

Youth related claims in the public sphere: cross-national and spatial perspectives

Maria Paschou, Maria Kousis, Manlio Cinalli and Didier Chabanet

Draft

Abstract

Youth policies in EU countries have been variously affected by the economic crisis during the last decade. Young people view themselves in worsening conditions in welfare provisions, education and employment prospects and their mobilization towards social and political change is rising. Against this backdrop, they, together with other collective actors, appear in the mediated public sphere to make political claims on the issues which concern them. This study focuses on the spatial scope of these various claimants based on new data produced under political claims analysis in the nine countries of the EURYKA project. Drawing on the literature on “youth politics” as well as on the different “youth regimes” met across Europe, it is aimed to understand the extend to which youth issues are negotiated in the public domain through local contexts. This is achieved through cross-nationall comparison, first, of the public claims made by youth actors with those made by non-youth actors and, second, of the scope of the actors across the different issues related to the youth.

Keywords: political claims analysis, youth and space, young, welfare regimes, youth regimes, European

Introduction

Youth policies in EU countries have been largely and variously affected by the economic crisis during the last decade. According to the OECD, youth has been hit by the crisis harder than any other group, which is mirrored in rising unemployment rates among the youth as well as in increase of the youth population living in poverty (Carcillo et al. 2015:8). While improving employment and social integration among youth becomes a main policy concern, cuts in social spending is restricting the capacity for effective responses (ibid). Although Southern Europe has been most dramatically affected by the crisis, other European countries and their respective welfare policies have also been affected. NEET rates rose during the crisis considerably in SE countries: above +10 percentage points in Greece and Spain, +5 percentage points in Italy (Carcillo et al. 2015:10). While NEET status is strongly related to low educational attainment, since the beginning of the crisis, the share of highly-educated youth among NEETs has, risen in nearly all countries and substantially: over +7 percentage points in Greece and over +6 percentage points in the United Kingdom.

Does space matter when it comes to public discourse on socio-economic, welfare, educational and other youth related issues? How is it linked to national contexts and youth claims in the public sphere? Research remains limited on how these are reflected in different European public spheres by national and subnational actors. Subnational spaces of claims making for youth are even more important under the current crisis of national states, as they are more suitable spaces of representation. Nevertheless, this is not a ubiquitous trend given the different way that actors are empowered across national contexts.

This paper first aims to map the differences in the way that the public domain is structured across the national and subnational dimension in nine European countries for the 2010-2016 period, following the 2008 global financial crisis. Secondly we examine the extent to which the spatial scope of claimants is related to the type of issues (e.g. welfare state, education, socio-economic) raised in within national contexts. We will do so using a dataset of 4281 claims, whose actors have either national or subnational scope – out of the total set of 4545 claims - of the EURYKA project.

Theoretical framework

Space, Youth political engagement and media

The recent literature on youth political participation recognizes a “pan-European paradox”: while young people are disengaged from institutional politics, they have idealistic notions about democratic participation and want to be involved in politics (Cammaerts et al. 2015: 8). Thus, most political participation and civic engagement of young people

takes place through unconventional routes and “*at a distance from mainstream media and the political establishment*” (Mejias and Banaji, 2018: 3).

The literature suggests that young people prefer “issue by issue”, “cause-oriented” and “do-it-yourself” ways of engaging in politics (Baczewska: 290; 3). Young people bring politics in their everyday life or else “the personal is political” (Flesher Fominaya 2012: 6).

Spatial proximity thus can be seen to emerge as a critical trait that invigorates youth involvement in the social and political life. Evidence provided by a qualitative study of young activists demonstrates the tendency of young people to negotiate politics “through everyday, localized and relational networks” (Baczewska et al, 2018: 298). Banaji and Cammaerts (2015) empirical findings provide evidence for the fact that youth political engagement takes place predominantly in subnational – regional or regional- spaces: Young people “*engage with the world around them, specifically in relation to their local communities, leisure spaces (or lack thereof), schools, employment and housing prospects, and entry into adult life. This interest and indeed engagement is a feature common across nation, gender, ethnicity and class*” in their qualitative investigation based on focus groups (128... Thus it is expected that the scope of young actors is predominantly subnational.

A recent analysis of UK media demonstrates that young people in the UK are represented in media and policy as vulnerable to radicalisation, exclusion or criminality; thus, they are stigmatised by the national mainstream media, and in particular by the tabloid press (Mejias and Banaji, 2018).

From an audience perspective, the UK exhibits the highest scores of youth disconnection from the mainstream media as a source to follow politics compared to other European countries (LSE Enterprise, 2013: 114) and this explains why young actors are underrepresented in the British press in our sample. Greece, on the contrary, is a country where young people report to follow politics through the media at a higher frequency (LSE, *ibid*) and this can be seen again in relation to our finding that the Greek youth exhibits a considerably high share of public claims compared to youth claimants in other countries.

Welfare regimes, Youth Policies and the crisis

In an effort to classify youth policies across European countries following the rationale of welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990), Wallace and Bendit (2009) distinguish four types of youth policy regimes, which are based on different orientations of youth (e.g. age definition) and philosophies of interventions (e.g. treating young generation as a problem, or as resource for society).

- *Universalistic Regime*, which emphasizes youth independence and autonomy and targets all young people. This regime accords with the family model and welfare state of the **Nordic countries**, where young people are encouraged to leave early their family homes and they are state subsidised. These policies are newer compared to

the youth policies in Continental Europe, they are based upon a narrow definition of youth (ie early teens to 25 years) and view the young generation as a resource rather than a problem for society.

- *Community Based Regimes* which correspond to the **liberal/minimal welfare** state regimes as defined by Esping-Andersen and which delegate main responsibilities to civil society and local authorities. These policies are also based in a narrow age definition of youth but are directed to youth who are seen as a problem (eg young offenders, ethnic minorities, homeless youth) rather than to the whole generation of youth as it is in the Universalistic Regimes.

Example is the **UK**, where youth policies are discussed in the context of social exclusion at a national level.

- *Protective Regimes* which correspond to the **corporatist – employment based model** of the welfare state and are based in long traditions of state youth policies and institutions, with main examples being **France and Germany**. These policies are based on a wide definition of youth in terms of age and target groups - including for example also children and young families. They are both centralized and decentralized and their aims are also very broad, including both to empower and to deal with the problems of youth. Their emphasis on protection however leads to a rather paternalistic outlook towards the youth.

- *Centralised Regimes* which characterize the **South European countries** (Greece, Spain and Italy) and correspond to the Latin Rim welfare, where the family has been held traditionally responsible for young people and where youth policy initiatives have been most recently developed largely as a response to EU directives. These policies are mainly centralized and involve a mixture of resource and problem orientation towards the youth, dealing both with particular problems in these countries such as unemployment as well as the promotion of associative life of young people.

This typology seems almost identical with Walther's (2006) classification of European youth transition regimes: the *universalistic* regime, consisting of the Scandinavian countries; the *liberal* transition regime which characterizes the Anglo-Saxon countries; the *employment-centered* transition regime met in Continental Europe and the *sub-protective* transition regime of Mediterranean countries. More recent work also include the **post-socialist/transition cluster** (Hatzivasiliou et al 2016).

Vogel's (2002) study advocates for a three cluster solution: the Nordic cluster, the Southern cluster and the Central European cluster. Thévenon (2015) also discusses a three cluster solution, based on the socio-economic structures, cultural arrangements and institutional patterns: *the liberal context*, which prioritizes becoming a financially responsible adult and thus pays particular attention to develop policies which foster preparedness for early and successful entrance to the job market, example of which is the UK; *the socio-democrat context*, which prioritizes becoming an independent citizen and develops policies aiming to help individuals reconcile different roles – as student, young professional or parent and corresponds to Nordic countries; *the conservative context*, whereby the family is responsible for preparing young people for the transition to adult life, where state intervention mainly targets education and which includes both Central and South European Countries.

Based on an analysis of a diverse set of indicators on three policy fields - education, labour market and welfare provisions, Thévenon (ibid) underlines the heterogeneity observed within each of these ideal-types and some country-based particularities: France is somewhat similar to the Nordic countries, with the social aid system covering a larger fraction of the young adult population than in most other systems in Continental Europe; UK policies are characterized by the fact that social aid largely targets vulnerable people; Germany stands out from the rest of Continental Europe for its high spending on education and particularly on tertiary education, while Greece, Spain and Italy stand out for their lower spending on education and un-protective welfare states.

More recent works however point out that the different welfare regimes have witnessed welfare state retrenchment (Petmezidou 2014, 2017). The financial crisis of the nineties has even affected the Nordic countries, with austerity policies leading to more marketization and individualized services (Strake et al 2014,). Furthermore, in both universalistic social-democratic regime and corporatist welfare regime countries welfare benefits are much related to prior earnings, i.e. former employment experience (Norman et al. 2016), and therefore the groups which have not got do not have access to the labour market –, i.e. migrants, young people, single parents, people with disabilities, drug addicts, - have become particularly vulnerable (Uba and Kousis 2018). In the UK liberal regime the recent austerity policies have made the regulations even stricter, leading to an expanding set of beneficiaries (Norman et al. 2016, Uba and Kousis 2018). The impacts of the 2008 global crisis and subsequent austerity policies led to further weakening of the any existing welfare policies in the South European welfare regimes (Greece, Italy, Spain), which are mainly based on family networks (Esping-Andersen & Myles, 2009; Petmezidou 2017). Although these countries have similar welfare regimes, the severe impact of crisis related austerity policies in Greece have more pervasive affects on its youth, compared to those in Italy or Spain (Petmezidou 2017, Uba and Kousis 2018). When it comes to the post-socialist welfare regime (Poland) relates to high employment flexibility due to the regime change in the 1990s and, is much similar to the corporatist system.

The above classification of regimes appear, like their predecessors (Castel, 1995; Rosanvallon, 1995) to follow Esping-Andersen (1990), who classified the welfare state not only based on the amount of social provisions, but also on how they are delivered (Cinalli and Giugni 2013). Given their focus on the welfare state or social policy they are only of limited help for studying cross-national differences in state intervention and policy-making relating especially to the wide repertoire of youth-related issues, especially concerning socio-economic, education and welfare issues. Furthermore, according to current research (Hadjivassiliou 2017) there is a need to update and further refine youth transition regimes typology since these regimes are in a state of flux, particularly due to the Great Recession of 2008, in the liberal (UK) and the subprotective regimes, with effects visible even in the universalistic ones, although more time is required to assess their impacts.

The sections to follow present the method and analysis of fresh youth-related political claims data covering the 2010-16 period. Our aim is to investigate the spatial dimension of these claims across nine national public domains presenting different youth regimes.

Method

Our cross-national data derive from political claims analysis applied by nine national teams in the context of Work Package 2 of the EURYKA project. The method allows for the study of all actors making claims in the public sphere, including state or social movements actors, through the use of newspapers.

Aiming at a representative and unbiased sample, five daily newspapers (and when necessary, tabloids) were used for each country. They were of as high circulation as possible and of different political orientations, and covered the period starting on 1 January 2010 and ending on 31 December 2016. The articles were sampled from all sections of the selected newspapers, excluding the editorials and sports sections, through key words searches using any word derivative of the words <young> or <student> or <teenage> in the home language.

The nine national random samples consist of 500 claims in each country and thus allow us to focus not only on atypical events (usually most visible in the media), but also to include the everyday debate about youth and related issues. At the same time, our period of study, 2010-16, allowed us to assess diachronic changes in terms of public reactions to these issues. The articles were sampled from all sections of the selected newspapers, excluding the editorials and sports sections, through key words searches. All articles containing any word derivative of the words <young> or <student> or <teenage> were selected in the home language.

For the purposes of this paper out of the 4.545 claims, we investigate the great majority, which contains those actors with national and subnational scope, by country, in terms of: youth and nonyouth related claims, the year of claim, the type of actor making the claim, and the type of issue.

Hypotheses of the paper

H1

Actor scope is the most crucial variable of the geographical scope in which public debates originate and take place. It is hypothesized that cross-national variance in the scope of the actor, reflects differences in the scope of institutional configurations and the structure of the welfare state regimes. Thus, countries that are traditionally strong in centralization and top-down governance, such as France and the UK are expected to score highest in the public visibility of actors with national scope. On the contrary, nations which are traditionally stronger in terms of subsidiarity, such as Germany, or decentralization, such as Switzerland and Italy, are expected to exhibit stronger presence of actors who act at the subnational level.

H2

The literature on youth politics shows that young people are engaged in the social and political life through their everyday experience and localized circumstances. Despite abstaining from institutional politics, young people raise their voice in their proximal local context. Based on this, a prevalence of young actors with a subnational scope can be hypothesized.

H3

Given the assumed predominant local scope of the youth, it could be hypothesized that education-related actors are highly likely to follow youth trend of enhanced sub-national forces due to their proximity to the youth in terms of everyday experience and interest representation.

H4

Nationalisation takes place consistently across the major policy fields of national state such as the labour market and socio-educational policies. By contrast, sub-nationalisation is especially possible through the opening of discussion in the public space on a larger variety of issues that are closer to youth interests and sensitiveness (more typical of youthness such as "creativity and culture" but also including challenges on traditional issue fields such as "law and order").

Findings

The tables that follow aim to illustrate the profile of actors who appear in the public sphere of European countries to raise claims on youth, by focusing on their national or subnational scope, which is introduced here as a criterion for the cross-national comparison. More specifically, we examine the spatial dimension of the issues involved in their claims and discuss how these are related to respective policy fields.

Cross-national variance in actor scope

Table 1: Youth related Claims by All Actors in nine European countries: Subnational(red) and National(blue) scopes

country of coding * actscoper Crosstabulation

country of coding		actscoper	Total	
			National	'Subnational (regional/local)'
France	Count	304	162	466
	% within actscoper	13,30%	8,10%	10,90%
	% of Total	7,10%	3,80%	10,90%
	Germany	Count	204	282

	% within actscoper	8,90%	14,10%	11,40%
	% of Total	4,80%	6,60%	11,40%
Greece	Count	250	227	477
	% within actscoper	10,90%	11,40%	11,10%
	% of Total	5,80%	5,30%	11,10%
Italy	Count	163	310	473
	% within actscoper	7,10%	15,50%	11,00%
	% of Total	3,80%	7,20%	11,00%
Poland	Count	344	116	460
	% within actscoper	15,10%	5,80%	10,70%
	% of Total	8,00%	2,70%	10,70%
Spain	Count	213	271	484
	% within actscoper	9,30%	13,60%	11,30%
	% of Total	5,00%	6,30%	11,30%
Sweden	Count	250	238	488
	% within actscoper	10,90%	11,90%	11,40%
	% of Total	5,80%	5,60%	11,40%
Switzerland	Count	180	309	489
	% within actscoper	7,90%	15,50%	11,40%
	% of Total	4,20%	7,20%	11,40%
UK	Count	377	81	458
	% within actscoper	16,50%	4,10%	10,70%
	% of Total	8,80%	1,90%	10,70%
Total	Count	2285	1996	4281
	% within actscoper	100,00%	100,00%	100,00%
	% of Total	53,40%	46,60%	100,00%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	
Pearson Chi-Square	430,622a	8	,000	
Likelihood Ratio	451,959	8	,000	
Linear-by-Linear Association	9,917	1	,002	
N of Valid Cases	4281			

a 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 213,54.

The cross-national comparison of the scope of actors highlights the following (Table 1): There is a first group of countries, which includes France, Poland and the UK, where the public domain is strongly nationalized. A second

group of countries includes Germany, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland, where the public domain is strongly sub-nationalised. There is, finally, a third small group of "even countries" which includes Greece and Sweden and where centralisation and decentralisation are balanced.

Are young people more likely to raise their voice at the subnational level?

In what follows we compared the patterns in the national vs. subnational scope of claimants between youth actors (also incl. youth-related actors) and non-youth actors and across countries (Table 2).

The aforementioned country-grouping is repeated: Polish, French and British actors acting at the national level dominate their public domains irrespective of being young or not, whereas Italian, Swiss and Spanish actors who represent the subnational level are prevalent in their countries. Most importantly, the findings confirm our hypothesis that the rate of actors with a subnational scope is higher for young claimants compared to non-young claimants, which is noticed in all participating countries –except for Germany. Thus, a stronger presence of youth actors goes together with a stronger impetus for sub-nationalisation. This is particularly evident in the third group of "even countries" (Greece and Sweden) whereby the balance is reached by the equal sub-national force of youth actors on the one hand, and national force of non-youth actors on the other hand.

Table 2: Youth vs. non-youth actors by actor scope and country

actorY_nY * actscoper * country of coding Crosstabulation

country of coding				actscooper			
				National	'Subnational (regional/local)'	Total	
France	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	293	131	424	
			% within actscooper	96,4%	80,9%	91,0%	
	Youth actors	Count	11	31	42		
		% within actscooper	3,6%	19,1%	9,0%		
	Total	Count	304	162	466		
		% within actscooper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
				% of Total	65,2%	34,8%	100,0%
Germany	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	161	234	395	
			% within actscooper	78,9%	83,0%	81,3%	
	Youth actors	Count	43	48	91		
		% within actscooper	21,1%	17,0%	18,7%		
	Total	Count	204	282	486		
		% within actscooper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		
				% of Total	42,0%	58,0%	100,0%
Greece	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	228	182	410	
			% within actscooper	91,2%	80,2%	86,0%	
	Youth actors	Count	22	45	67		
		% within actscooper	8,8%	19,8%	14,0%		
	Total	Count	250	227	477		
		% within actscooper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%		

			% of Total	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%
Italy	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	159	265	424
			% within actscoper	97,5%	85,5%	89,6%
	Youth actors	Count	4	45	49	
		% within actscoper	2,5%	14,5%	10,4%	
	Total	Count	163	310	473	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		34,5%	65,5%	100,0%		
Poland	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	314	90	404
			% within actscoper	91,3%	77,6%	87,8%
	Youth actors	Count	30	26	56	
		% within actscoper	8,7%	22,4%	12,2%	
	Total	Count	344	116	460	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		74,8%	25,2%	100,0%		
Spain	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	187	219	406
			% within actscoper	87,8%	80,8%	83,9%
	Youth actors	Count	26	52	78	
		% within actscoper	12,2%	19,2%	16,1%	
	Total	Count	213	271	484	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		44,0%	56,0%	100,0%		
Sweden	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	246	203	449
			% within actscoper	98,4%	85,3%	92,0%
	Youth actors	Count	4	35	39	
		% within actscoper	1,6%	14,7%	8,0%	
	Total	Count	250	238	488	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		51,2%	48,8%	100,0%		
Switzerland	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	161	236	397
			% within actscoper	89,4%	76,4%	81,2%
	Youth actors	Count	19	73	92	
		% within actscoper	10,6%	23,6%	18,8%	
	Total	Count	180	309	489	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		36,8%	63,2%	100,0%		
UK	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	344	61	405
			% within actscoper	91,2%	75,3%	88,4%
	Youth actors	Count	33	20	53	
		% within actscoper	8,8%	24,7%	11,6%	
	Total	Count	377	81	458	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		82,3%	17,7%	100,0%		
Total	actorY_nY	Non youth actors	Count	2093	1621	3714
			% within actscoper	91,6%	81,2%	86,8%
	Youth actors	Count	192	375	567	
		% within actscoper	8,4%	18,8%	13,2%	
	Total	Count	2285	1996	4281	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
% of Total		53,4%	46,6%	100,0%		

Which types of actors are more likely to follow youth-related issues?

An examination of actor types across the national vs subnational dimension (Table 3) shows that education related actors and other actors together with youth actors are much more likely to have subnational scope, while all other actors who are making claims on youth in the public sphere most frequently have national scope.

Table 3: Actor types by actor scope

ACTOR_CAT * actscoper Crosstabulation

		actscoper		Total	
		National	'Subnational (regional/local)'		
ACTOR_CAT	State actors and judiciary	Count	743	540	1283
		% within ACTOR_CAT	57,9%	42,1%	100,0%
		% of Total	17,4%	12,6%	30,0%
	Political parties/groups	Count	286	165	451
		% within ACTOR_CAT	63,4%	36,6%	100,0%
		% of Total	6,7%	3,9%	10,5%
	Professional organizations and groups	Count	296	94	390
		% within ACTOR_CAT	75,9%	24,1%	100,0%
		% of Total	6,9%	2,2%	9,1%
	Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	127	35	162
		% within ACTOR_CAT	78,4%	21,6%	100,0%
		% of Total	3,0%	0,8%	3,8%
	Education related actors	Count	192	375	567
		% within ACTOR_CAT	33,9%	66,1%	100,0%
		% of Total	4,5%	8,8%	13,2%
	Youth Actors	Count	339	525	864
		% within ACTOR_CAT	39,2%	60,8%	100,0%
		% of Total	7,9%	12,3%	20,2%
	Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	276	217	493
		% within ACTOR_CAT	56,0%	44,0%	100,0%
		% of Total	6,4%	5,1%	11,5%
	Other Actors	Count	26	45	71
		% within ACTOR_CAT	36,6%	63,4%	100,0%
		% of Total	0,6%	1,1%	1,7%
Total	Count	2285	1996	4281	
	% within ACTOR_CAT	53,4%	46,6%	100,0%	
	% of Total	53,4%	46,6%	100,0%	

Table 4 below provides a more detailed account on the scope of the different actor types in each national context. It shows once again that youth actors as well as education-related actors act mainly at the subnational rather than the

national level. Exceptions to this rule is Germany with the superiority of the national scope in education-related actors, while Switzerland shows similar frequencies for national and subnational scope. The scope of state actors, who generally have the strongest presence in the mediated public debates, seem to mirror the above mentioned groupings, with the exception of Switzerland, with close in frequency national and subnational scopes for youth actors.

Table 4: Actor types by actor scope and by country

ACTOR_CAT * actscoper * country of coding Crosstabulation

country of coding			actscoper		Total	
			National	'Subnational (regional/local)'		
France	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	90	33	123
			% within actscoper	29,6%	20,4%	26,4%
		Political parties/groups	Count	33	5	38
			% within actscoper	10,9%	3,1%	8,2%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	26	11	37
			% within actscoper	8,6%	6,8%	7,9%
			% of Total	5,6%	2,4%	7,9%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	17	2	19
			% within actscoper	5,6%	1,2%	4,1%
		Education related actors	Count	11	31	42
			% within actscoper	3,6%	19,1%	9,0%
		Youth Actors	Count	96	62	158
			% within actscoper	31,6%	38,3%	33,9%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	27	14	41
			% within actscoper	8,9%	8,6%	8,8%
		Other Actors	Count	4	4	8
			% within actscoper	1,3%	2,5%	1,7%
	Total		Count	304	162	466
% within actscoper			100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
Germany	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	37	71	108
			% within actscoper	18,1%	25,2%	22,2%
		Political parties/groups	Count	17	48	65
			% within actscoper	8,3%	17,0%	13,4%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	27	3	30
			% within actscoper	13,2%	1,1%	6,2%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	19	4	23
			% within actscoper	9,3%	1,4%	4,7%
		Education related actors	Count	43	48	91
			% within actscoper	21,1%	17,0%	18,7%
		Youth Actors	Count	26	75	101
			% within actscoper			

			% within actscoper	12,7%	26,6%	20,8%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	28	26	54
			% within actscoper	13,7%	9,2%	11,1%
		Other Actors	Count	7	7	14
			% within actscoper	3,4%	2,5%	2,9%
	Total		Count	204	282	486
			% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Greece	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	131	47	178
	_CAT		% within actscoper	52,4%	20,7%	37,3%
		Political parties/groups	Count	22	0	22
			% within actscoper	8,8%	0,0%	4,6%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	10	7	17
			% within actscoper	4,0%	3,1%	3,6%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	21	11	32
			% within actscoper	8,4%	4,8%	6,7%
		Education related actors	Count	22	45	67
			% within actscoper	8,8%	19,8%	14,0%
		Youth Actors	Count	29	101	130
			% within actscoper	11,6%	44,5%	27,3%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	14	15	29
			% within actscoper	5,6%	6,6%	6,1%
		Other Actors	Count	1	1	2
			% within actscoper	0,4%	0,4%	0,4%
	Total		Count	250	227	477
			% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Italy	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	50	86	136
	_CAT		% within actscoper	30,7%	27,7%	28,8%
		Political parties/groups	Count	25	16	41
			% within actscoper	15,3%	5,2%	8,7%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	17	8	25
			% within actscoper	10,4%	2,6%	5,3%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	10	3	13
			% within actscoper	6,1%	1,0%	2,7%
		Education related actors	Count	4	45	49
			% within actscoper	2,5%	14,5%	10,4%
		Youth Actors	Count	35	93	128
			% within actscoper	21,5%	30,0%	27,1%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	21	52	73
			% within actscoper	12,9%	16,8%	15,4%
		Other Actors	Count	1	7	8
			% within actscoper	0,6%	2,3%	1,7%
	Total		Count	163	310	473
			% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Poland	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	104	29	133
			% within actscoper	30,2%	25,0%	28,9%
		Political parties/groups	Count	46	8	54
			% within actscoper	13,4%	6,9%	11,7%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	62	4	66
			% within actscoper	18,0%	3,4%	14,3%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	16	3	19
			% within actscoper	4,7%	2,6%	4,1%
		Education related actors	Count	30	26	56
			% within actscoper	8,7%	22,4%	12,2%
		Youth Actors	Count	46	25	71
			% within actscoper	13,4%	21,6%	15,4%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	37	20	57
			% within actscoper	10,8%	17,2%	12,4%
	Other Actors	Count	3	1	4	
		% within actscoper	0,9%	0,9%	0,9%	
Total		Count	344	116	460	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
Spain	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	54	97	151
			% within actscoper	25,4%	35,8%	31,2%
		Political parties/groups	Count	31	30	61
			% within actscoper	14,6%	11,1%	12,6%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	21	8	29
			% within actscoper	9,9%	3,0%	6,0%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	10	5	15
			% within actscoper	4,7%	1,8%	3,1%
		Education related actors	Count	26	52	78
			% within actscoper	12,2%	19,2%	16,1%
		Youth Actors	Count	37	57	94
			% within actscoper	17,4%	21,0%	19,4%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	30	14	44
			% within actscoper	14,1%	5,2%	9,1%
	Other Actors	Count	4	8	12	
		% within actscoper	1,9%	3,0%	2,5%	
Total		Count	213	271	484	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
Sweden	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	79	81	160
			% within actscoper	31,6%	34,0%	32,8%
		Political parties/groups	Count	54	18	72
			% within actscoper	21,6%	7,6%	14,8%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	41	24	65
			% within actscoper	16,4%	10,1%	13,3%
	Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	17	2	19	

		% within actscoper	6,8%	0,8%	3,9%	
	Education related actors	Count	4	35	39	
		% within actscoper	1,6%	14,7%	8,0%	
	Youth Actors	Count	26	44	70	
		% within actscoper	10,4%	18,5%	14,3%	
	Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	29	29	58	
		% within actscoper	11,6%	12,2%	11,9%	
	Other Actors	Count	0	5	5	
		% within actscoper	0,0%	2,1%	1,0%	
	Total	Count	250	238	488	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
Switzerl and	ACTOR _CAT	State actors and judiciary	Count	56	67	123
			% within actscoper	31,1%	21,7%	25,2%
		Political parties/groups	Count	29	36	65
			% within actscoper	16,1%	11,7%	13,3%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	21	27	48
			% within actscoper	11,7%	8,7%	9,8%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	8	4	12
			% within actscoper	4,4%	1,3%	2,5%
		Education related actors	Count	19	73	92
			% within actscoper	10,6%	23,6%	18,8%
		Youth Actors	Count	32	54	86
			% within actscoper	17,8%	17,5%	17,6%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	14	39	53
			% within actscoper	7,8%	12,6%	10,8%
		Other Actors	Count	1	9	10
			% within actscoper	0,6%	2,9%	2,0%
	Total	Count	180	309	489	
		% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	
UK	ACTOR _CAT	State actors and judiciary	Count	142	29	171
			% within actscoper	37,7%	35,8%	37,3%
		Political parties/groups	Count	29	4	33
			% within actscoper	7,7%	4,9%	7,2%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	71	2	73
			% within actscoper	18,8%	2,5%	15,9%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	9	1	10
			% within actscoper	2,4%	1,2%	2,2%
		Education related actors	Count	33	20	53
			% within actscoper	8,8%	24,7%	11,6%
		Youth Actors	Count	12	14	26
			% within actscoper	3,2%	17,3%	5,7%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	76	8	84
			% within actscoper	20,2%	9,9%	18,3%

		Other Actors	Count	5	3	8
			% within actscoper	1,3%	3,7%	1,7%
	Total		Count	377	81	458
			% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%
Total	ACTOR	State actors and judiciary	Count	743	540	1283
	_CAT		% within actscoper	32,5%	27,1%	30,0%
		Political parties/groups	Count	286	165	451
			% within actscoper	12,5%	8,3%	10,5%
		Professional organizations and groups	Count	296	94	390
			% within actscoper	13,0%	4,7%	9,1%
		Labor organizations and Economy related groups	Count	127	35	162
			% within actscoper	5,6%	1,8%	3,8%
		Education related actors	Count	192	375	567
			% within actscoper	8,4%	18,8%	13,2%
		Youth Actors	Count	339	525	864
			% within actscoper	14,8%	26,3%	20,2%
		Other civil society organizations and groups	Count	276	217	493
			% within actscoper	12,1%	10,9%	11,5%
		Other Actors	Count	26	45	71
			% within actscoper	1,1%	2,3%	1,7%
	Total		Count	2285	1996	4281
			% within actscoper	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Which types of issues are more likely to be voiced, by which actors, subnationally?

An examination of the issues discussed by actor scope (Table 5) demonstrates that political issues, socio-economic and employment issues, social welfare and Education, ICTs, are predominantly discussed by actors of a national scope. Cultural, religious and law and order issues are mainly discussed by actors of a subnational scope, while all other remaining issues which do nevertheless occupy the media less frequently do present marginal differences, exhibiting a balanced distribution across the national vs subnational scope of the actor.

Table 5: Types of issues by Actor scope

ISSUE_CAT * actscoper Crosstabulation

		actscoper		Total	
		National	'Subnational (regional/local)'		
ISSUE	Political Issues	Count	209	175	384
	_CAT	% within ISSUE_CAT	54,4%	45,6%	100,0%
	Education	Count	760	691	1451
		% within ISSUE_CAT	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%

Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	372	176	548
	% within ISSUE_CAT	67,9%	32,1%	100,0%
ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	52	21	73
	% within ISSUE_CAT	71,2%	28,8%	100,0%
Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	325	269	594
	% within ISSUE_CAT	54,7%	45,3%	100,0%
Creativity & culture	Count	88	192	280
	% within ISSUE_CAT	31,4%	68,6%	100,0%
Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	45	51	96
	% within ISSUE_CAT	46,9%	53,1%	100,0%
Extremism	Count	48	35	83
	% within ISSUE_CAT	57,8%	42,2%	100,0%
Violence and Abuse	Count	140	127	267
	% within ISSUE_CAT	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%
Law and Order, Crime	Count	117	146	263
	% within ISSUE_CAT	44,5%	55,5%	100,0%
Military Issues	Count	21	6	27
	% within ISSUE_CAT	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
Other Issues	Count	108	107	215
	% within ISSUE_CAT	50,2%	49,8%	100,0%
Total	Count	2285	1996	4281
	% within ISSUE_CAT	53,4%	46,6%	100,0%
	% of Total	53,4%	46,6%	100,0%

The cross-national comparison of the salience of various issues based on the scope of the claimant shows the following country specificities:

- In France, socio-economic and labour, welfare, as well as education issues are most important issues for claimants with national scope, while religious issues by actors of subnational scope.
- In Germany, education is overwhelmingly the important issue for both national and subnational actors.
- In Greece, education is also the main theme of youth debates more through a national scope, but subnational actors present an increased interest in political issues as well as in welfare compared to the national ones.
- Education is also the prevalent issue of claims made by subnational actors in Italy. Socio-economic issues comes second for national actors but subnational actors are concerned with a variety of other issues, such as politics, welfare, law and order and creativity and culture.
- In Poland, in education, political issues and all main issues claimants have national scope.
- Spanish socio-economic issues are more frequently made by actors with national scope, while education, politics and welfare by actors with subnational scope.
- In Sweden, the actors with national scope focus mainly on socio-economic issues, whereas the actors with subnational scope emphasize welfare. Sweden together with France are distinguished for their overall lowest score in the presence of education issues.

-In Switzerland, welfare issues are more national in scope, while education, politics, culture are more subnational.

- In the UK, in all main issues national scope of claimant is of higher frequency than the subnational.

Table 6: Types of issues by Actor scope and country

ISSUE_CAT * actscoper * country of coding Crosstabulation

country of coding			actscoper		Total	
			National	'Subnational (regional/local)'		
Franc e	ISSUE_CA T	Political Issues	Count	32	10	42
			% within ISSUE_CAT	76,2%	23,8%	100,0%
		Education	Count	66	33	99
			% within ISSUE_CAT	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	73	22	95
			% within ISSUE_CAT	76,8%	23,2%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	6	3	9
			% within ISSUE_CAT	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	36	15	51
			% within ISSUE_CAT	70,6%	29,4%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	2	3	5
			% within ISSUE_CAT	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	8	12	20
			% within ISSUE_CAT	40,0%	60,0%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	16	10	26
			% within ISSUE_CAT	61,5%	38,5%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	13	12	25
			% within ISSUE_CAT	52,0%	48,0%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	17	18	35
			% within ISSUE_CAT	48,6%	51,4%	100,0%
	Military Issues	Count	10	1	11	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	90,9%	9,1%	100,0%	
	Other Issues	Count	25	23	48	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	52,1%	47,9%	100,0%	
	Total	Count	304	162	466	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	65,2%	34,8%	100,0%	
Germ any	ISSUE_CA T	Political Issues	Count	17	21	38
			% within ISSUE_CAT	44,7%	55,3%	100,0%
		Education	Count	91	162	253
			% within ISSUE_CAT	36,0%	64,0%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	7	4	11
			% within ISSUE_CAT	63,6%	36,4%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	3	2	5
			% within ISSUE_CAT	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	32	42	74

		% within ISSUE_CAT	43,2%	56,8%	100,0%	
	Creativity & culture	Count	13	26	39	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%	
	Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	2	4	6	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%	
	Extremism	Count	10	5	15	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%	
	Violence and Abuse	Count	13	7	20	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	65,0%	35,0%	100,0%	
	Law and Order, Crime	Count	13	9	22	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	59,1%	40,9%	100,0%	
	Other Issues	Count	3	0	3	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
	Total	Count	204	282	486	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	42,0%	58,0%	100,0%	
Greec	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	23	38	61
e	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	37,7%	62,3%	100,0%
		Education	Count	136	93	229
			% within ISSUE_CAT	59,4%	40,6%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	30	22	52
			% within ISSUE_CAT	57,7%	42,3%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	9	4	13
			% within ISSUE_CAT	69,2%	30,8%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	16	29	45
			% within ISSUE_CAT	35,6%	64,4%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	10	23	33
			% within ISSUE_CAT	30,3%	69,7%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	9	1	10
			% within ISSUE_CAT	90,0%	10,0%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	5	0	5
			% within ISSUE_CAT	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	6	7	13
			% within ISSUE_CAT	46,2%	53,8%	100,0%
		Military Issues	Count	2	2	4
			% within ISSUE_CAT	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	4	8	12
			% within ISSUE_CAT	33,3%	66,7%	100,0%
	Total	Count	250	227	477	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%	
Italy	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	19	24	43
	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	44,2%	55,8%	100,0%
		Education	Count	57	111	168
			% within ISSUE_CAT	33,9%	66,1%	100,0%

		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	34	21	55
			% within ISSUE_CAT	61,8%	38,2%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	8	27	35
			% within ISSUE_CAT	22,9%	77,1%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	8	30	38
			% within ISSUE_CAT	21,1%	78,9%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	0	2	2
			% within ISSUE_CAT	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	0	5	5
			% within ISSUE_CAT	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	3	18	21
			% within ISSUE_CAT	14,3%	85,7%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	18	34	52
			% within ISSUE_CAT	34,6%	65,4%	100,0%
		Military Issues	Count	0	1	1
			% within ISSUE_CAT	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	16	37	53
			% within ISSUE_CAT	30,2%	69,8%	100,0%
Total			Count	163	310	473
			% within ISSUE_CAT	34,5%	65,5%	100,0%
Poland	ISSUE_CAT	Political Issues	Count	50	12	62
			% within ISSUE_CAT	80,6%	19,4%	100,0%
		Education	Count	130	39	169
			% within ISSUE_CAT	76,9%	23,1%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	45	7	52
			% within ISSUE_CAT	86,5%	13,5%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	8	2	10
			% within ISSUE_CAT	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	34	12	46
			% within ISSUE_CAT	73,9%	26,1%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	26	14	40
			% within ISSUE_CAT	65,0%	35,0%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	11	6	17
			% within ISSUE_CAT	64,7%	35,3%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	6	1	7
			% within ISSUE_CAT	85,7%	14,3%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	12	10	22
			% within ISSUE_CAT	54,5%	45,5%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	13	9	22
			% within ISSUE_CAT	59,1%	40,9%	100,0%
		Military Issues	Count	5	2	7
			% within ISSUE_CAT	71,4%	28,6%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	4	2	6
			% within ISSUE_CAT			

			% within ISSUE_CAT	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
	Total		Count	344	116	460
			% within ISSUE_CAT	74,8%	25,2%	100,0%
Spain	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	17	26	43
	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	39,5%	60,5%	100,0%
		Education	Count	78	99	177
			% within ISSUE_CAT	44,1%	55,9%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	44	40	84
			% within ISSUE_CAT	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	7	3	10
			% within ISSUE_CAT	70,0%	30,0%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	21	29	50
			% within ISSUE_CAT	42,0%	58,0%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	3	19	22
			% within ISSUE_CAT	13,6%	86,4%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	4	3	7
			% within ISSUE_CAT	57,1%	42,9%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	0	5	5
			% within ISSUE_CAT	0,0%	100,0%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	14	23	37
			% within ISSUE_CAT	37,8%	62,2%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	2	12	14
			% within ISSUE_CAT	14,3%	85,7%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	23	12	35
			% within ISSUE_CAT	65,7%	34,3%	100,0%
	Total		Count	213	271	484
			% within ISSUE_CAT	44,0%	56,0%	100,0%
Swed	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	21	14	35
en	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	60,0%	40,0%	100,0%
		Education	Count	51	45	96
			% within ISSUE_CAT	53,1%	46,9%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	70	34	104
			% within ISSUE_CAT	67,3%	32,7%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	6	3	9
			% within ISSUE_CAT	66,7%	33,3%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	39	54	93
			% within ISSUE_CAT	41,9%	58,1%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	17	27	44
			% within ISSUE_CAT	38,6%	61,4%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	1	1	2
			% within ISSUE_CAT	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	4	1	5
			% within ISSUE_CAT	80,0%	20,0%	100,0%

		Violence and Abuse	Count	18	22	40
			% within ISSUE_CAT	45,0%	55,0%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	11	25	36
			% within ISSUE_CAT	30,6%	69,4%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	12	12	24
			% within ISSUE_CAT	50,0%	50,0%	100,0%
		Total	Count	250	238	488
			% within ISSUE_CAT	51,2%	48,8%	100,0%
Switz	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	20	26	46
erlan	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	43,5%	56,5%	100,0%
d		Education	Count	34	84	118
			% within ISSUE_CAT	28,8%	71,2%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	22	24	46
			% within ISSUE_CAT	47,8%	52,2%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	5	4	9
			% within ISSUE_CAT	55,6%	44,4%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	57	50	107
			% within ISSUE_CAT	53,3%	46,7%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	3	48	51
			% within ISSUE_CAT	5,9%	94,1%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	3	13	16
			% within ISSUE_CAT	18,8%	81,3%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	2	5	7
			% within ISSUE_CAT	28,6%	71,4%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	15	16	31
			% within ISSUE_CAT	48,4%	51,6%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	5	26	31
			% within ISSUE_CAT	16,1%	83,9%	100,0%
		Military Issues	Count	3	0	3
			% within ISSUE_CAT	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	11	13	24
			% within ISSUE_CAT	45,8%	54,2%	100,0%
		Total	Count	180	309	489
			% within ISSUE_CAT	36,8%	63,2%	100,0%
UK	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	10	4	14
	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	71,4%	28,6%	100,0%
		Education	Count	117	25	142
			% within ISSUE_CAT	82,4%	17,6%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	47	2	49
			% within ISSUE_CAT	95,9%	4,1%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	8	0	8
			% within ISSUE_CAT	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	82	11	93

		% within ISSUE_CAT	88,2%	11,8%	100,0%	
	Creativity & culture	Count	6	2	8	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	75,0%	25,0%	100,0%	
	Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	7	9	16	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	43,8%	56,3%	100,0%	
	Extremism	Count	10	3	13	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	76,9%	23,1%	100,0%	
	Violence and Abuse	Count	47	19	66	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	71,2%	28,8%	100,0%	
	Law and Order, Crime	Count	32	6	38	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	84,2%	15,8%	100,0%	
	Military Issues	Count	1	0	1	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
	Other Issues	Count	10	0	10	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	100,0%	0,0%	100,0%	
	Total	Count	377	81	458	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	82,3%	17,7%	100,0%	
Total	ISSUE_CA	Political Issues	Count	209	175	384
	T		% within ISSUE_CAT	54,4%	45,6%	100,0%
		Education	Count	760	691	1451
			% within ISSUE_CAT	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%
		Socioeconomic and Employment	Count	372	176	548
			% within ISSUE_CAT	67,9%	32,1%	100,0%
		ICT, Media and Innovation	Count	52	21	73
			% within ISSUE_CAT	71,2%	28,8%	100,0%
		Welfare, social benefits, social well-being	Count	325	269	594
			% within ISSUE_CAT	54,7%	45,3%	100,0%
		Creativity & culture	Count	88	192	280
			% within ISSUE_CAT	31,4%	68,6%	100,0%
		Religion/spiritual related issues	Count	45	51	96
			% within ISSUE_CAT	46,9%	53,1%	100,0%
		Extremism	Count	48	35	83
			% within ISSUE_CAT	57,8%	42,2%	100,0%
		Violence and Abuse	Count	140	127	267
			% within ISSUE_CAT	52,4%	47,6%	100,0%
		Law and Order, Crime	Count	117	146	263
			% within ISSUE_CAT	44,5%	55,5%	100,0%
		Military Issues	Count	21	6	27
			% within ISSUE_CAT	77,8%	22,2%	100,0%
		Other Issues	Count	108	107	215
			% within ISSUE_CAT	50,2%	49,8%	100,0%
	Total	Count	2285	1996	4281	
		% within ISSUE_CAT	53,4%	46,6%	100,0%	

Discussion [in process]

This paper has focused on the spatial dimensions of claims making in nine national public domains, aiming to understand the relationship with a youth regimes and national contexts, for the 2010-16 period, following the global financial crisis. Through cross-national comparison, we first examine public claims made by youth actors as well as those made by non-youth actors and, second, of the scope of the actors across the different issues related to the youth.

Our cross-national comparison of the scope of actors reveals three groups of countries. In the first group, France, Poland and the UK, the public domain is strongly nationalized, while in the second group of countries, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland, the public domain is strongly sub-nationalised. In the third small group of "even countries", Greece and Sweden, centralisation and decentralisation are balanced.

Our data on the spatial dimension of youth vs nonyouth actors show a similar trend. Polish, French and British actors acting at the national level dominate their public domains regardless of whether they are young or not, whereas Italian, Swiss and Spanish actors with a subnational scope are prevalent in their countries. Furthermore, the findings confirm our hypothesis that the rate of actors with a subnational scope is higher for young claimants compared to non-young claimants in all countries but Germany. In the "even countries" (Greece and Sweden) sub-nationally oriented youth actors are similar in frequency to nationally oriented non-youth actors.

When it comes to the types of actors, we find that education related actors and other actors together with youth actors are much more likely to have subnational scope, while all other actors who are making claims on youth in the public sphere are most frequently of national scope. Looking at national contexts the data shows once again that in seven of the nine countries, youth actors as well as education-related actors act mainly at the subnational rather than at the national one – except for Germany showing prevalence of national scope in education-related actors, and Switzerland showing similar frequencies of national and subnational scopes.

Looking at the issues raised by claimant scope we find that actors of a national scope focus more on political issues, socio-economic and employment issues, social welfare and Education, ICTs. By contrast, actors of subnational scope more frequently make claims on cultural, religious and law and order issues. Cross-national variations of the main issues by scope of claimant appear to follow the main pattern described above. These findings aim to contribute to the "youth regimes" literature by highlighting the importance of the spatial dimension of public claims making.

Bibliography

- Andreotti, A., & Mingione, E. (2016). Local welfare systems in Europe and the economic crisis. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 23(3), 252-266.
- Banaji, S., & Cammaerts, B. (2015). Citizens of nowhere land. *Journalism Studies*, 16(1), 115–132.
doi:10.1080/1461670x.2014.890340
- Cammaerts, B., M. Bruter, S. Banaji, S. Harrison and N. Anstead (2015) *Youth Participation in Democratic Life: Stories of Hope and Disillusion*. Basingstoke Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan
- Carcillo, S. et al. (2015), “NEET Youth in the Aftermath of the Crisis: Challenges and Policies”, OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 164, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5js6363503f6-en>
- Chabanet, D. (2014). Between youth policy and employment policy: The rise, limits and ambiguities of a corporatist system of youth representation within the EU. *JCMS: Journal of common market studies*, 52(3), 479-494.
- Cinalli, Manlio, Giugni, Marco. (2013) New challenges for the welfare state: The emergence of youth unemployment regimes in Europe? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, vol.22, no. 3, p. 290-299
- Cinalli, M., & Sanhueza, M. J. (2018). Trajectories of Solidarities in France Across Fields of Vulnerability. In *Solidarity in Europe*(pp. 227-251). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (Oxford: Polity Press).
- Hadjivassiliou, K., Tassinari, A., Eichhorst, W., & Wozny, F. (2016). Assessing the performance of school-to-work transition regimes in the EU.
- Hadjivassiliou, K. (2017). Policy overview of school-to-work transitions. *Youth employment*, 84. *STYLE Handbook*.
- Kretsos Lefteris (2014) Youth policy in austerity Europe: the case of Greece, *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 19:sup1, 35-47, DOI: 10.1080/02673843.2013.862730
- LSE Enterprise (2013). EACEA 2010/03: Youth participation in democratic life – final report. London: LSE Enterprise
- Mejias, Sam & Shakuntala Banaji (2018): Backed into a corner: challenging media and policy representations of youth citizenship in the UK, *Information, Communication & Society*, DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2018.1450436
- Petmesidou, M. (2017). Can the European Union 2020 Strategy Deliver on Social Inclusion? *Global Challenges working paper No 3*,
<http://bora.uib.no/bitstream/handle/1956/16140/GlobalChallengesNo3MP.pdf?sequence=5&isAllowed=y>
- Petmesidou, M., & Guillén, A. M. (2014). Can the welfare state as we know it survive? A view from the crisis-ridden South European periphery.
- Petmesidou, M., Menéndez, M. C. G., & Hadjivassiliou, K. (2017). What have we learnt about policy innovation and learning?. *Youth employment*, 116.
- Thévenon, O. (2015). Aid policies for young people in Europe and the OECD countries. *Families and Society WP Series*, 34, 1-53.
- Uba, K., & Kousis, M. (2018). Constituency Groups of Alternative Action Organizations During Hard Times: A Comparison at the Solidarity Orientation and Country Levels. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(6), 816-836.
- Vogel J. (2002), « European Welfare Regimes and the Transition to Adulthood: A Comparative and Longitudinal Perspective”, *Social Indicators Research*, 59(3): 275-299.

Wallace, C., & Bendit, R. (2009). Youth policies in Europe: towards a classification of different tendencies in youth policies in the European Union. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 10(3), 441-458.

Walther, A. (2006). "Regimes of Youth Transitions. Choice, flexibility and security in young people's experiences across different European contexts". *Young*, 14(2), pp. 119-139.

Annex

Table 2 supplement

		Chi-Square Tests				
country of coding		Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
France	Pearson Chi-Square	31,031 ^c	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	29,168	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	29,452	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	30,964	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	466				
Germany	Pearson Chi-Square	1,280 ^d	1	,258		
	Continuity Correction ^b	1,028	1	,311		
	Likelihood Ratio	1,271	1	,260		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,289	,155
	Linear-by-Linear Association	1,278	1	,258		
	N of Valid Cases	486				
Greece	Pearson Chi-Square	11,975 ^e	1	,001		
	Continuity Correction ^b	11,080	1	,001		
	Likelihood Ratio	12,121	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,001	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	11,950	1	,001		
	N of Valid Cases	477				
Italy	Pearson Chi-Square	16,738 ^f	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	15,464	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	20,553	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	16,702	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	473				
Poland	Pearson Chi-Square	15,212 ^g	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	13,959	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	13,629	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	15,179	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	460				
Spain	Pearson Chi-Square	4,300 ^h	1	,038		
	Continuity Correction ^b	3,799	1	,051		
	Likelihood Ratio	4,392	1	,036		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,046	,025
	Linear-by-Linear Association	4,291	1	,038		
	N of Valid Cases	484				
Sweden	Pearson Chi-Square	28,481 ⁱ	1	,000		

	Continuity Correction ^b	26,727	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	32,102	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	28,423	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	488				
Switzerland	Pearson Chi-Square	12,719 ^j	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	11,878	1	,001		
	Likelihood Ratio	13,643	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	12,693	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	489				
UK	Pearson Chi-Square	16,551 ^k	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	15,030	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	13,886	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	16,515	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	458				
Total	Pearson Chi-Square	99,994 ^a	1	,000		
	Continuity Correction ^b	99,093	1	,000		
	Likelihood Ratio	100,757	1	,000		
	Fisher's Exact Test				,000	,000
	Linear-by-Linear Association	99,971	1	,000		
	N of Valid Cases	4281				

a. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 264,36.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14,60.

d. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 38,20.

e. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 31,88.

f. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16,89.

g. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14,12.

h. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 34,33.

i. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19,02.

j. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 33,87.

k. 0 cells (0,0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9,37.