). All variables included in the descriptive overview and the structural analysis are listed below. For each analysed question the formulation and answer categories is indicated, as well as the number of the according item in the ESS-questionnaire and the name in the ESS-dataset.

The ESS includes the following two variables on electoral participation (B13, B14):

**B13 Vote**

„Some people don’t vote nowadays for one reason or another. Did you vote in the last [country] national/election in [month/year]?”

categories: yes – no – not eligible to vote – (don’t know)

**YES AT B13**

**B14 PrtVtxx**

„Which party did you vote for in that election?”

[Country-specific (question and) codes]

categories (example): Conservative – Labour – Liberal Democrat – Scottish National Party – Plaid Cymru – Green Party – Other (write in) – (Refused) – (Don’t know)

---

6 This refers to the last election of a country’s primary legislative assembly
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Furthermore, there are the two item batteries that capture political activities (Table 2) and involvement in different voluntary organisations (Table 3).

**B15-B24:**

“There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following?“

categories: yes – no – (don’t know)

Table 2: ESS-variables included in the descriptive overview and structural analysis: Activities (B15 to B24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qno</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>CONTPLT</td>
<td>Contacted politician or government official last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>WRKPRTY</td>
<td>Worked in political party or action group last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>WRKORG</td>
<td>Worked in another organisation or association last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>BADGE</td>
<td>Worn or displayed campaign badge/sticker last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>SGNPTIT</td>
<td>Signed petition last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>PBLDMN</td>
<td>Taken part in lawful public demonstration last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>BCTPRD</td>
<td>Boycotted certain products last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>BGHTPRD</td>
<td>Bought product for political/ethical/environment reason last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>DNTMNY</td>
<td>Donated money to political organisation or group last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>ILGLPST</td>
<td>Participated illegal protest activities last 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Number in ESS-questionnaire
2 Name in ESS-dataset
3 Short text (=label in ESS-dataset)
**E1a-12a:**

“For each of the voluntary organisations I will now mention, please use this card to tell me whether any of these things apply to you now or in the last 12 months, and, if so, which.”

categories: none – member – participated – donated money – voluntary work

**Table 3: ESS-variables included in structural analysis: voluntary organisations – E1 to E12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qno¹</th>
<th>name²</th>
<th>text³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>SPTCxx</td>
<td>Sports/outdoor activity club, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>CLTOxx</td>
<td>Cultural/hobby activity organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>TRUxx</td>
<td>Trade union, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>PRFOxx</td>
<td>Business/profession/farmers organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>CNSOxx</td>
<td>Consumer/automobile organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>HMNOxx</td>
<td>Organisation for humanitarian aid, human rights, minorities, or immigrants, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>EPAOxx</td>
<td>Environmental/peace/animal organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>RLGOxx</td>
<td>Religious/church organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>PRTYxx</td>
<td>Political party, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>SETOxx</td>
<td>Science/education/teacher/parents organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>SCLCxx</td>
<td>Social club, club for young, retired/elderly, women, friendly societies, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>OTHVxx</td>
<td>Other voluntary organisation, last 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Number in ESS-questionnaire  
² Name in ESS-dataset  
³ Short text (=label in ESS-dataset)

For the descriptive overview and the analysis of structural comparability, we decided to focus on those countries that are part of the EUYOUPART consortium. Data availability further restricted the number of countries that could be included in this analysis - only countries whose data were available by February 2004 were used. These countries were Austria, Germany, Finland, the UK and Italy. In the descriptive analysis, the German sample was not split, in the structural analysis the German sample was split in the Eastern and Western part. The reasons for this decision will be explained in this section.

---

⁷ The data release of the ESS “round1” started in August 2003. In February 2004 the third version of the data was released including five of the countries participating in EUYOUPART.
3.3.2 Descriptive overview on variables measuring political participation

Before we enter into the more complex aspects of data analysis, we would like to give an overview about the descriptive ESS results of youth political participation in Austria, Finland, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom.

Descriptive results include variables on voting and on the activities battery described above. The main findings along the three background variables age, gender and occupational status are reported. The independent variables were recoded as follows:

**Age:** Young people above 18 years were distinguished from those younger than 18 years, to roughly distinguish between young people eligible to vote in national elections and those who were not eligible to vote.

**Gender:** Men were distinguished from women.

**Occupational status:** Those in education were distinguished from those in the workforce. The individuals who indicated being simultaneously in fulltime education and workforce, were coded as students. Those who did not fit in either category were omitted from the analysis.

**Data**

The empirical analysis is based on data from the European Social Survey (ESS). Interviews in the five countries were conducted from September 2002 to September 2003. The sample of the survey did not focus specifically on youth, therefore a sub-sample of young people aged 15-25 was selected from the overall sample.

The same item-battery was used for estimating socio-political activism of youth and older age groups, no youth-specific items were included. Annex 1 shows relevant political participation and social location indicators in the ESS questionnaire.

**Variables selected for the descriptive overview**

For the descriptive overview, the following political participation indicators were selected:

- voting (B13), party choice (B14)
- political participation-activities (B15-B24; see Table 2)

**Samples**

The analysis of participation patterns required four samples to be used (Table 4).

All interviewed people aged 15-25 years. This sub-sample was used for estimating effects of country, age and gender on participation modes, voting excluded.
Young people eligible to vote at the time of the last parliamentary election in a particular country; this sub-sample included only citizens 18 years or older in the beginning of the year when the parliamentary election, which was covered by the ESS survey, was held. This sub-sample was used to estimate effects of country and gender on voting.

Young people either in education or in workforce and eligible to vote at the time of last parliamentary election in a particular country. This sub-sample was used to estimate effect of occupational status on voting.

Young people either in education or in workforce. This sub-sample was used to estimate effects of occupational status on participation in other forms.

The use of several sub-samples instead of one sample was justified with intention to utilize as much information as available for a particular analysis. The analysis of effects of occupational status on voting most severely limited the number of respondents, analysis of effects of age and gender on other participation modes placed no additional limits to the number of respondents.

As a consequence, effects of gender, age and occupational status on participation patterns must be compared with care – the results are based on different samples in terms of sample size as well as in terms of sample composition.

The data were weighted. According to ESS guidelines, sample design weight was switched on – this weight adjusts data for in-country disparities between obtained sample and statistical model of the population.

Using this weighting scheme has a consequence that one can not compute reasonable totals across the five countries; figures are valid for separate countries only.8

Table 4. Weighted sample sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All young people</th>
<th>Sample of young people eligible to vote</th>
<th>Sample of young people either in education or in work force</th>
<th>Sample of young people either in education or in work force and eligible to vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 WeightingESS.doc, downloaded from www.europeansocialsurvey.org
East and West-Germany
A hypothesis, which seemed plausible before empirical analysis was that East- and West-Germany differ in terms of youth political involvement. Analysis of the survey data suggested the opposite – that there was no significant difference between East and West for any participation form. The differences were below two percentage points and for all participation modes, chi-square test proved the differences to be insignificant.

Youth Political Participation

Voting in parliamentary elections
Voting is still considered to be the most significant instrument of democracy. Therefore electoral turnout and party choice in elections is analysed separately from other modes of participation.

Election dates
In different countries the last parliamentary elections were held at different times, which caused different time-periods between the election date and the interview date. The break was the longest in Finland (elections held in March 1999) and the shortest in Austria (November 2002). Unequal time intervals between elections and survey caused the different age structure of the countries’ sub-samples: the average age of the sub-sample was the highest in Finland and the lowest in Austria and Germany.

Parliamentary elections were held at the following dates:

Austria

Finland
The last elections to the Finnish parliament Eduskunta/Riksdag took place on the 16th March, 2003. Previous parliamentary elections in Finland took place in 1999. ESS survey was carried out from September to December 2002, therefore it could not record participation in the 2003 elections.

Germany
Elections to the Bundestag took place on the 22nd September, 2002.\(^9\)

**Italy**

Elections to the Camera dei Deputati took place on the 13th May, 2001.\(^{10}\)

**United Kingdom**

Elections to the House of Commons took place on the 7th June, 2001.\(^{11}\)

**Turnout**

Election turnout was computed as a percentage of those reporting to have voted in the last parliamentary elections: the basis was a category of people who were citizens and who were 18 years old by the 1st of January of the election year.

The percentage of young people who did vote varied from low 43% in the UK to high 91% in Italy. In all five countries, the percentage reporting abstention from elections was above 20%. It was especially high in the United Kingdom (50%) and in Finland (34%).

The percentage of those who reported not to be eligible to vote was highest in Austria (11%), in Finland the percentage was 0% (Figure 1).

---

\(^9\) The German parliament has two chambers. The Bundestag (Federal Diet) has 603 members, elected for a four year term, 299 members elected in single-seat constituencies and 299 members allotted to realize a proportion to their total vote and extra seats because of this compensation. The Bundesrat (Federal Council) has 69 members representing the governments of the states.

\(^{10}\) The Italian Parlamento (Parliament) has two chambers. The Camera dei Deputati (Chamber of Deputies) has 630 members, elected for a five year term, 475 members in single-seat constituencies and 155 members by proportional representation. The Senato della Repubblica (Senate of the Republic) has 326 members, elected for a five year term, 232 members in single-seat constituencies, 83 members by proportional representation and 11 senators for life.

\(^{11}\) British Parliament has two chambers. The House of Commons has 659 members, elected for a five year term in single-seat constituencies. The House of Lords has 675 members, 557 life peers and 118 hereditary members.
**Turnout and gender**

Voting was relatively popular among young women in Austria, Germany, Finland and in the United Kingdom. Only in Italy the turnout was higher among young men. In the UK the difference was approximately 10%, in Finland 7% and in Austria and Germany the difference was about 2%. In Italy, however, the turnout among boys was nearly 10% higher than that among girls.

Contrary to the expectations, the opposite behaviour – abstention from voting – was not very popular among young men. In four countries the third option – namely to classify oneself ineligible to vote – clearly was more popular among men. The percentage of those reporting ineligibility was higher among young men in all countries except Finland. However, the differences were small and in Finland the difference was 0%.
As stated above, the turnout was higher among women in all countries except Italy. The differences ranged from 2% in Austria and Germany to 10% in the United Kingdom. In Italy, the difference was approximately 10% on behalf of men.

Among men we find some higher percentage of those reporting that they were not eligible to vote. The percentage difference was between 1% and 4%. In Finland there was no difference.

**Turnout and age**
The effect of age was not analysed because the dividing line between the age categories was 18 years, which is precisely the age when a person turns eligible to vote.

**Turnout and occupational status**
In two countries – Finland and the UK – the percentage reporting participation in the last national elections was clearly higher among students than among employed persons, the differences were respectively 19% and 12%. In the other three countries – Austria, Germany and Italy – the turnout was a little higher among employed persons: The difference varied between 5% and 7%.

The percentage of ‘ineligibles’ was higher among Austrian, German and British students (the differences varied from 6% to 8%), there was no difference in Finland and there was an insignificant opposite direction difference in Italy.

**Party choice**
Green movements were relatively popular among young people. In Finland and in Austria, Green parties received the largest share of youths’ votes (respectively 30% and 36%). Greens captured considerable portion of youth’s votes also in Germany (12% of the 1st vote and 24% of the 2nd vote). In Italy and the United Kingdom there was no significant success of green movement among youth.

Another finding was that socialist and conservative parties were successful among youth. In the United Kingdom, the Labour Party received 46% of the youth’s votes, in Germany the SPD and the CDU/CSU received 73% of the 1st vote and 51% of the 2nd vote, in Finland the Centre Party and the Social Democratic Party together received 39% of the youth’s votes. In Italy, 3 leftwing parties managed to secure 43% of the youth’s votes (La Margehrita 18%, Democratici di Sinistra 16% and Rifondazione Comunista 9%). In Austria the Social Democrats were less successful but still received nearly a quarter of the young people’s votes (23%); this certainly is a notable support.

Liberal and right-wing parties were significantly less successful among young people. In Italy only the right-centre party Forza Italia captured the largest share of the youths’ votes. However, their success might be attributed to skilled media
campaigns to a notable extent (‘king of mass media’ – S.Berlusconi – holds key position in the party).

Party choice and gender
In Austria, the United Kingdom and in Italy party choice was the same for boys and girls. In Germany and in Finland, boys and girls had their different favourite parties. In Germany, the 1st vote gave male support to CDU/CSU (men 40%, women 12%) and female support to Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (men 5%, women 21%). The 2nd vote was similar: CDU/CSU mainly enjoyed support of boys (men 19%, women 9%) and Bündnis 90/Die Grünen enjoyed support of girls (men 16%, women 37%). Additionally, FDP enjoyed support of men (men 24%, women 11%).

In Finland, The National Coalition Party (NCP) and The Centre Party (CP) enjoyed young men’s support (support to NCP was 27% among men 27% and 8% among women; support to CP was 35% among men and 8% among women) while The Swedish People’s Party (SPP) and The Green League (GL) enjoyed women’s support (SPP: men 4%, women 16% and GL: men 15%, women 48%).

Party choice and occupational status
In Austria, Finland and Italy the occupational status did not differentiate party choice significantly.

In Germany, the 1st vote relationship was caused by relative popularity of SPD and CDU/CSU among employed youth (40% of students and 48% of employed voted for SPD; 19% of students and 37% of employed voted for CDU/CSU) and by the popularity of Bündnis 90/Die Grünen, by the FDP and the PDS among students (16% of students and 9% of employed voted for greens; 16% of students and 3% of employed voted for FDP; 11% of students and 1% of employed voted for PDS). When we consider also the 2nd vote, SPD and CDU/CSU remain popular among the employed (SPD: students 29% and employed 43%; CDU/CSU: students 11%; employed 19%). FDP and PDS remain popular among students (FDP: students 26%, employed 6%; PDS: students 11%, employed 4%). The Greens drastically lost student support, the movement captured even larger share of votes from employed (students 23%, employed 26%).

In the United Kingdom, the relationship emerged from different support of young adults for the Conservative Party (among students 0% voted for, among employed 26% voted for), Labour Party (students 35%, employed 42%), the Liberal Democrat Party (students 40%, employed 23%) and the Green Party (students 15%, employed 3%). One can see that new values – environment and individual values – enjoyed students’ support while traditional values of social equality and tradition enjoyed more support among employed persons.
**Conventional participation**

Figure 2 gives an overview of youth participation in conventional activities in the five countries.

**Figure 2. Youth participation in conventional activities**

![Bar chart showing youth participation in conventional activities across five countries]

- Worked in political party or action group:
  - Italy: 2.6%
  - United Kingdom: 2.6%
  - Finland: 0.0%
  - Germany: 3.9%
  - Austria: 5.2%

- Worked in another organisation or association:
  - Italy: 6.3%
  - United Kingdom: 4.5%
  - Finland: 19.5%
  - Germany: 17.0%
  - Austria: 16.2%

- Worn or displayed campaign badge/sticker:
  - Italy: 10.2%
  - United Kingdom: 9.7%
  - Finland: 9.3%
  - Germany: 7.6%
  - Austria: 16.5%

- Contacted politician or government official:
  - Italy: 6.8%
  - United Kingdom: 5.6%
  - Finland: 10.9%
  - Germany: 9.2%
  - Austria: 9.0%

- Donated money to political organisation or group:
  - Italy: 1.8%
  - United Kingdom: 11.5%
  - Finland: 7.3%
  - Germany: 6.2%
  - Austria: 3.9%

---

**Work in a political organisation**

Relatively few among the young people worked for a political party or an action group during the last 12 months, the percentages were between 0 and 5.2%. The
relationship was statistically significant and it was due to the significant difference between Austria and Finland\textsuperscript{12}.

\textit{Work in a non-political organisation}

Regarding participation in non-political organisations, two groups emerged: in Italy and the United Kingdom the percentages were relatively low (6\% and 5\% respectively): in Finland, Germany and Austria the percentages were three times larger, namely between 16\% and 20\%.

The Scheffe test confirmed the presence of two homogeneous subgroups wherein participation rates were roughly similar. The first group comprised Italy and the United Kingdom and the second one comprised Germany, Austria and Finland.

\textit{Wearing a campaign badge/sticker}

There are two countries deviating from the rest of three: while in Italy, in the United Kingdom and in Germany the percentage of youth involved in campaigns was approximately 10\%, the percentage was notably higher in Finland (17\%) and somewhat lower in Austria (8\%).

The difference was statistically significant between Finland – Germany and Austria – Germany.

\textit{Contacting}

Contacting rates were roughly similar in all countries, approximately one tenth of youth contacted politicians or government officials.

\textit{Donating money}

The percentage of young people, who have donated money to a party varied from 2\% in Italy to 12\% in the UK. In the other three countries the percentage remained between 4\% and 7\%, no specific patterns of the countries could be observed.

\textit{Elite-challenging behaviour}

Three items indicated youth participation in elite-challenging actions. Figure 3 gives an overview of youth participation in protest activities.

\textsuperscript{12} A Chi-square test was employed to test the significance of a relationship and the Scheffe test was used to find pairs of countries where the mean value of a participation indicator was significantly different.
**Figure 3. Youth participation in protest activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protest Activity</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Austria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signed petition</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawful demonstration</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal protest</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signing a petition**

Italian youth stands apart from other countries – while in the UK, Finland, Germany and Austria the percentage of young people, who have signed a petition varied between 25% and 35%, in Italy the percentage was only 12%.

The proportion of those signing a petition in Italy was significantly lower than in Germany, the UK and in Finland. The difference was also significant between Austria (25%) and UK (36%).

**Participation in lawful demonstrations**

The UK and Finland were the two countries, where a significantly lower percentage of youth participated in a lawful public demonstration. The percentage was approximately 4% while it was 16% to 20% in the other three countries.
Participation in illegal protest actions
Illegal protesting was the at least popular form among youth: Less than 5% have participated in some unlawful action. In Italy the percentage was the highest (5%), in Germany the percentage was 3%. In other three countries it was 2% or less.

Political consumerism
Political consumerism is a new phenomenon and researchers have not yet reached a consensus about it’s position among other forms of socio-political activism. Figure 4 gives an overview of involvement in politically motivated consumption.

Figure 4. Youth participation in political consumption

Boycotted certain products
The percentages of boycotting certain products vary highly between the five countries (from 4% to 31%), only Germany and Austria display similar percentages (24% and 22%). Thereby two homogeneous subsets emerged: In Italy (4%) and the United Kingdom (11%) boycotting showed relatively low figures, whereas in Finland, Germany and Austria they were relatively high (31%, 24% and 22%).

Bought product for political/ethical/environment reason
Finland is the country, where the largest share of young people chose a product for political reasons (46%). The German and the Austrian youth is also prone to buy products for political reasons (respectively 34% and 29%). In the United Kingdom and in Italy 19% and 4% of youth chose a product for political reasons.
Effects of gender, age and occupational status

Participation and gender
In all five countries, the percentage of political involvement was higher among young women than among young men. The difference was the largest in Finland, where in 8 forms out of 10 the proportion of active people was higher among women. In Germany, there were 7 such forms, in Italy the number was 6, in Austria it was 5 and in the United Kingdom it was 4.

Among the 10 forms of political participation, there are clearly gender specific modes. In the case of most forms, the participation rate was higher among women, only a couple of forms were more popular among men. Signing a petition, boycotting a product and especially buying a product for political reason were strongly dominated by young women in all countries. Percentage differences varied from around 10% to around 25%. Taking part in a lawful demonstration and displaying a campaign sticker also tended to be more popular among young women than among young men (in 3 countries out of the 5), but the percentage differences were smaller, well below 10%.

Participation in illegal protest actions was clearly more popular among men. Though the differences were relatively small, they were found in 4 countries (Austria, Germany, Finland, the United Kingdom). In the case of Italy, the difference was 0.

Contacting politicians or government officials, working for a political party, action group or another organisation or association was also slightly more popular among men than among women (in 2 or 3 countries out of the 5). The percentage differences were below 10%.

Participation and age
In all five countries the percentage of politically active people was higher among those eligible to vote. In Italy, however, the age-difference was smaller compared to other countries. The difference was most visible in the United Kingdom, where all 10 modes were more popular among older youth. In Austria, the number was 9, in Germany and Finland it was 7 (in Finland the difference of participation in campaigns and working for a party was 0). In Italy, 5 forms were more popular among ‘younger youngsters’ and 5 forms among ‘older youngsters’.

Boycotting certain products, signing a petition, buying a product for political reasons and contacting a politician/official were the forms, which clearly were more popular among ‘older youth’ in all five countries.\footnote{To be honest, in Italy buying a product for political reasons was insignificantly more popular in the category of ‘younger youth’}
Wearing a campaign badge/sticker, working for some political or non-political organisation, donating money and taking part in legal demonstrations were the modes, which were nearly equally popular in both categories.

Participation in illegal actions was slightly more popular in the younger age category.

**Participation and occupational status**

In all countries except Finland, participation rates were higher among students. The difference was most visible in the United Kingdom and in Germany, where 9 modes out of 10 were more popular among students. In Italy the figure was 8 and in Austria it was 7. In Finland, the participation rates among employed persons were higher in the case of 5 modes and in the case of one mode participation the rates were the same.

Participation in a legal demonstration and signing a petition were much more popular among students. In none of the countries these modes were more popular among employed persons.

Working for a political or a non-political organisation, wearing a campaign badge and the involvement in illegal actions was more popular among students of four countries.

Political consumerism activities and donating money to political organisations were more popular among students of three countries.
3.3.3 Analysis of patterns of participation

Different methods to test equivalence have been introduced. In this paper we will focus on testing construct equivalence to identify the similarity of structures across countries. To test this form resp. level of equivalence statistical methods which relay on the structure of variables and dimensions are appropriate. Although most frequently exploratory factor analysis is used for this purpose, this is not the appropriate method for the kind of variables tested for EUYOUPART.

As the dimensionality and structural aspects of ESS-indicators measuring political participation will be tested, these variables require another approach than factor analysis. Patterns and combinations of involvement and participation seem to be the appropriate procedure that brings the testing closer to structural aspects of the variables and therefore could serve to test structural respectively functional equivalence of measures.

This test of structural aspects by means of patterns of variables should give an idea of:

- where considering the country-specific context of items is very important
- which items to include in the questionnaire (and which combinations)
- what happens if certain items will be excluded

The purpose of the test is not to indicate which items should be excluded, but to consider which information will get lost if certain items will be excluded. Furthermore the importance of the social and political context will be emphasised.

The following item batteries are used to test structural aspects and to calculate patterns of involvement:

- B15 to B24 (“B-block”): activities
- E1 to E12 (“E-block”): involvement in voluntary organisations

The patterns are calculated by block and by countries, which combines the of evaluation by topics and by country.

The analysis was limited to young people at the age of 15 to 25 years – similar to the descriptive overview. The data are not weighted for the structural analysis, because some frequencies of combinations are very low (down to one person per
country). A brief overview on the NOT weighted frequencies of the analysed variables can be found in the annex (Table 8, Table 9).

The total sample size of all relevant countries and the number of participants included in further analysis (15-25-year-old) is given in Table 5. E.g. the total sample size of Austria was 2,257 persons. But only 316 young people at the age of 15 to 25 years were included in further analysis.

The analysis of structural equivalence includes only variables which could be asked to all participants of the survey, therefore no further splitting of the age group was necessary in this part of analysis.

Table 5: Total sample size & youth/young adults, by selected countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>15-25 years</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>2,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany – East</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German – West</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>10,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first item battery (activities) and the formulation of the questions was given in Table 2, the second item battery (voluntary organisations) was already cited in Table 3.

Now, first the most common combinations and involvement patterns of the item battery activities are described (Figure 5 and Table 6), then the item battery “voluntary organisations” is examined (Figure 6 and Table 7).

The involvement patterns refer to specific combinations of activities. The most common involvement patterns of the item battery “activities“ are introduced in Figure 5, e.g.:

- “Nothing" means that the respondents are not involved in any of the 10 possible actions (given in Table 2).
- “Petition" means that the only activity of the respondents was to sign a petition.
“boycotted products/bought products”: the respondents have boycotted certain products AND deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or environmental reasons.

Figure 5: The most common involvement patterns of item battery “activities”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. nothing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• none the 10 possible actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. petition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signed a petition (B19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bought products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental reasons (B22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. boycotted products/bought products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boycotted certain products (B21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental reasons (B22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. petition/boycotted products/bought products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signed a petition (B19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boycotted certain products (B21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental reasons (B22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. petition/bought products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Signed a petition (B19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliberately bought certain products for political, ethical or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental reasons (B22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. boycotted products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boycotted certain products (B21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. demonstration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taken part in a lawful public demonstration (B20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. worked in another organisation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked in another organisation or association (B17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. contacted politician, govt or local govt official:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contacted a politician, government or local government official (B15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. donated money to pol. organisation or group:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Donated money to a political organisation or group (B23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows the 12 most common involvement patterns in the countries under investigation. All other possible patterns are summed up in the categories “others” and are not specially referred to.

The lowest level of involvement is found in Italy, the highest in Finland: 66% of Italian young people (age 15-25 years) and 30% of young Finnish people are not involved in any activities asked in this block.

In Great-Britain, young people have above average signed a petition without getting involved in any other activities – 15% signed a petition in this country, about 3 to 6% in the other countries.

The involvement patterns show that in Italy the political participation of young people seem to be different in terms of combinations than in other countries which are analysed in the framework of EUYOUPART.

In addition, it has to be noted that the column “total” does not consider the size of the included countries, because there was no weighting applied to the data.
Table 6: Involvement patterns “activities” (“B-block”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>G-E</th>
<th>G-W</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 nothing</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 petition</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bought products</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 boycotted products/bought products</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 petition/bought products</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 petition/bought products</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 boycotted products</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 demonstration</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 worked in another organisation</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 contacted politician, govt or local govt official</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 donated money to pol. organisation or group</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 petition/demonstration</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 others</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second item battery (voluntary organisations) was cited in Table 3. The involvement in different voluntary organisations is specified through different categories: membership, participation, donation of money or voluntary work. There are also different organisations included which are not political organisation or institutions. They are included in the following analysis of involvement patterns anyway, because the level of involvement in conventional political organisations is not very high in this age group and an organisation which seems not to be political in one country can have a political background or activity in another country.

The different organisations and the respective formulation of the question was shown in Table 3.
Calculating the involvement patterns of this item battery it was not distinguished between different answer categories. Membership, participation, donation of money and voluntary work was treated in the same way and included in the analysis.

Now the most common combinations and involvement patterns of the item battery voluntary organisations are described, they are introduced in Figure 6 and Table 7.

Again, the involvement patterns refer to specific combinations of involvement in voluntary organisations. The most common involvement patterns of the item battery “voluntary organisations“ are introduced in Figure 6, e.g.:

- “Nothing” means that the respondents are neither members, nor have participated, nor donated money, nor done any voluntary work in any of the voluntary organisations mentioned above.

- “Sports club” means that the only involvement in a voluntary organisation was an activity in a sports club or club for outdoor activities. There is not made any difference between – membership, participation, donation of money and voluntary work in this organisation.

- “Sports club/cultural or hobby activities”: the respondents are involved in a sports club or club for outdoor activities AND in an organisation for cultural or hobby activities.

**Figure 6: The most common involvement patterns of item battery “voluntary organisations”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. nothing:</td>
<td>none of the 12 possible organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sports club:</td>
<td>a sports club or club for outdoor activities (E1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. religious or church organ.:</td>
<td>a religious or church organisation (E8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sports club/cultural or hobby activities:</td>
<td>a sports club or club for outdoor activities (E1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an organisation for cultural or hobby activities (E2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sports club/social club</td>
<td>a sports club or club for outdoor activities (E1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a social club, club for the young, the retired/elderly, women, or friendly societies (E11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>trade union:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a trade union (E3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>sports club/religious or church org.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a sports club or club for outdoor activities (E1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a religious or church organisation (E8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>cultural or hobby activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an organisation for cultural or hobby activities (E2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>social club:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a social club, club for the young, the retired/elderly, women, or friendly societies (E11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>consumer or automobile organisation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• a consumer or automobile organisation (E5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>humanitarian aid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an organisation for humanitarian aid, human rights, minorities, or immigrants (E6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>environmental protection, peace or animal rights:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• an organisation for environmental protection, peace or animal rights (E7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>others:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• any other combination of organisations, except those mentioned above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows the 12 most common involvement patterns with regard to voluntary organisations. All other possible patterns are summed up in the categories “others” and are not specially referred to.

The lowest level of involvement in voluntary organisations is found in Eastern Germany, where 34% of young people are not involved in any of the referred organisations. The highest level is again documented in Finland: 82% Finnish young people at the age of 15-25 years are involved in any of these organisations.

In the Western part of Germany, young people are above average involved exclusively in sports clubs (or clubs for outdoor activities), whereas in other countries these activities are practiced in combination with involvement in other voluntary organisations.

The involvement patterns with regard to voluntary organisations show that in Italy the participation of young people seem to follow different combinations than in other countries which are analysed here.
Table 7: Involvement patterns “voluntary organisations” (“E-block”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>pattern</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>G-E</th>
<th>G-W</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 nothing</td>
<td>25,7</td>
<td>22,8</td>
<td>34,2</td>
<td>22,6</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>26,1</td>
<td>27,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 sports club</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>16,3</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 religious or church organ.</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 sports club/cultural or hobby activities</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 sports club/social club</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>7,0</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 trade union</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sports/religious or church organ.</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 cultural or hobby activities</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 social club</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 consumer or automobile organisation</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 humanitarian aid</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>10,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 environmental protection, peace or animal rights</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 others</td>
<td>44,6</td>
<td>57,2</td>
<td>30,6</td>
<td>41,0</td>
<td>49,3</td>
<td>44,7</td>
<td>57,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total %</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Especially, if the patterns of involvement differ between countries, the importance respectively meaning of the relevant context is different in the investigated countries.

Based on the comparison of the involvement patterns, important conclusions can be drawn:

- In the countries under investigation, there are different levels of involvement of young people at the age of 15 to 25 years.
- The involvement in voluntary organisations shows primarily patterns of “civil activities” or involvement in organisations which are not referred to be political. But the question if a certain organisation can be seen as politically active or politically involved has to be decided in the specific national context.
- Country-specific differences of patterns refer to different national context of (political) participation.
4 Interesting findings from other international studies

The different reports concentrated on different items in international data sets, namely political interest (Austrian report), voting behaviour (Austrian report) and legal and illegal civil protest (French report).

4.1 Political Interest

In different international data-sets different variables dealing with political interest were identified: The ISSP Role of Government III (1996), Youth and History (1994/95), World Value Survey 1990, Eurobarometer December 1990 and Young Europeans and Politics (1997) were the data sets under research. The focus within the reports lay on differences between countries and on differences referring to gender, employment status and voting age. In order to identify these differences the chi square test was employed.

4.1.1 ISSP 1996 Role of Government

The countries analysed were West Germany, East Germany, the United Kingdom, Italy, France and the Czech Republic. All the other countries included into the ISSP data set are not part of our project and were therefore excluded. The data analysis is based on a subsample of young people from 15-25 years.

The only relevant question asked the respondents to rate their interest in politics. Especially young Italians and French showed more interest in politics than young people in other countries. There is also a difference in political interest between young people in West Germany and in East Germany (of 10%). In all countries – except in France – young men were more interested in politics than young women were. In France, both male and female respondents said to be interested in politics to nearly the same extent.

The differences between students and work force in the countries under research varied a lot. Whereas in the United Kingdom, in the Czech Republic and in France the differences were very low (from 2% to 6%), in all other countries students were more interested in politics than work force (differences from 15% in West Germany to 19% in East Germany). Among work force about 50% in all countries were “not very” or “not at all” interested in politics – the only exception again was France, where only 28% of the young work force was not interested in politics. No people under 18 years were interviewed.
4.1.2 Youth and History (1994/95)

The Youth and History survey, too, only contains one item to measure political interest. Again young people are most interested in France, second in Italy. And again male respondents are more interested in politics than the female ones: The differences are highest in Germany (14%) and lowest in the United Kingdom (5%).

4.1.3 World Value Survey 1990

The variable dealing with political interest was the potential for political discussions with friends. Above all young people in East Germany tended to discuss political issues with friends. Since the former east block has collapsed only one year before this survey was conducted, this result seems plausible. Estonia and West Germany had an amazingly large share of people who chose the middle category “occasionally” (generally the middle category always had the highest percentage). In Italy, the United Kingdom and in France a large amount of young people (about 40%) never discusses political matters with their friends.

There are also differences between male and female respondents: The data revealed that men discuss political items more often than women in all countries under research. The only exception was the United Kingdom, where two times more women than men frequently discussed politics. Statistically significant differences were also shown between non-students and students in all countries, above all in Austria and Germany: Almost three times more students than non-students were frequently discussing politics.

4.1.4 Eurobarometer 1990 Youth Sample

This Eurobarometer Survey includes four variables dealing with interest in politics. One variable aims to measure how often respondents have discussed political issues with their friends. The other three items intend to measure interest in national and international politics as well as interest in the peace movement. Again, in comparison to the results of the World Value Survey, East Germany shows the highest amount of young people discussing politics and France the smallest one. Additionally there was a shift from “frequently” to “occasionally” in East Germany among young people discussing politics: whereas in the World Value Survey 38% answered to discuss politics “frequently” and 57% “occasionally”, it were 27% “frequently” in the Eurobarometer and 66% “occasionally”. Also the strong interest in the peace movement in Germany might be partially due to the central role of civil society organisations during the “Mauerfall”.

Even though the Eurobarometer Survey sampled young people aged 16 to 24 years whereas the World Value Survey focused on 18 years old respondents and older, the results concerning gender were similar: men are more likely to discuss political matters with their friends than women in all the countries under research with (again) the exception of the United Kingdom, where twice as much women
than men stated to discuss about politics with friends. Furthermore there are similar
differences between students and non-students in the Eurobarometer data: in
general students are more likely to discuss political matters, above all in Austria
and West Germany. The only exception in this sample is Estonia, where non-
students more frequently discuss politics than students. The confirmatory factor
analysis showed that in most countries the factor loadings for interest in peace
movement are very modest, whereas the other factor loadings are reasonably
large.

4.1.5 Young Europeans and Politics (1997)

In the Young Europeans and Politics Survey seven variables were identified
dealing with political interest. Only three countries of our interest were under
research, namely Italy, France and Spain and only four out of the seven variables
were applied to all countries. The focus lay on analysing those items that dealt with
getting information on politics from the newspaper.

The frequency of discussing politics with friends was similar in all three countries.
The gender differences were only significant in Italy and France, where frequently
more men discussed politics with their friends. The differences between students
and non-students were also significant: above all in Spain and in France students
are more often discussing politics with their friends. Concerning the newspaper
items there are only minor differences in reading behaviour between the
respondents from Italy, France and Spain. However, there is a large gender gap in
the answers in Italy: significantly fewer female respondents than male ones are
very interested in reading international political issues in newspapers.

4.2 Voting Behaviour

Variables concerning voting behaviour were found in two surveys, namely in the
was analysed along the two dimensions “party preference at elections and
referenda” and “willingness to vote at elections and referenda”. The referring items
for party preference measured as well the willingness to vote as the party
preference at elections. The countries under research were West and East
Germany, the United Kingdom, France and the Czech Republic. The differences
between the countries, between gender, voting age and occupational status were
looked at.

4.2.1 ISSP 1996 Role of Government III

About two thirds of the respondents in all countries were willing to take part in
elections. The number of voting deniers was lowest in the Czech Republic. Further
non-students tended more frequently to refuse participation at elections than students did. The differences due to gender were not significant. One problem of the ISSP 1996 survey was the different wording of the question concerning party affiliation in France.

A further item under research was the respondents’ self-placement on the left-right scale. Remarkable was the trend to extreme poles: While in East Germany this trend went to the far left position, in the Czech Republic and in France it went to the far right one. In the United Kingdom there was a relative strong positioning on the centre liberal category. Women tended more frequently to the left side of the scale, whereas male respondents tended more to the right end. Further, students positioned themselves most frequently in the centre, liberal and centre left, left categories. Non-students tended to the poles: 48% far left, left and 44% right, far right.

4.2.2 World Value Survey 1997

The World Value Survey, too, contains one variable dealing with party preference at elections respectively with the willingness to take part in elections and with one variable dealing with the political self-placement. The countries under research were West and East Germany, Finland, Estonia, France and the United Kingdom. In contrary to the ISSP 1996 Survey the respondents to the World Value Survey have hardly chosen the category “no will to vote”. Significant deviations referring to gender and occupational status were not observable in the World Value Survey.

4.3 Legal and Illegal Civil Protest

Two surveys included questions concerning legal and illegal civil protest: The World Value Survey 1990 and the Young Europeans and Politics Survey 1997. As the wordings of the questions are significantly different the results of the surveys can hardly be compared. Only one couple of questions were directly compared, namely on lawful respectively peaceful demonstration. Whereas the World Value Survey rests on a nationally-based sampling the Young Europeans and Politics Survey focuses on differences between students and non-students.

4.3.1 Young Europeans and Politics Survey (1997)

Nearly half of the respondents (young people in France, Italy and Spain) have already attended a peaceful demonstration, three quarters have joined a strike and even a third has occupied a school. Nearly 40% would occupy a school and 30% would occupy a flat and about three quarters would join a strike or attend a peaceful demonstration. 81%, however, would never attend a violent
demonstration. In terms of gender the respondents differed significantly: Illegal and potentially violent means of action are more accepted by male respondents.

4.3.2 World Value Survey (1990)

Slightly more than half of the respondents have already signed a petition and nearly one third has attended a lawful demonstration. About a quarter might join a boycott and attend a lawful demonstration. Two thirds, however, would never occupy a building. Again, male respondents are more tolerant towards illegal and potentially violent types of participation than the female ones.
5 Implications and conclusions for EUYOUPART

5.1 Relevant Findings from the National Reports

The single national reports differed a lot with respect to their contents. As they are based on different national studies, which themselves differ a lot concerning the sampling (not all studies included the sample of 15-25 years old youth), the questions used and the wording of the questions, they are hardly comparable to each other. Nevertheless, some specific national patterns of political participation have been pointed out and some specifications were observable in several countries.

Estonia as one of the new democracies is the country which in general shows the highest participation rates: 74% voted in the last parliamentary elections and 60% of all respondents are very/rather interested in politics. In Finland, too, 74% voted in the last election and more than half of the respondents are very/somewhat interested in politics. In Austria half of the respondents are very interested in politics and in France even 86% stated to be very/somewhat interested in politics.

The high rate of consuming political information on TV is one of the most striking results that is fairly consistent throughout the countries under research. In Estonia 95% of the respondents follow political news on TV at least once a week, in Italy 76% follow national news on TV and 47% follow regional news on TV. 69% of the Slovakian respondents consume political information from the TV and in Austria more than half of the respondents follows the news on TV at least once a week.

Another interesting finding in different countries was the meaning of sports clubs. 65% of the Estonian respondents, one third of the Italian respondents and slightly over one fourth of the Austrian respondents are members of sports clubs. Being a member of the Trade Union seems to be rather important for Finnish and Estonian respondents, above all for young female Estonians.

Participating in legal demonstrations is performed by more than half of the French respondents and by 44% of the German respondents. Discussing politics with friends and acquaintances is above all interesting for Estonian and French respondents: 92% respectively 88% often/sometimes discuss political and social problems and more than half do so in Finland.

All these items that were found throughout the countries which are part of EUYOUPART should be kept in mind when developing the questionnaire. Asking one and the same question in a consistent wording in all eight countries will bring comparable and significant results.
5.2 Conclusions & recommendations based on the European Social Survey

The objective of EUYOUPART is to develop a measurement instrument for political participation of young people (aged 15 to 25 years), which should be cross-nationally comparable at least for the countries involved in this project. This instrument – the questionnaire – has to allow for comparisons of empirical constructs and indicators between countries. This part of the report focuses on issues of measurement which can be followed and concluded on the basis of the European Social Survey. The main objective was to examine the comparability of dimensions and variables of the ESS as well as the utility for EUYOUPART.

The comparability of important behavioural variables was partly tested in a secondary analysis of the ESS data by focusing on structural aspects of participation and activity of young people.

There are some limitations with regard to generalisation and analysis of the ESS:

The limitations of generalising the findings of the MTMM-experiments conducted by the methodological research group within the framework of the ESS concern the countries involved. The pilot study focused on the Netherlands and Great Britain. The main study included only two countries that are also taking part in EUYOUPART (Great Britain and Finland).

The limitations concerning analysis of comparability and equivalence are the following:

- The ESS includes many variables, but only a few dimensions could have been analysed in terms of comparability. The main reason is, that multiple measures are not available for all relevant dimensions
- The analysis was focused on behavioural variables measuring political participation of young people. Attitudinal variables of the ESS were not analysed at this stage. Behavioural variables have different underlying constructs in terms of measurement than attitudinal variables and are therefore more difficult to analyse and test for comparability.
- Not all countries of EUYOUPART are taking part in the ESS. Only those countries available by February 2004 were included in analysis - the test was reduced to five countries (Austria, Germany, Finland, the UK and Italy).
- The introduced method is only one possibility to test structural aspects. Multiple methodologies should be applied to international and other cross-cultural data to insure the cross-cultural comparability of results.
- Finally, the comparability was considered mainly by statistical means of evaluation. The findings could be contrasted with qualitative findings. The qualitative work could be used for interpretations of statistical analysis.
These limitations will partly be pretest and final statistical analysis of comparability of the EUYOUPART survey which will be fielded at the end of 2004:

- It will be possible to pretest scales, different question wording and format or different answering categories. There will be no MTMM-study, but an extensive pretest is planned in all eight countries of EUYOUPART.

- All empirical constructs and dimensions which are measured by more than two variables will be tested after the EUYOUPART main survey (and partly after the pretest).

- The focus will stay on behavioural variables, but the equivalence of attitudinal variables will also be tested.

- Multiple methodologies to test aspects of structure and measurement of indicators reproducing political participation among young people will be applied on the data of the main survey. By means of different statistical methods the comparability of items and dimensions will be tested.

Despite the limitations mentioned above, some recommendations can be given on the basis of the ESS and the analysis of the relevant variables. The MTMM-study of ESS should be used to consider and decide different steps of the questionnaire development in EUYOUPART. The findings of the MTMM-experiments can not be generalised, but indicate decisions on mode of data collection, types of questions or answering categories. The structural aspects respectively the Involvement patterns are relevant for the discussion of the questionnaire development and the interpretation of descriptive results. The findings and recommendations based on analysis of structural aspects (“involvement patterns”) are:

- Although the levels of involvement do not differ significantly between Germany-East and Germany-West (see descriptive analysis), there are partly differences in structural aspects, especially with regard to activities in voluntary organisations (see involvement patterns).

- The level of young people who are not active in terms of conventional and unconventional political participation is high. E.g. 66% of Italian young people are not active. Aside from theoretical implications, this has to be considered in the questionnaire development. The majority of the respondents is not addressed by the content of the questions. This can get boring for young people and can produce non-response.

- The patterns of involvement differ between countries, especially in Finland and Italy. In other countries there are selective differences, e.g. signing a petition in Great Britain.

- The patterns of involvement indicate country-specific differences in the social, political and cultural context of activities and organisations. E.g.
signing a petition in Great Britain is an activity which appears more often isolated from other activities than in other countries and therefore has a different “meaning” for young people. Exclusion (or reception) of items has to consider this country-specific context.

- Most activities take place in combination with other activities. The involvement in one organisation often associated with involvement in other organisations. The exclusion (or reception) of items has to consider the context of other variables.

5.3 Relevant Findings from the international reports

The different reports concentrated on different items in international data sets, namely political interest (Austrian report), voting behaviour (Austrian report) and legal and illegal civil protest (French report).

The item on the frequency of political discussions with friends can be compared and yields several differences. Even though the item wording as well as the answering categories were slightly different from each other and the respondents differed dramatically in regard to age, quite similar patterns could be found within the surveys. Therefore the questionnaire should ask about political interest in general, about discussions on political issues with friends and reading about politics in newspapers. The item, interest in peace movement, did not show significant differences and should be excluded.

There are two further results that should be kept in mind when designing the EUYOUPART questionnaire. The one is that the wording and the meaning of the questions should be the same in all countries and that we have an explicit category for those who refuse participation in elections. The second is that the number of categories of the left-right scale should be the same for each country to ensure comparability.

As young people sympathise to a large extent with attending peaceful demonstrations, joining strikes and signing petitions, we should give those forms of political participation enough space within the questionnaire. Even one third shows a willingness to occupy schools and flats. A further finding was that male respondents are more tolerant towards illegal and potentially violent types of participation than the female ones.
6 References


ESS-documentation

EUYOUPART
Political Participation of Young People in Europe
HPSE-CT-2002-00123

Annex

B15-B24:

“There are different ways of trying to improve things in [country] or help prevent things from going wrong. During the last 12 months, have you done any of the following? yes – no – (don’t know)

Table 8: Frequencies of “B-block”, by country (not weighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity (in last 12 months)</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>G-E</th>
<th>G-W</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B15 Contacted politician or government official</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>8,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16 Worked in political party or action group</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17 Worked in another organisation or association</td>
<td>15,3</td>
<td>16,0</td>
<td>17,2</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>8,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18 Worn or displayed campaign badge/sticker</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>7,0</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>16,5</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>11,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19 Signed petition</td>
<td>29,1</td>
<td>29,4</td>
<td>29,3</td>
<td>29,5</td>
<td>36,2</td>
<td>13,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20 Taken part in lawful public demonstration</td>
<td>18,6</td>
<td>21,9</td>
<td>18,8</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>20,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21 Boycotted certain products</td>
<td>23,1</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>25,9</td>
<td>31,3</td>
<td>10,9</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22 Bought product for political/ethical/environment reason</td>
<td>29,9</td>
<td>29,4</td>
<td>34,7</td>
<td>46,1</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23 Donated money to political organisation or group</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24 Participated illegal protest activities</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>4,8</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total n</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUT... Austria G-E ... Germany-East G-W ... Germany-West
FIN ... Finland GB ... Great Britain IT ... Italy
E1a-12a:

“For each of the voluntary organisations I will now mention, please use this card to tell me whether any of these things apply to you now or in the last 12 months, and, if so, which.”

none – member – participated – donated money – voluntary work

Table 9: Frequencies of “F-block”, by country (not weighted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in organisation (in last 12 months)</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>G-E</th>
<th>G-W</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>GB</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 Sports/outdoor activity club</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Cultural/hobby activity organisation</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Trade union</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Business/profession/farmers organisation</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Consumer/automobile organisation</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Organisation for humanitarian aid, human rights, minorities, or immigrants</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Environmental/peace/animal organisation</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Religious/church organisation</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Political party</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10 Science/education/teacher/parents organisation</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11 Social club, club for young, retired/elderly, women, friendly societies</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12 Other voluntary organisation</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUT... Austria  G-E... Germany-East  G-W... Germany-West  
FIN... Finland    GB... Great Britain      IT... Italy