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This volume comes at a critical juncture, as global commitments transition from the Millennium Development Goals to Sustainable Development Goals and the wider post-2015 development agenda is being discussed and debated. In these discussions, children and youth have been recognized as one of the nine major groups of civil society whose participation in decision making is essential for achieving sustainable development. There is also a concomitant need for action – innovative, evidence-based approaches to addressing entrenched global challenges or ‘wicked problems’ and engaging youth in those efforts.

Youth, whose role, perspectives and active participation in research has long been debated. It is widely believed that their participation can result in better policy responses and contribute to the development of more relevant and effective interventions and programs to address their needs. However, the engagement of youth in research processes is not without critique; issues such as how to move from tokenism towards authentic participation and empowerment have been critically discussed, and many question if youth can or should even be expected to make change happen.

Youth ‘At the Margins’: Critical Perspectives and Experiences of Engaging Youth in Research Worldwide brings together a range of critical and empirical contributions from emerging scholars and seasoned academics alike. Each contribution provides a unique perspective on the potentialities and challenges associated with youth engaged research. The chapters presented in this volume strive to critically interrogate and debate important foundational issues to consider when engaging youth in the research process, such as epistemological and methodological considerations. Important insights into the ethical, pedagogical and practical aspects one must contend with can be gleaned from the selection of chapters here; some of which are primarily theoretical and descriptive, whilst others present empirical data with case examples from around the world.

This volume is devoted to showcasing high quality contributions to the scholarly literature on youth engaged research in order to spur further critical debate on the various epistemological, methodological and ethical issues associated with engaging youth in research processes and in addressing intractable global issues.

The audience for this volume includes students, researchers and academics within a broad range of fields who are interested in understanding the range of approaches being used worldwide to include youth in research endeavors on issues of global importance including poverty, social exclusion, structural violence, un- and under-employment, education and health.
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New Research – New Voices involves two strands, leaving open the possibility of others as the series grows:

Strand 1: New Voices and New Knowledge in Research Methodology
This strand in the book series is dedicated to producing cutting-edge titles focusing on Research Methodology. While it might be generally acknowledged that educational researchers often tend to import methods developed in neighboring disciplines, this is not always acknowledged in the literature on methodology. This series intends to contribute to the knowledge foundation in educational research by specifically seeking out those who work both across disciplines and inter-disciplinary in terms of their methodological approaches. The overall focus is to develop a series focusing on those methods which are appropriate in dealing with the specific research problems of the discipline.

The series provides students and scholars with state-of-the-art scholarship on methodology, methods and techniques focusing on a range of research topics. It comprises innovative and intellectually rigorous monographs and edited collections which bridge schools of thought and cross the boundaries of conventional approaches. The series covers a broad range of issues focusing on not only empirical-analytical and interpretive approaches, but moreover on micro and macro studies, and quantitative and qualitative methods.

Strand 2: New Voices and New Knowledge in Educational Research
This part of the series will focus on theoretical and empirical contributions that are unique and will provide important insights into the field of educational research across a range of contexts globally. This part of the series will collectively communicate new voices, new insights and new possibilities within the field of educational research. In particular the focus will be on scholars, students and communities that have often been excluded or marginalized within educational research and practice.
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INTRODUCTION

This volume comes at a time when there is a great need to take stock. With the 25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in November 2014 and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which formed the blueprint for the majority of the world’s countries and development institutions coming to a close in 2015, it is an important time to assess and reflect. Critical appraisal is needed, not only of the achievements that have been made regarding important targets and indicators related to youth and children worldwide, and to what extent they have been involved in efforts to improve their prospects in life; but also to identify areas in need of improvement and recommit to efforts to reduce disparities and enhance empowerment. There is also a concomitant need for action – innovative, evidence-based approaches to addressing entrenched global challenges and engaging youth in those efforts. The recent State of the World’s Children Report 2015, which focuses on innovation for every child, draws attention to the potential of harnessing fresh, innovative community and youth-driven strategies to overcome intractable global issues (UNICEF, 2014). To that end, we feel that UNICEF’s efforts to develop principles for inclusive innovation may further contribute to efforts to ethically engage youth and children in the development and implementation of strategies and programs not only in international development work, but also in scholarly research efforts.

The objective of this volume is to present both critical reflections and empirical examples of scholarship in order to further develop our understanding of the challenges and possibilities of youth-engaged research. Reflective contributions and empirical data are needed to effectively shape the research agenda going forward and to generate novel ideas and approaches to involving youth. As editors, our own research agendas seek to address some of the challenges and possibilities of engaging youth in research. For instance, Project SHINE (Sanitation and Hygiene INnovation in Education) aims to engage Maasai youth in Tanzania as change agents to catalyze a process for increased community capacity to develop and sustain locally relevant strategies to improve sanitation, hygiene and health outcomes (Bastien et al., forthcoming). Another example is research that focuses on adult education programs, which meet the learning needs for youth at risk of social exclusion (Holmarsdottir, 2014). Overall, we hope that in this volume we
have managed to achieve a balance of these parallel foci and by doing so open up for new discussions about the importance of including youth in the research process. It is our hope that this volume will be particularly useful for emerging and seasoned scholars with interest in developing an understanding of the potentialities and pitfalls associated with engaging youth in research processes and who share a commitment to advancing such research and action.

We begin by setting the stage through a discussion of the global context in which youth are currently transitioning to adulthood. In this section, we draw on a range of international reports to highlight just a few examples of the “wicked problems” currently influencing youth transitions globally, such as increased urbanization, poverty, poor health, social exclusion and inequity, radicalization of youth, violence, civil war, and un- and under-employment. We also present a brief discussion of how the terms youth and children are conceptualized in diverse ways in the literature and argue for the need to embrace appreciative inquiry approaches and those which positively frame and position youth as assets to be nurtured and developed. The notion of “wicked problems” as complex social issues is then problematized in greater detail with emphasis on the need to move towards transdisciplinarity and systems thinking in order to adequately engage with and tackle the global challenges currently facing youth and impacting youth transitions. Through a discussion of the capabilities approach and the “right to research”, we explore current debates surrounding the engagement of youth in research. We subsequently present a brief discussion of youth-engaged methodologies, before presenting an overview of the volume.

THE GLOBAL CONTEXT

The effects of the global economic crisis have left few countries unscathed and the impact on youth has also been felt worldwide, with respect to livelihood and educational opportunities, health, and (un- or under-) employment status. From a life-course perspective, these impacts are of substantial importance given that events that transpire during this stage in life affect and are affected by events in other phases in life (WHO, 2014). Thus, the livelihood, educational and health prospects of the current generation of youth will affect not only the adult lives of these youth, but also the development prospects of the next generation.

Progress that has been made in the past decades includes increased primary school enrollments worldwide, reductions in childhood mortality and morbidity due to increased vaccination coverage for key diseases such as measles, reduced maternal mortality ratios, and other important health and education indicators (WHO, 2014). However, there continues to be substantial challenges facing youth and children worldwide, with wide disparities remaining both within and between countries and regions. As the deadline for meeting the Education for All goals was 2015, it has become apparent that the most marginalized groups still lack access to quality education and that none of the goals will be met (UNESCO, 2013/4). In terms of health challenges, globally, the leading causes of death among adolescents are road injury, HIV (particularly in Africa where it is the number two cause of
death among adolescents, although there is uncertainty surrounding these data), suicide, lower respiratory infections and interpersonal violence (WHO, 2014). Mental health is increasingly recognized as an issue of global importance given that it influences social and economic outcomes across the lifespan (Barry, Clarke, Jenkins, & Patel, 2013).

With respect to challenges associated with livelihoods, recent European Union (EU) figures show that youth unemployment was 24 per cent in January 2013, which is more than double the adult rate (Eurostat, 2013). Often referred to as NEETs (neither employed nor enrolled in education or training), youth who fall into this category currently comprise an estimated 7.5 million young Europeans (aged 15-24). Not only are the youth unemployment figures in Europe alarming, but the global youth unemployment rate which has long exceeded that of other age groups is also cause for concern. The global youth unemployment figures saw the largest annual increase on record in 2009; at its peak, 75.8 million young people were unemployed (UN, 2011a). Ultimately, youth unemployment has long-term implications for both young people and the societies in which they live, for instance political and economic instability and also “scarring” effects such as the deterioration of skills and lack of work experience. The importance of skills and qualifications is becoming increasingly important in the knowledge-based economy and as a result, low-skilled workers have fewer prospects (European Commission, 2013). Further, we are reminded that during this life stage fundamental decisions are made relating to

…transitions out of school, into work, into sexual relations, into marriage, into parenting and, generally, into assuming adult roles in communities in which individuals will spend their early adult years. Although these transitions onto various trajectories are not immutable…[they considerably affect the possibilities and opportunities] over the rest of people’s lives and, indeed, the context in which their children are born and raised. (Lloyd, Behram, Stromquist & Cohen, 2005, p. 1)

Posing an added challenge to the current state of global affairs is the high percentage of youth residing in the Global South, with figures estimating that 1.2 billion youth worldwide aged 15-24 (87 per cent) now live in low- and middle-income countries (World Economic Forum, 2013). Accordingly, between 2010 and 2015 the number of youth living in sub-Saharan Africa, for example, is expected to increase by 19.4 million, which translates to an increase in the region from 14 to 15 per cent (ILO, 2010). Thus, many low- and middle-income countries are experiencing a “youth bulge”. In Africa (both sub-Saharan and North Africa), about 40 per cent of the population is under the age of 15 and nearly 70 per cent is under 30 years of age (UN, 2011b). This youth bulge has the potential to become either a dividend or dilemma; a dividend that can be either demographic or economic while a dilemma can be in terms of political unrest such as in France, Sweden, Tunisia and Egypt in recent years (see also Phl this volume).

In addition to these crises, youth today are also confronted with an increasingly interconnected world with new global challenges. In this globalized world, some of
the most visible challenges include, for example, accelerated advances in technology, economics, environment, culture and education, all of which are restructuring social relations and social networks. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), established in the year 2000 constitute the most recent attempt to define and tackle the world’s most pressing social challenges, which include among other issues, education, health, gender, poverty, food security, environmental sustainability, and a global enabling environment. Environmental issues, which affect youth livelihood prospects and health through access to resources such as water are, for example, one of the most critical global challenges of our time, something that also threatens our cultural heritage (UN, 1987) and will profoundly affect future generations.

Current discussions on the post-2015 MDGs, now referred to as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), appear to include the majority of the objectives above, but they are likely to be tackled from a different perspective such as through new partnerships and by engaging citizens as advocates for the SDGs, taking account of MDG lessons, global change and new priorities (Sachs, 2012). Some of the new priority areas under discussion for the post-2015 agenda include under prioritized health issues such as sanitation, as well as energy, peace and stability, governance, technology, urbanization, youth and skills training and social inclusion. Such wicked problems will not only require a transdisciplinary approach, but will also need to include current and future stakeholders and leaders, many of whom are today’s youth.

THE INCLUSION OF YOUTH PERSPECTIVES

Globally, the circumstances of youth, the opportunities afforded them and the challenges they face differ substantially. Similarly, the extent to which young people have been marginalized in research processes, which often tend to be “expert driven”, varies considerably. The inclusion of youth perspectives, particularly those considered by many to be “at the margins” of societies, is increasingly on the agenda of international agencies. For instance, the United Nation’s International Year of Youth in 2011 focused on youth perspectives vis-à-vis promoting the ideals of peace, freedom, progress and solidarity and the achievement of the MDGs. At the policy level, this increased focus on youth involvement in decisions that affect their lives has been spurred by a number of international declarations, such as the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and most recently the Colombo Declaration on Youth 2014. Global reports focusing on youth include UNICEF’s State of the World’s Children, UNESCO’s 2012 Global Monitoring Report entitled Youth and Skills: Putting education to work, in addition to the United Nations World Report on Youth 2013, with a specific focus on migrant youth. Action towards achieving the goals set forth by international declarations and policy documents invariably differs from country to country and is impacted by factors such as the global financial crisis, fiscal responsibility and governance, which among other factors have led to high unemployment rates particularly among youth (ILO, 2014).
Within academic discourse, the perspectives and participation of youth in decision making processes and research has long been debated (Todd, 2012). For many scholars, meaningful involvement of youth can increase the validity of data, by helping to contextualize issues that affect youth, especially among marginalized groups. Youth can then use the knowledge gained through their experience in research processes to be change makers in their communities. Engaging youth can also serve an accountability function and give youth voice to participate in civic society on a broader stage and challenge their leaders to bring about change. A strengthened evidence base may also support advocacy and action, in addition to more effective programming and subsequent policy responses (UN, 2013). Other scholars, however, raise concern over challenges such as how to move beyond tokenism (see Baily and Merz this volume) towards authentic participation, how to address power imbalances and achieve empowerment and whether youth can or even should be expected to make change happen (Hart, 1992; O’Donoghue, Kirshner, & McLaughlin, 2003).

On many levels we can argue that efforts to actively draw attention to the importance of youth voices and incorporate youth in research and policy processes has progressed in the last two decades. One example relates to a paradigm shift from a deficit model of viewing youth as “broken” or on the verge of becoming broken, or as “problems to be managed”, towards appreciative, inquiry-based and positive youth development (PYD) perspectives and approaches (Lerner et al., 2006; Reason & Bradbury, 2001). This development has influenced not only the vocabulary used to describe youth, but also the theoretical and empirical bases for the field of youth studies (see Lerner et al. 2006 for a thorough discussion of historical developments). At the policy level, it has been noted that youth are now considered to be legitimate stakeholders in many public policy arenas (Zeldin, Camino, & Calvert, 2003).

Yet, we are now faced with the next challenge, which is identifying best practices to ensure youth involvement is both meaningful and effective. Kara (2007) points out that “…initial barriers to youth involvement were often conceptual (e.g. why engage youth?), whereas now the challenge now is often procedural, and even process oriented (e.g. how to meaningfully and effectively engage youth?)” (p. 564). Thus, the current challenges have more to do with the researcher’s ability to design, conduct and engage in high quality, meaningful participatory research that is able to capture and measure impact. In recognition of these issues that are currently still contested in the literature and for which more empirical evidence is needed, we caution that youth participation should not be perceived or presented as a panacea, nor will a one size fits all approach be an effective means of engaging youth in the research process. Ensuring the quality of youth participation will be contingent on adopting a nuanced, relevant and contextually appropriate strategy, as a number of chapters in this volume suggest. Strader (this volume) in particular, adopted a play-based approach to engaging Baka youth in Cameroon, after her initial research strategy failed to yield the richness she had hoped for. By immersing herself in their daily activities, including
play, Strader was able to establish trust and build relationships with the children and more effectively engage with them. Similarly, Henderson and colleagues (this volume), in working with Aboriginal youth in Canada on structural violence, recognized the need to relinquish control over the direction of the project in order to build analytical capacity and reflexivity among the youth to critically think about structural violence and to achieve the objectives of setting youth on a path of intergenerational partnership and social network-building.

TOWARDS CONTEXTUALIZED UNDERSTANDINGS OF “CHILDREN” AND “YOUTH”

Youth are as diverse as the challenges they face. For instance, where local definitions vary widely, many scholars opt to utilize an age-based definition of youth. “Youth” may also appear to be a concept exclusively related to age. However, youth as a concept is highly dependent on context. To define a person as a youth requires consideration of a multitude of factors, some of which may be more influential in certain contexts. For instance, youth may be defined based on their relationship to their family, their ability to support themselves and their relation to educational institutions. For example, a 28 year-old student will be regarded as a youth in many contexts whereas a 28 year-old married mother will fall into another category. Many organizations such as the World Bank (2007), UN (2011a) and UNESCO operationally define youth as the period between 15 and 24 years of age. This boundary can be perceived as being fluid, to accord with local traditions and contexts. For instance, UNESCO notes that “for activities at the national level, for example when implementing a local community youth program, youth may be understood in a more flexible manner” and as such “the definition of youth… can be based for instance on the definition given in the African Youth Charter where youth means every person between the ages of 15 and 35 years” (UNESCO, n.d.).

Yet, as is evident in a number of studies within the social sciences (i.e. anthropology, sociology, psychology and education) and in some of the chapters in this volume, the concept of youth is often conceptualized as a developmental and liminal phase in life, a transition between childhood to adulthood (see for example the volume by Christiansen, Utas & Vigh, 2006 and Furlong, 2009). Thus, youth are neither children nor adults, but instead they occupy a liminal position. For many young people, liminality “…has become a permanent phenomenon” a kind of “…postmodern liminality” (Kahane & Rapoport, 1997, p. 31). Kahane and Rapoport (1997) for instance, assert that liminality is a fusion between two or more social categories that is “betwixt and between” in which:

the informal context enables…[youth] to overcome their marginal status and live within different worlds [adult and childlike] at the same time, to feel that they belong in both rather than in a vacuum between them. (Kahane & Rapoport, 1997, p. 31)
For the authors in this volume, this in-between stage is central to conceptualizations and discourse concerning youth. Further, some authors use the term children and youth interchangeably in this volume, particularly given the fact that “borders between all phases of the life course have become fuzzy, the timing and duration of transitions between childhood, adolescence, youth, adulthood and old age are less age-dependent” (Heinz, 2009, p. 3) than have previously been the case. As mentioned, there is also the need to recognize that these life phases are dependent on local context and realities. Conversely, some of the authors in this volume engage in nuanced debates not only around the concept of youth, but also the implications of how we define it. Dunne and colleagues, for instance, highlight the multiple axes of identification that are in play in the ongoing discursive construction of our subjectivities, the category of “youth”...[and the need to] consider the complexities of the different relations which contribute to the social realities produced by the research. (p. 305 in this volume)

As editors, we strove to respect and honor the diversity of conceptualizations among the contributors to the volume by not forcing our own understandings or preferences on authors. Rather, by showcasing a range of approaches and lenses for understanding and representing youth, we hope that readers will get a sense of the diversity of the literature on youth.

Increasingly recognized in the literature and in this volume, youth are not merely passive social actors, they also have agency – not understood here simply as having the capacity to act autonomously, but the sort of agency that is subject to different possibilities and positionalities. This is evident in several chapters in this volume, but particularly so in the chapters by Fessenden and Henderson and colleagues who have presented a more nuanced interpretation of youth agency and various forms of resistance. Ultimately, in this volume we attempt to contribute to understandings of youth as “both social being and social becoming: as a position in movement” (Christiansen et al., 2006, p. 11). Overall, in understanding youth and their position in society, both the authors in this volume and we as editors are equally concerned with recognizing that youth have a critical role to play as future leaders in their respective communities and societies in confronting wicked problems.

WICKED PROBLEMS AND THE POTENTIAL ROLE OF YOUTH IN ADDRESSING GLOBAL CHALLENGES

We cannot solve the problems with the same thinking we used in creating them. (Albert Einstein)

The term wicked problems was first coined in the early 1970’s (Rittel & Webber, 1973) to illustrate the intractability of the plethora of social issues facing the world, such as those described earlier in this chapter. Unlike “tame” problems which tend to be more easily defined and solved through the application of linear approaches,
starting with problem identification and working towards a “solution”, wicked problems are difficult to define, highly complex and multi-causal, unstable, lack clear solutions or mitigation strategies and may give rise to unintended consequences; they go beyond the capacity of any one organization or body to respond to, and do not respect academic silos (Rittel & Webber, 1973; Hunter, 2009). Although not all scholars are likely to embrace the notion of wicked problems framed as such and may argue it is too alarmist, we found the concept useful for framing several aspects of the work we set out to accomplish with this volume. Firstly, we recognize that youth are frequently conceptualized and represented as wicked problems to be solved or managed, by those who work primarily within a deficit model. Although we note that shifts have taken place in this regard, one could argue that research funding is still largely directed towards studies that focus on risk factors and minimization of such factors, rather than research that stems from an assets or appreciative inquiry-based approach. In addition, we use the term wicked problems as a useful conceptual tool to illustrate the complexity of the issues youth around the globe currently face. Lastly and most central to our discussions, wicked problems and the concomitant call for transdisciplinarity and systems thinking highlight the importance of youth as key stakeholders to be actively engaged in research processes.

We argue that engaging youth in research is a wicked problem in itself, as each attempt to involve youth in research presents a unique set of challenges, but also opportunities. As Rittel and Webber (1973) point out there is no single solution or one set of criteria, no single approach or method and there is always room for improvement. As the chapters in this volume will show, each attempt to involve youth in research, whether it is in terms of definition (i.e. who are the youth, how are they defined and understood and are they “at the margins”) or if it delves into how to include them in research (i.e. as participants, co-researchers or peer
researchers) will bring about a new set of issues that must be tackled. For us the wicked problems are not just about the issues that are dealt with in research itself, but also about how to meaningfully include youth as important stakeholders in the process.

Further, we are reminded that given the highly complex and ambiguous nature of wicked problems, holistic, multi-level, systems-based approaches have been advocated as a means for both grasping and tackling the multifaceted and interconnected issues facing the world. Systems thinking represents a way of perceiving and understanding the world, through the application of a framework within which to organize information in order to understand its complexity (Leischow et al., 2008; Richmond, 2000). More specifically, systems thinking is

...a paradigm or perspective that considers connections among different components, plans for the implications of their interaction, and requires transdisciplinary thinking as well as active engagement of those who have a stake in the outcome to govern the course of change. (Leischow & Milstein, 2006, p. 403)

Thus, systems thinking is an approach which explicitly aims to both account for and engage with the interrelated issues which feed into wicked problems, and to incorporate the multiple and often conflictual perspectives of relevant stakeholders. For example, the challenges related to the integration of immigrant youth in schools in Europe, North America or in Japan (see Gordon, this volume), or increasing school enrolment in low- and middle-income countries. With respect to understanding school enrolment for instance, collaboration across a wide range of disciplines is essential, including not only education, but also medicine to understand the underlying causes such as malnutrition that may contribute to school drop-out and absenteeism; economics, to shed light on rates of return to education and perceptions which may influence parental decision making with respect to sending children to school or the decisions made by youth to stay in school; and anthropology and sociology to understand the impact of gender norms and the relevance of education to the setting as it influences enrolment. Each discipline has a unique, but perhaps insufficient body of evidence to contribute to address global challenges.

Underpinning and implicit in a systems approach is a commitment to transdisciplinarity, which has yet to be defined in a universally accepted manner, but which some scholars argue is a “process in which team members representing different fields work together over extended periods to develop shared conceptual and methodological frameworks that not only integrate but also transcend their respective disciplinary perspectives” (Stokols, Hall, Taylor, & Moser, 2008, p. 474). The importance of “breaking down silos” or disciplinary boundaries in academia has become increasingly emphasized. This is also something we have actively sought to achieve in this volume. Indeed, as discussed below, scholars are increasingly advocating for other paradigm shifts as well, including a rights-based approach to youth participation in research processes.
Appadurai (2006) persuasively argues that research should be considered within a human rights-based framework. By this he is suggesting a deparochialization and democratization of the right to research by ensuring that the capacity to carry out research is within the reach of ordinary citizens, in particular youth. Appadurai (2006) argues that,

…asserting the relevance of the right to research, as a human right, is not a metaphor. It is an argument for how we might revive an old idea, namely, that taking part in democratic society requires one to be informed. One can hardly be informed unless one has some ability to conduct research, however humble the question or however quotidian its inspiration. This is doubly true in [a] world where rapid change, new technologies and rapid flows of information change the playing field for ordinary citizens every day of the week. (p. 177)

Drawing on his experience with a grassroots NGO in India, he describes efforts to train teachers and students using the principle of “documentation as intervention” as a means of inquiry-based skill development with an aim of fostering capacity to engage in action oriented efforts to achieve social change. Such an approach holds potential to develop the triple capacity to inquire, to analyze and to communicate. Appadurai argues that it is essential to make research a process that is more accessible to youth of a wide range of interests, as research is:

…not only the production of original ideas and new knowledge (as it is normally defined in academia and other knowledge-based institutions). It is also something simpler and deeper. It is the capacity to systematically increase the horizons of one’s current knowledge, in relation to some task, goal or aspiration. (Appadurai, 2006, p. 176)

Intimately connected with this notion of conceptualizing research as a right, is the capabilities approach, articulated by Sen (1999) and Nussbaum (2000). This framework is predicated on two pillars, namely that the freedom to achieve well-being is of primary moral importance, and second, that freedom to achieve well-being is to be understood in terms of people's capabilities, or their real opportunities to do and be what they have reason to value. This freedom to achieve well-being is something that the authors and we as editors strove to uncover in this volume, by showcasing the ways in which the inclusion of youth in research can contribute in this regard.

In this volume, we showcase four examples of researchers that demonstrate a commitment to the meaningful and active engagement of youth as partners in research. In chapters that elucidate the potential, but also the challenges associated with involving youth as co-researchers, Dunne and colleagues, Henderson and colleagues, Skourtes and Shadowen (all in this volume) illustrate that youth have the desire and capacity to substantially enrich and enlighten research processes.
Although it is beyond the scope of this introductory chapter, and indeed this volume, to give these important and interlinked concepts such as wicked problems, transdisciplinarity and systems thinking, research as a right and the capabilities approach, a detailed and fulsome discussion, they framed our editorial discussions and decisions. It is our hope that future research efforts to tackle the most pressing and persistent challenges facing youth worldwide will build on our discussion in this introduction and embrace the messiness associated with wicked problems, using approaches which may be informed by the guiding principles of transdisciplinarity and systems thinking, to the extent that it is feasible and appropriate.

YOUTH-ENGAGED METHODOLOGIES

Youth are frequently studied and perceived as being passive subjects rather than active agents. As mentioned above, they are also often perceived and portrayed as being wicked problems to be solved or managed, and not often invited to actively and meaningfully engage in the research process. Indeed, research is often done 

for or on children, but less commonly 

with them. However, an increasing number of scholars advocate for moving beyond traditional approaches or models of research that view participants as subjects, towards engaging with youth participants as social actors, collaborators, and agents of change. Such efforts are in line with approaches such as participatory action research (PAR) and community-based participatory research (CBPR), which aim to build on local knowledge and strengths and foster participation by all affected stakeholders, including youth. Efforts to involve children and youth in research are evolving and exist on a continuum (see Figure 1). For instance, youth may to varying degrees, be engaged in defining the research questions, designing and/or implementing an intervention, and/or assessing the outcome of an intervention through data analysis. In this volume, we see authors engaging youth in their research along this continuum to demonstrate the diversity of approaches that can be found in youth-engaged research. In all approaches, serious consideration of the complex ethical issues concerning research with children and youth is important to ensuring they are safeguarded from both short-term and long-term harm. Researchers must also be cognizant that there may be discord between approaches, which conceptualize children and youth as autonomous, rights-bearing citizens, and local understandings and norms, which may position children and youth as dependants. As evidenced in this volume, scholars adopting participatory approaches to engaging youth in research may discuss at length the epistemological and theoretical bases for involving youth, such as social constructivism and critical theory, or they may adopt a more pragmatic standpoint and focus on PAR as a methodological choice, a tool for collecting data or a means of increasing the relevance and validity of data.
Figure 1. Continuum of children and youth participation in research.
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Whilst it is our hope that this volume makes a contribution towards the advancement of youth scholarship, we must acknowledge that there continues to be a lack of sufficient empirical evidence relating to youth engagement in research processes. It is our hope that this volume will contribute to the growing literature in this regard, however in recognition that significant gaps in our understanding remain, we strongly encourage researchers to publish findings that demonstrate successful and unsuccessful examples of youth engagement in research such that opportunities for learning are not missed. As is clear from this volume, additional research is needed which investigates the potential risks, benefits and barriers to meaningfully and effectively engaging youth in research processes, and which sheds light on the contextual factors at play that require attention when planning ethical and methodological approaches to youth-engaged research. Ideally, a convergence in terms of adopting standardized definitions and methods of measuring outcomes such as empowerment would facilitate comparison across studies; however we do recognize that this can be challenging, particularly in light of the semantical challenges associated with defining youth and children as discussed above. Moreover, in many instances, it is likely that the outcome measures are more driven by and reflective of researcher perspectives with respect to program effects. This represents an additional area of scholarship in need of further development. Researchers that work closely with youth as collaborators and stakeholders in defining outcome parameters would make a substantial contribution towards setting the bar in terms of relevant, meaningful engagement in research.

OVERVIEW OF THE VOLUME

This volume emerged out of a shared commitment on the part of the editors to expand the knowledge base for understanding the role that youth and youth voices can play within research and on the global stage with respect to addressing the complex socio-cultural, economic and political challenges of our time.

Authors contributing to this volume come from a range of academic disciplines including education, social work, psychology, medicine, nursing, anthropology, political science, and the humanities; several of the chapters represent trans-disciplinary collaborations. A range of what could be considered wicked problems are dealt with in this volume, including poverty, war, conflict and structural violence, access to education, stigma and discrimination. There are a number of other timely and complex issues facing youth today that are not featured in this volume including the radicalization of youth, mental health and suicide among youth (suicide now ranks number three among causes of death during adolescents), social media and “cyber-bullying”, as well as many other important challenges. In terms of geographical coverage in this volume, author contributions span a number of continents and countries with representation from sub-Saharan Africa (Cameroon, Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Senegal), Europe and Eastern Europe (Spain and Ukraine), Asia (Japan, India, Pakistan and Myanmar), the Middle East (Syria and the Occupied Palestinian Territories), Oceania (Australia), and North America (Canada). Although this is an impressive range, insights from research
among youth in the Circumpolar North and in Latin and South America, and other regions of the world would have presented an even more comprehensive view of efforts worldwide to actively engage youth in research endeavors.

We structured the volume in such a way that foundational concepts and issues that are central to engaging youth and youth voices in research are presented in Section I. In Section II, we contextualize some of the important issues raised in the first section by showcasing studies from around the world that have focused on youth and community empowerment and activism. Section III illustrates the relationship between youth and the institutions and structures they may have to navigate. A selection of insightful case studies is presented from diverse contexts in institutionalized settings such as prisons and orphanages, but also studies that highlight the school as an institution that is not always relevant or inclusive of all students. Finally, we include a series of contributions that constitute case examples from the “field.” These studies provide detailed methodological accountings, which may serve as useful reflective reference points for those researchers who are particularly interested in the challenges and opportunities associated with field research. To varying degrees, each of the chapters presented in this volume weaves together critical insights concerning the epistemological and methodological challenges associated with engaging youth in research, which is the foundation that this volume is built upon.

Following our introduction to the volume, we offer chapters that examine macro level issues associated with marginalized youth. Huang and Holmarsdottir, for instance, offer critical reflection and consideration of youth and youth policy in the European context. Although this chapter focuses on Europe, the authors take up a number of issues that are relevant to youth worldwide, such as the need to overcome structural barriers to equality and justice. To enhance understandings of important epistemological and methodological aspects associated with research concerning marginalized youth, Pihl’s contribution interrogates the implications of the epistemology, theory and methodology for how we conceptualize, represent and ultimately understand youth. Wearing builds on this discussion of how youth tend to be conceptualized and represented in the literature and attends to the inherent power/knowledge inequalities, for instance demarcated by status and class, which exist between researchers and marginalized youth. He shares important reflections concerning the ethics and collective impact of qualitative research on marginalized youth and argues that researchers must be reflexive when it comes to examining important ethical and relational aspects of the research process in order to ensure adequate protection of research participants who may be particularly vulnerable, and also to safeguard integrity in the production of “knowledge”. In the next chapter, Keenan offers nuanced insights into the consent process as it pertains to involving minors in research, with a particular focus on the role of parents and proxies. She illustrates the complexities associated with obtaining informed assent from children and youth and highlights the need for research protocols to be flexible and responsive to the local context, whilst ensuring that youth are safeguarded from harm. Challenging the assumption that a participatory research approach is a kind of “silver bullet” for the ethical
complexities of working with youth at the margins, the next chapter by Fessenden offers an insightful and critical analysis of the limitations and potential of “engaged, insider methodologies” to foster empowerment through a case example of anarcho-punk youth and dumpster-divers in Spain. Her research efforts, which have her straddling and negotiating insider-activist-researcher positionalities, describe how she did not empower the anarcho-punk youth. Fessenden’s contribution highlights both the complexities and the nuances of insider ethnographies and also the potential for co-empowerment among researchers and participants. This chapter serves as an important segue to the next section in the book where the contributions also contend with the notion of empowerment within the research context.

In section II, a series of chapters offer rich and insightful case studies concerning youth and community empowerment and activism from such diverse contexts as Asia, Africa and North America. Here, we include authors who challenge assumptions that engaging youth in research necessarily leads to empowerment and social change, whilst exploring the potentialities of the method by presenting case studies and lessons learned from the field. An interesting example of an insider-outsider research endeavor is presented by Roy and Roy (Canadian born siblings of Bengali heritage) who find that youth in India desire opportunities and resources which would enable them to become active and effective change agents for health promotion and social justice. Their work highlights the importance of building relationships not only with youth, but also with the wider community, which includes important gatekeepers for accessing youth. Among youth in Kenya, Lee explores the challenges and opportunities of employing a participatory community-based approach to engage marginalized youth in action research and ground-up policy-making. She finds that whilst power differentials among researchers and youth are not fully transformed or transcended when using a participant engaged approach, there is tremendous potential in adopting participatory action research methodologies which can create space and opportunities for youth to critically reflect on structural inequality, and consider ways in which they might harness their creativity and skills to be change makers within their communities. Baily and Merz also grapple with this process of engaging youth as change agents in their study that focuses on youth activism in India. Drawing on a wealth of experience as youth activists themselves, the authors reflect on the challenges associated with ensuring that youth participation is authentic and transcends tokenism. They also offer lessons learned concerning the importance of endogenous research or research that emerges from within. Shifting to more of a focus on structural violence and serving as a bridge to the next section in the volume, Henderson, Ireland and Thurston present the development of a youth-powered documentary among Aboriginal youth in Canada as a case study in digital participatory methodologies, which has become increasingly popular as a means of critically engaging marginalized populations in research. The authors offer up a number of important caveats to be considered when using digital media approaches, including ethical and pedagogical considerations around engaging youth as co-researchers. In an interesting development, the youth in this study
asserted themselves and claimed the space to disclose or not disclose perspectives or experiences associated with forms of structural violence, but rather focused on “spooky stories” and haunting, as well as withdrew from completing the film. The authors insightfully note that, “silence and refusal may be empowered voices nonetheless” (p. 212 in this volume).

In section III, perceiving children and youth as capable social actors who have the right to engage in research is also the point of departure for the work of Flynn and Saunders who present two studies of children in Australia whose parents have experienced incarceration. The authors provide insights and guidance for researchers on how to meaningfully engage marginalized youth in research such that it increases the likelihood that their involvement will be both an ethically sound and empowering experience. Another example of work within an institutionalized setting, Korzh presents her research among youth living in orphanages in Ukraine. Highlighting some of the methodological and practical challenges faced in the field, she also shares critical reflections on researcher obligation to participants, raising important questions for budding and seasoned researchers alike. Strader also draws on her rich field work experience in the field with indigenous Baka youth in Cameroon to emphasize how a critical constructivist approach which employs participatory and immersive methods can contribute towards the development of a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of youth perspectives and experiences. Also facing various forms of discrimination, but in their adopted country, Gordon explores how “newcomers” to Japan struggle to survive and thrive in an educational system not well-equipped to deal with difference. She presents a case study that gives voice to youth and demonstrates how educational reforms have bolstered the resilience of immigrant youth, ultimately leading to improved academic and vocational outcomes for the students.

In section IV, a series of diverse empirical cases from around the world are presented which use a participatory approach to engaging youth in research. Drawing from case studies conducted in Senegal, Pakistan and the Occupied Palestinian Territories, Dunne, Durrani, Crossouard and Fincham explore both the potential and problematic aspects of engaging youth as co-researchers and peer researchers. The authors’ post-structural framing of power and identity in their youth-researching-youth approach sheds light on the importance of being attentive to the range of imbalances that can arise in such relationships. Advocating a rights-based approach to research, this chapter also highlights the strength of the method that is performative, and affords youth an opportunity to enact their citizenship. There is also a clear emphasis on methods for field research in Plowright’s contribution, which focuses on research with child soldiers in the conflict zones of Syria and Myanmar, and the post-conflict setting of northern Uganda. In his chapter, Plowright grapples with the ethics of engaging with such a vulnerable group and concludes by sharing some general guidelines based on his own work, for researchers contemplating entering a similar setting. While Plowright’s chapter focuses on youth in various fragile settings, the chapter by Shadowen looks at how youth in India are engaged across the participatory spectrum in two ways: both as
surveyors (co-researchers) and as participants in an evaluation study of an after-school program initiated by an international NGO in collaboration with the local community. Shadowen discusses how challenges related to actively involving youth in research processes, in particular in a setting where age-based hierarchies predominate and youth are typically seen but not heard. Finally, the volume concludes with a critical feminist, visual ethnography with stigmatized working-class, out-of-school, urban females in Vancouver, Canada. Skourtes offers a wealth of insights into a wide range of key issues associated with research among marginalized populations. For instance, she engages in a discussion of epistemological concerns that were central to her study, and of power dynamics. Importantly, she also provides a detailed accounting of her application of visual methods in the study, which will be of benefit to researchers aiming to undertake similar studies.

It is our hope that with this volume, we are both bearing witness to and engaging as active contributors to a burgeoning literature and paradigm shift that treat or appreciate youth as assets and creative change makers who have a contribution to make in research processes, dispelling the notion of youth as wicked problems to be merely studied as objects.
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SECTION I

(RE)VISITING CRITICAL EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON ENGAGING YOUTH IN RESEARCH
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2. YOUTH AT THE MARGINS OF CITIZENSHIP

A Review of European Youth Policy

INTRODUCTION

According to the Oxford Dictionary of English the noun “margin” appears to be objective and uni-dimensional (horizontal). The word describes an object in our physical world: at “an edge or border of something”, “a line determining the limits of an area”, “a boundary line or the area immediately inside the boundary”, or “the blank space that surrounds the text on a page” (Thompson, Fowler, & Fowler, 1995). The word becomes abstract with dimensions such as quantity, amount, and direction when describing phenomena that are human-related activities: margin of profit in commerce or economy, margin of safety in engineering or construction, margin of a normal behavior in psychology. In sociological studies, the term “marginalization” describes both a social process of becoming or being made marginal as a group within the larger society and an intermediate position between social inclusion and exclusion (Hammer, 2003) in different dimensions such as education, economy, labor market, housing, social and political participation in a local community or the national government, in which young people often find themselves disproportionally overrepresented. Correspondingly, marginalization is not only linked to inclusion and exclusion, it is also linked to issues of human rights.

In June 2014, six years into the economic recession in Europe, the Commissioner for Human Rights at the Council of Europe claimed that youth human rights are at risk and called for a “rights-based approach” in European youth policy to raise “awareness of the lack of specific attention afforded to young people in most European and international human rights instruments” (Muižnieks, 2014). A word search through the significant international human rights related declarations adapted by international organizations and agencies since the end of the World War II reveals that neither youth as a term nor young people as a group have ever been specifically mentioned. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948) states the rights of “all human beings” (Article 1) and “everyone” (from Article 2 and onwards); the Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations, 1989) includes “everyone under 18 years of age” (Article 1); the European Social Charter (CoE, 1961 and revised 1996) specifically mentions “the rights of children and young persons to protection” (Article 7) but it limits the age of children and young persons to 18 years old and younger; and the Charter of the Fundamental Rights of the European Union (EU, 2009, legally binding on the Treaty of the European Union) has one entry...
mentioning “young people” in Article 32 “Prohibition of child labor and protection of young people at work”.

In order to understand why and how European youth’s human rights are at risk and why it is necessary to call for rights-based youth policy, this chapter reviews and analyses policy documents relevant to youth published by the two European intergovernmental institutions, namely, the Council of Europe and the European Union. Two reasons make this study of the two European institutions interesting and relevant to young people as marginalized citizens in Europe. First, both institutions were established on the principle of human rights and democracy. Founded in 1949 (the Treaty of London) and currently having 47 member states, the Council of Europe (CoE) is “the continent’s leading human rights organization” ever since it adopted the European Convention on Human Rights in 1950. Formally established in 1992 and currently having 28 member states, the European Union is based on the rule of law as “every action taken by the EU is founded on treaties that have been approved voluntarily and democratically by all EU member countries”. Second, young people as a specific social group have long been “claimed” to be a common policy concern by both European institutions which is made evident by the works of EU-CoE Youth Partnership since 1998. The Partnership aims to foster synergies between youth policies of the two institutions as well as of the member states on themes specifically relevant to European youth: participation/citizenship, social inclusion, recognition and quality of youth work.

This policy review will focus on one of the key themes of European youth policy: citizenship, with the aim to contribute to understandings of this concept as documented in European policies and its relevance to the current human rights ‘at-risk’ situation currently facing many youth in Europe. In a layman’s understanding, citizenship denotes the legal link between a person and a state. The possession of citizenship is normally associated with the legal right to work and live in a country and to participate in political life. As young people are first of all citizens of a state in Europe or in the world, does it mean that European young citizens also enjoy the rights associated with their citizenship? If young citizens enjoy equal status and rights as every other citizen, why is citizenship a specific focus in European youth policies? What is the meaning of citizenship in the European youth policies? In the following, this chapter first provides an account of the facts of young people’s marginal positions in European society, followed by a discussion of citizenship from the research literature. The section entitled “Data and methods” gives a brief description of the data collection process of policy documents and analytic approach applied. The results of the review and analyses are presented in two accounts of policy development: 1) a chronological account of the development of the citizenship concept in European policies after the World War II and 2) European youth policies on citizenship. At the end of the chapter, we offer a tentative definition of citizenship for European youth policy together with critiques on the focus of some of these policies.
YOUTH AT THE MARGINS

In the following, we present some factual accounts of the marginal position currently occupied by young people in Europe and other parts of the world. In doing so, we can classify these into three arenas namely, civil, political and social. These three arenas in the lives of youth are also related to law, human rights and democracy, and to health, education, wealth and citizenship. We will come back to this link later on in this chapter.

First in terms of the civil arena, systems of criminal justice in most countries in the world hold children and young people criminally responsible (e.g. at age 15 in Norway, age 10 in England and age 12 in the United States), constrain when they have the right to work (e.g. at age 16 in Norway) and when they have the right to vote (i.e. at age 18 in most countries). In many cases young people are disproportionately treated as disposable (Giroux, 2012). Specifically, youth who are unwilling or who question the neo-liberal agenda (the logic of the free-market) are seen as disposable; thus both goods and young people are increasingly objectified and disposable (Giroux, 2012). Moreover, drawing on Greenwald (2011), Giroux (2013, p. 646) points out that “given that by age 23, almost a third of Americans are arrested for a crime, it becomes clear that in the new militarized state young people, especially poor minorities, are viewed as predators, a threat to corporate governance, and are treated as disposable populations” (Greenwald, 2011). Since many youth are seen as disposable they are also over-represented as convicted criminals in prisons, particularly in the US and the UK, but also other countries. In the US, for example, approximately 250,000 children (between the ages of 10 to 17) are prosecuted, sentenced or incarcerated as adults each year, of which 70 percent are serving for nonviolent offenses. In the year 2009 alone, the US police made 1.6 million juvenile arrests (Children’s Defence Fund, 2011). In England and Wales, there were over 1.3 million arrests in 2010 of which almost 250,000 were among youth aged 10-17, with 10-17 year olds accounting for 17 percent of all arrests, but representing only 11 percent of the population. In the same year, young people under the age of 21 represented approximately 26 percent of the first entrants into the criminal justice system (Ministry of Justice, 2012).

In the political arena, young people in Europe between the ages of 18-30 participate in democracy and civic actions nearly as much as older generations do, but they are generally underrepresented in formal power structures. Data made available by the European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy (EKCYP) and data from the European Social Survey 2008 suggest that in many countries, young people are engaged in national elections nearly as much as the older people. Among 20 European countries with available information at EKCYP, the difference in the proportion of young people who vote compared to adults over 30 is only about 17 percentage points (i.e. about 66 percent of young people on average vs. 83 percent of adults over 30). Meanwhile, a large-scale study in seven EU countries (i.e. Austria, Finland, France, Hungary, Poland, Spain and the UK) shows that the majority of European youth (87 percent) are engaged in one or several forms of political and civic actions (LSE, 2013). However, only a dozen of
European countries have some young representatives (under or at the age of 30) in national parliaments or local governing councils. In those countries, about 20 percent of the population are youth, but young representatives only occupy approximately 5 percent of the parliament seats (Huang, 2013) and less than 4 percent of young people in Europe are members of political parties or a trade union (Eurostat, 2009) where the power of negotiation usually resides.

Third, in terms of the social arena, youth today are the best (or longest) educated generation in European history (Eurostat, 2009). At work, however, young people tend to have higher rates of temporary and part-time employment, lower rates of pay and are 50 percent more vulnerable to workplace injury from accidents, chemical exposure, and psychological pressure such as stress or harassment (Eurostat, 2009; European Commission, 2012a). During economic downturns young people tend to be the hardest hit and they are often the first to lose their jobs. In March 2014, as unemployment rates (between the ages 15-74) reached 10.5 percent in the EU28, the youth unemployment rate (between the ages 15-24) was twice as high at 22.8 percent and as high as 56.8 percent in Greece and 53.9 percent in Spain (Eurostat, 2014). Meanwhile, in terms of social and economic aspects, young people are overrepresented in statistics of at-risk-of-poverty (Eurostat, 2009), being exposed to abuse and violence, having poor mental health and high rates of suicide (UNICEF, 2011).

In general, young people’s human rights have been constantly undermined (or even violated) in several aspects of their lives in Europe and in other parts of the world. They are discriminated against in the work place and in the market; they are unprotected and treated as disposable by our society; they are excluded in decision-making positions and have no say in affairs that are vital to their very survival as human beings. All these issues also relate closely to the concept of citizenship, something we now turn our attention towards.

**THE DEFINITION OF CITIZENSHIP AND ITS ASSOCIATIONS WITH MARGINALIZATION AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION**

According to the definition by the Oxford Dictionary of English, a citizen is “a legally recognized subject or national of a state” while citizenship is “the position or status of being a citizen of a particular country” (Thompson, Fowler, & Fowler, 1995). In the literature, Crick (2000) argues that the concept of citizenship is said to have diverse conceptualizations across disciplines and there is not a universally accepted definition, while others argue that there are only four citizenship models based on four competing ideologies (Hoskins, 2012), i.e. the liberal model, the communitarian model, the civic republican model and the critical model. Some scholars find the concept to be both descriptive and normative (Holford & van der Veen, 2006) or both normative and empirical (Taylor-Gooby, 1991). Within the context that citizenship describes a legal relationship between the people and the state, most commonly cited is Marshall’s (1950) description of the concept as including rights of citizens (as related to human rights) in three interdependent aspects of a society: civil, political and social (as we have noted in the previous
Normative arguments are often about how citizenship should be developed or what citizenship should be like, as some suggest that citizenship can be constructed actively by people or should be a set of practices inherent in the activities of citizens (Turner, 1993; Jamieson et al., 2005), while empirical aspects of citizenship argue for a “holistic analysis” on the ways in which all aspects of citizenship (civil, political and social) influence and impact each other (Lister & Pia, 2008).

Meanwhile, some scholars offer alternative interpretations of citizenship (Evans, 1995), between maximal citizenship having consciousness of self as a member of a shared democratic culture and participation and minimal form emphasizing individual civil and legal status, rights and responsibilities. Others propose additional dimensions to the concept, for instance with global, cosmopolitan, or environmental citizenship from concerns about global inequality and climate change, and transnational and multicultural citizenship in response to the dilemmas raised by migration and by the cultural diversity within state boundaries (Stoker et al., 2011). Some scholars (Somers, 2008; Burgi, 2014) focus on the rights of citizenship that are violated considerably by the market, which include “legal and civil freedoms, and equal access to justice; participatory rights in democratic governance; and the social inclusionary rights that allow for the meaningful exercise of all the others” (Somers, 2008, p. 5). Yet others view the concept as a living process with actions and activities. Following the “ideal image of the citizen” as an active participant, but not citizenship as a formal relation to the political system (Morrow, 2005, p. 381), and moreover some new terms have emerged: effective citizenship (Westholm et al., 2007), engaged citizenship (Dalton, 2008), active citizenship (Hoskins & Mascherini, 2009), participatory citizenship (Hoskins et al., 2012) and passive citizenship (Amnå & Ekman, 2014).

Nevertheless, participation in civil, political and social lives is essential for citizenship in a democracy, but individuals or groups at marginal positions in any one or more dimensions in a society are often excluded from full or partial and meaningful participation in many aspects of society (de Haan & Maxwell, 1998; Duffy, 1995, 2001; Horsell, 2006). Instead of suggesting that individuals’ lack of ability or inability prevents them from participating in the “normal” activities of “normal” citizens in a society (Burchardt, Le Grand, & Piachau, 1999), we follow the argument of “structured inabilities to participation” (Chakravarty & D’Ambrosio, 2006) when it comes to understanding the marginal positions of young people. This allows for a more complex, multidimensional understanding of the interplay, overlap and social distance between money, work, political power and citizenship.

However, contemporary discourses of citizenship in educational research offer a more comprehensive definition (Abowitz & Harnish, 2006, p. 653), though much of the emphasis focuses on the political aspect of the concept and is worth repeating here:

Citizenship in a democracy (a) gives membership status to individuals within a political unit; (b) confers an identity on individuals; (c) constitutes a set of
values, usually interpreted as a commitment to the common good of a particular political unit; (d) involves practicing a degree of participation in the process of political life; and (e) implies gaining and using knowledge and understanding of laws, documents, structures, and processes of governance.

This definition provides a preliminary conceptual framework of citizenship to guide the review and analysis of European youth policies that are presented in the sections following a presentation of data and analysis methods.

DATA AND METHODS

This chapter analyzes policy documents adopted and research documents published by the two selected European institutions (the European Union and the Council of Europe). Data collection entailed two steps. The first step was to locate all policy documents accessible from official websites or online archives of the two institutions. Policy documents of the Council of Europe are in the form of declarations, resolutions, recommendations and White papers of the Committee of Ministers, the Parliamentary Assembly and the Congress of European Local and Regional Authorities. Policy documents of the European Union include forms of treaties, directives, decisions and communications by the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union and the European Commission. The inclusion criteria of policy documents for analysis were the following keywords: 1) “citizenship” appeared in the titles of policy documents or in the body of the texts of key policy documents, 2) “youth”, “young people” and/or “young citizen” appeared in the titles or in the body of the text of research documents published by the two intuitions. This search resulted in 43 policy documents as listed in Table A in the Appendix at the end of the chapter. The second step of data collection was to search the body of the texts of the policy documents for 1) keywords: citizenship, youth, young people, young citizens, 2) the words and the sentences associated with those keywords.

The analytical method applied in this chapter is a classical exercise of qualitative content analysis (Bryman, 2004) using the Critical Hermeneutic Approach. The policy analysis follows the three “moments” of the Critical Hermeneutic Approach outlined by Phillips and Brown (1993) used in their study on documents of organizations: 1) the “social-historical moment” for bringing out the perspectives of the producers of the documents, in this case the European Union and the Council of Europe; 2) the “formal moment” for examining the text looking for the keywords and their associations, in this case, citizenship, young, marginalization and social exclusion; 3) the “interpretation-reinterpretation moment” for the interpretation of the results from the previous two moments. The results of analyses are presented in three sections as follow where the first is on the development of the concept of citizenship in European policies which represents the social-historical moment of the two European institutions. The second section of the results represents the formal moment of examining the texts for the
keywords and their associations. The results of the interpretation-reinterpretation moment are included in the section of conclusion at the end.

THE CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP IN EUROPEAN POLICIES

The European Union

The citizens’ right of free movement among the member states in the European Union is an essential element of the development of the concept of a European citizenship. Table 1 chronologically shows the official documents and policies that are important for the building of European citizenship in the Union. In 1957, the six EU founding member countries (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and Netherlands) signed the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (also called the Treaty of Rome) which granted workers the right to move and reside freely among the member states. The right of free movement among the member states was restricted only to workers both in the treaty Single European Act signed in 1986 for establishing a single market in Europe and in Treaty on European Union signed in 1992 when the European Union was formally established. However, the Treaty on European Union in 1992 introduced for the first time the concept of “a citizenship of the Union” or the EU citizenship as a legal term which claims that every national member of a state is also an EU citizen.

In 1993, the Union expanded the right of free movement and residence from workers only to also include students (Council Directive 93/96/EEC). Only in 2009, the free movement of persons (EU citizens and their families), beyond free movement of goods, service, workers, students and capital, became a legislative reality when the Lisbon Treaty was signed to grant citizenship of the Union in the form of a legally binding agreement with the European Charter of Fundamental rights. The Lisbon Treaty is the first of the EU treaties to include democratic principles (Part Two of the Treaty: Article 9-Article 12) which is said to have changed the meaning of EU citizenship and the relationship of the citizen with the nation state and the European institutions (Guild, 2010). The EU Citizenship Report 2010 clarifies (COM(2010)0603) that Article 20 of the Treaty on Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) defines the concept of European citizenship. Article 20 of TFEU states that every person holding the nationality of a member state shall be a citizen of the Union and shall enjoy the rights and be subject to the duties provided for in the Treaties including: 1) the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the member states, 2) the right to vote and to stand as candidates in elections to the European Parliament and in municipal elections in their member state of residence under the same conditions as nationals of that state, 3) the right to enjoy in a third country the protection of the diplomatic and consular authorities of any member state, and 4) the right to petition the European Parliament, to apply to the European Ombudsman, and to address the institutions and advisory bodies of the Union in any of the Treaty languages and to obtain a reply in the same language. Hence the Lisbon Treaty also marks the
completion of building the legislative concept of citizenship in the Union which grants citizen rights in all civic and social and political domains as defined by Marshall (1950).

Table 1. The legal rights development of citizenship in the European Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Legislation form</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Treaty of Rome</td>
<td>Workers have the right to move and reside freely among six EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Single European Act</td>
<td>Workers have the right to move and reside freely among 12 EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Treaty on European Union</td>
<td>Every national of an EU country is also an EU citizen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Council Directive 93/96/EEC</td>
<td>Students gained the right to move and reside freely among the EU countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Decision 95/553/EC</td>
<td>A common protection arrangement for all EU citizens by diplomatic and consular representations of member states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Decision 96/409/CFSP</td>
<td>A common format emergency travel document of the EU member states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Treaty of Amsterdam</td>
<td>“Every national of a member state shall be a citizen of the Union. Citizenship of the Union shall complement and not replace national citizenship” (Article 8-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Directive 2004/58/EC</td>
<td>The right of free movement of EU citizens and their family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Decision 1904/2006/EC</td>
<td>Establishing for the period 2007-2013 the programme “Europe for Citizens” to promote active European citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Communication COM(2009)313 final</td>
<td>On guidance for better transposition and application of Directive 2004/38/EC on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisbon Treaty</td>
<td>Citizenship of the Union in the form of a legally binding with European Charter of Fundamental Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Communication COM(2010)0063</td>
<td>EU citizenship report 2010: Dismantling the obstacles to EU citizens’ rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Regulation 390/2014</td>
<td>Establishing the “Europe for Citizens” programme for the period 2014-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Follows the chronological order at European Commission website JUSTICE.*

Moreover, the current Treaty of European Union (consolidated version 2012/C 326/01) specifically mentions in Article 3 that the Union shall “combat social exclusion and discrimination, and shall promote social justice and protection, equality between women and men, solidarity between generations and protection of the rights of the child” and contribute to “the protection of human rights, in
particular the rights of the child” but the treaty never specifically mentions youth. Nevertheless, youth are specifically mentioned in the Treaty on the Function of the European Union (consolidated version 2012/C 326/01) Article 47 states “Member states shall, within the framework of a joint programme, encourage the exchange of young workers”, and Title XII “Education, vocational training, youth and sports” Article 165 and Article 166 state that the Union will aim to “encourage the development of youth exchanges, encourage the participation of young people in democratic life in Europe, facilitate access of vocational training and encourage mobility of instructors and trainees and particularly young people”. Consequently, youth are not a focus in the EU treaties in regards to their rights as citizens, but youth have a specific position in education and training and participation in democratic life of Europe as part of the function of the European Union. As a part of the development process of European citizenship, the Union has established the Europe for Citizens programme (2007-2013 Decision 1904/2006/EC; 2014-2020 Regulation 290/2014) focusing on youth with objectives to “contribute to citizens’ understanding the Union, its history and diversity” and “foster European citizenship and to improve conditions for civic and democratic participation at Union level” (Regulation 290/2014: Article 1).

The Council of Europe

As European cooperation is primarily based on the principles of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (as noted earlier the civil, political and social arenas of peoples’ lives), the word citizenship appeared for the first time in Resolution 243 (1993) of the CoE Congress of Local and Regional Authorities on Citizenship and extreme poverty: the Charleroi Declaration and later in Resolution 41 (1996) on “health and citizenship: care for the poorest in Europe”.

The starting point for introducing the concept of youth citizenship in the Council of Europe is the principle of participatory democracy and education for the development of individual capacities, competences and attitudes by the people in Europe. In 1999, CoE launched an action plan for education for democratic citizenship (Decisions CM/DEL/DEC(99)668), which started a process of the production of several policy texts over the first decade into the 21st century on education for democratic citizenship (i.e. which eventually resulted in the Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education adopted in 2010. The Charter defines education for democratic citizenship as “education, training, awareness-raising, information, practices and activities which aim, by equipping learners with knowledge skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behavior, to empower them to exercise and defend their democratic rights and responsibilities in society, to value diversity and to play an active part in democratic life, with a view to the promotion and protection of democracy and the rule of law” (CoE, 2010, pp. 5-6).

In general, policy documents of the European Union use the term European citizenship to specify legal rights of citizens from any EU member state, while the Council of Europe took the term “democratic citizenship” as its starting point.
Compared to the concept of citizenship adopted by EU, the CoE’s term of
democratic citizenship “is based on a much broader understanding of the field of
political and social inclusion which extends beyond the legal and legislative” arena
(Breidbach, 2003, p. 9). Although none of the policy documents from the European
Union or the Council of Europe currently gives a specific definition of citizenship,
we observe a policy convergence (Steinar-Khamsi, 2004) between the two
European institutions concerning young citizens from the 1990s as shown in the
youth policy documents analysis in the next section.

THE YOUNG CITIZENS IN EUROPEAN POLICIES

Youth became a policy topic at the European level at first as a “problem” in 1960
when the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly adopted Resolution 20 on
social problems of youth and children, on stateless children, child welfare, juvenile
delinquency and moral safeguards in press and media concerning youth and
children. This resulted in the CoE Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation
592(1970) which encouraged increasing co-ordination between the various
international organizations dealing with youth problems and to support the role of
education. In 1972, the CoE established the European Youth Foundation with the
mission to support European youth activities in the promotion of “peace,
understanding and co-operation between the people of Europe and of the work, in a
spirit of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms” (Statute of the
European Youth Foundation, Article 1).

The first youth policy of the European Union was in the education sector when
the EU adopted the Resolution of the Council and of the Ministers of Education,
which was the result of a meeting within the Council held 13 December 1976
concerning measures to be taken to improve the preparation of young people for
work and to facilitate the transition from education to working life. Following the
legislative process of free movement of people in the Union, in 1979 when the EU
adopted the Council Decision 79/642/EEC for encouraging the exchange of young
and in 1989 (89/663/EEC) concerning the mobility of university students (i.e.
establishment of Erasmus program) paved the way to achieve the rights of free
movement for students in the Union in 1993 (93/96/EEC).

Youth Citizenship as Active Participation

As noted earlier, youth as citizens became a specific policy concern at the
European level since 1985 when the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly
adopted Recommendation 1019 on the participation of young people in political
and institutional life, which became the European Charter on the Participation of
emphasizes that young people are citizens in local communities where they live
and they have “the right, the means, the space and the opportunity and where
necessary the support to participate in and influence decisions and engage in
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actions and activities so as to contribute to building a better society” (p. 10). The revised Charter cautions that unemployed youth and youth residing in remote geographic areas are most at risk of being excluded in participation. Whereas the European Union defines active citizenship as “participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy” (Hoskins et al., 2012, p. 17).

Interestingly, both European institutions emphasize participation in their definitions of youth citizenship, but with different starting points. The CoE definition starts with the rights, opportunities and support of young citizens to participate in their local community, while the EU definition gives with a defined frame (or arena) and rules of participation.

Eventually, with common objectives to co-operate in the development of knowledge and evidence-based youth policy focusing on social inclusion, democratic citizenship and participation, the two European institutions went into policy cooperation on youth issues in the form of EU-CoE Youth Partnership in 1998. These objectives reflect the background of youth policy concerns at the European level which from then on many European youth are perceived to be at the margins (or a marginalized group) in terms of: 1) accessing and exercising their rights and duties as citizens, 2) participating in democracy, and 3) social inclusion or exclusion.

Youth Citizenship as Learning to Actively Participate

In the current European youth policymaking arena, at the institutional level, the Youth Department of CoE is part of the Directorate of Democratic Citizenship and Participation, while Youth is included in the EU program for education, training, youth and sports (Erasmus+). On the one side, the CoE has engaged in the development of education for democratic citizens through wide-ranging consultations and a number of policies (i.e. Rec (2000)24, Rec(2002)12, Rec(2003)8, and Recommendation 1682(2004)) from 1999 to 2010 which resulted in the Charter on education for democratic citizenship and human rights education. The Charter provides “an important reference point for all those dealing with citizenship and human rights education” (Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)7, p. 3) in 47 CoE member states and their youth organizations.

On the other side, as part of the efforts to enhance European citizenship through informal learning, the European Union has adopted a series of youth programs which involved over 2.5 million European young people as participants in hundreds of thousands projects from the previous 27 Member States of the EU and other countries such as Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey. The programs, i.e. “Youth for Europe” Phase I 1988-1991 (Council Decision 88/348/EEC), Phase II 1991-1994 (Council Decision 91/395/EEC) and Phase III 1995-1999 (Council Decision 818/95/EC), the “European Voluntary Service for Young People” 1998-1999 (Decision 1686/98/EC), “Youth Community Action Program”, 2000-2006 (Decision 1031/2000/CE) focused on active/responsible/European citizenship and cultural/intercultural learning. Subsequently, the “Youth
in Action Programme” 2007-2013 (Decision 1719/2006/EC) had its number one objective “to promote young people’s active citizenship in general and their European citizenship in particular” (Article 2, 1: a) through lifelong learning and intercultural learning. Eventually, active citizenship became a key objective of the EU lifelong learning program from 2006 (Decision 1720/2006/EC) and the Union program for education, training, youth and sports (Erasmus+) from 2014 to 2020.

So far, the completed programs are documented to be successful in several areas of improving learning of young people in, e.g. youth citizenship (European Commission, 2013a), youth volunteering (European Commission, 2012b), and youth entrepreneurship (European Commission, 2013b).


However, at the time of Europe sliding deep into an economic recession, the two European institutions take rather different approaches on their youth policy. As the guardian organization of Human Rights in Europe, the Council of Europe adopted a recommendation on young people’s fundamental rights in 2013. Whereas, in the European Union other youth-related policy documents concerning youth unemployment with regard to the current economic crisis (e.g. EU Communication COM(2013)447final) do not include any mention of citizenship nor mentions specifically young people as citizens. This appears to be an inevitable result of different principles in the foundations of the two institutions, i.e. CoE’s human rights principle verses EU’s free market principle.

EUROPEAN YOUTH CITIZENSHIP: EVERYTHING BUT RIGHTS

In contemporary Europe, challenged by the process of globalization and transnational migration partially facilitated by the building process of the European Union, the concept of citizenship goes beyond a legal status, beyond the link between the citizen and the state, and beyond the right to work, live, and participate in political life within the territory of a nation state. In the past two decades, we have witnessed a series of policies on young citizens produced by the two European institutions with a specific focus on exercising their duties as citizens, but not on accessing their rights as citizens. Two keywords appear in all young citizen related policy documents: participation and learning, containing only one
message: young citizens have the right to participate in society, but before that they have to learn to participate. However, we have to be reminded of whose interests European youth policy really represents at a time of economic crisis when interests are in conflict between social groups. As some policy researchers have so correctly pointed out policy “only represents the values of the interest group that possesses the authority in policy making, although it often presents itself as universal, generalized and even commonsensical” (Yang, 2007, p. 250). European young people, according to the statistical facts presented previously in this chapter, are at the margins of the society where they are usually excluded from the positions of authority in policies of education, economy, labor market, social justice and political aspects (see also Pihl this volume). As a result, in European youth policies young people are frequently either perceived as being at-risk or more often than not seen as a problem to be fixed or prevented.

Meanwhile, the concept of citizenship has apparently ambiguous meanings when it comes to policies specifically targeting young people in Europe. On the one hand, as an organization working on the principle of democracy and human rights, the concept of citizenship in youth policies of the Council of Europe is all about fundamental rights and participation without legal status nor legal rights. As a union of states based on economic cooperation for a “single market”, the legal status and the legal rights associated with European citizenship are undermined by the market of which most young people are at positions in the margins (e.g. out or between labor market, low economic status or poverty). Therefore, we observe that the EU policies on young citizens are “dancing” around at margins of citizenship: young citizens have the right to participate in our democratic society and they are provided with means (schools, youth organization, and volunteering services) to learn to participate in schools. When young people are unemployed or in poverty, they are dealt with as a problem which has nothing to do with citizenship.

Nevertheless, this policy document analysis with a critical hermeneutic approach has resulted in a tentative definition of citizenship from understanding the concepts and issues discussed in European youth policy documents, by expanding the definition by Abowitz and Harnish (2006):

Citizenship in a democratic society (a) gives membership status to individuals within a community with political, social and civic entities; (b) confers an identity on individuals; (c) constitutes a set of values, usually interpreted as a commitment to the common good of a particular community; (d) involves practicing a degree of participation in the process of civic, social and political life; and (e) implies gaining and using knowledge and understanding of laws, documents, structures, and processes of governance.

This definition describes clearly the elements and duties of becoming a citizen, which is applicable specifically to people who are actually at the margins of a formal citizenship (or non-citizens): young people before they reach the age of 18 in their home country or community and adults (i.e. people above the age of 18) who move to a new country or a new community. This definition helps our
understanding of the real meaning of youth citizenship in the European policies, i.e. a citizenship at the margins of a formal citizenship and a citizenship with everything but rights. Ultimately, we ned to remember that citizenship is not only about understanding what it is or might be, more than an “integration agenda”. Instead it is about overcoming structural barriers to equality and justice for all members of society including youth, not only in Europe but also globally.

NOTES
1 http://www.coe.int
2 http://europa.eu/eu-law/index_en.htm
3 http://ppp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership
4 http://ppp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership
5 EU28 refers to the European Union (EU) 28 member states, which are party to the founding treaties of the union and thereby subject to the privileges and obligations of membership. Unlike the members of international organizations, the constituent states of the EU are placed under binding laws in exchange for representation within the common legislative and judicial institutions. They do however retain considerable autonomy, and must be unanimous for the union to adopt policies concerning defense and foreign affairs.
6 http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/dates/index_en.htm
7 http://ppp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership
8 http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/youth/
9 http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/index_en.htm
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APPENDIX

Table A. Youth related policy documents in Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>CoE Parliamentary Assembly: Resolution 20 on the Social Problems of Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Resolution (72) 17 on a European Youth Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>EU Resolution of the Council and of the Ministers of Education, meeting within the Council, of 13 December 1976 concerning measures to be taken to improve the preparation of young people for work and to facilitate the transition from education to working life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>EU Council Decision 79/642/EEC on establishing a second joint program to encourage the exchange of young workers within the Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>CoE Parliamentary Assembly: Recommendation 1019 on the participation of young people in political and institutional life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>CoE Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe: European Charter on the Participation of Young People in Local and Regional Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>CoE Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe: Resolution 243 (1993) on Citizenship and extreme poverty: the Charleroi Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>CoE Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe: Resolution 41 (1996) on Health and Citizenship: Care for the Poorest in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Decisions CM/DEL/DEC(99)668, Declaration and program on education for democratic citizenship based on the rights and responsibilities of citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Recommendation Rec (2000)24 on the development of European studies for democratic citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe: Resolution 91 (2000) Responsible citizenship and participation in public life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Resolution ResAP(2001)3 Towards full citizenship of persons with disabilities through inclusive new technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>EU Council Resolution 2002/C 168/02 regarding the framework of European cooperation in the youth field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Recommendation Rec(2002)12 on education for democratic citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Recommendation Rec(2003)8 on the promotion and recognition of non-formal education/learning of young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Council Resolution 2003/C 295/02 on making school an open learning environment to prevent and combat early school leaving and disaffection among young people and to encourage their social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Council Resolution 2003/C 295/04 on common objectives for participation by and information for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>EU Parliament and the Council: Decision 790/2004/EC on establishing a Community action program to promote bodies active at European level in field of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CoE Parliamentary Assembly: Recommendation 1682(2004) calling for a European framework convention on education for democratic citizenship and human rights education to be drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>CoE European Year of Citizenship through Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Document/Recommendation/Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>EU Communication COM(2005)206final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Parliament and the Council: Decision 1719/2006/EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Communication COM(2006)417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Parliament and the Council: Recommendation 2006/962/EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>EU Communication COM(2007)498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>EU Council Resolution 22 May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Communication COM(2009)200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>EU Council Resolution 8064/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CoE Committee of Ministers: Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>CoE Parliament Assembly: Recommendation 2015(2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EU Communication COM(2013)447 final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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