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Abstract

Contemporary policy discourse about young people is frequently trapped in the dichotomous paradigm of simplistically portraying them as either ‘a problem’ or a ‘human resource’. This broadly applies both in Europe and in Asia. However, while significant comparative research on youth, youth work and youth policies has been done within Europe, there is very little research which compares the European and Asian contexts, and there is none to date specifically comparing Ireland and India. This thesis explores and compares the youth policies of Ireland and India through the analytical lens of Ian Gough’s (2008) “five I’s”: industrialisation, interests, institutions, ideas and international environment. It examines the major ‘factors and actors’ that have influenced the historical development of youth policies in both countries and situates these in their broader regional contexts.

There are many obvious differences between India and Ireland in terms of location, demography, culture(s) and other economic and social factors. However, there are also significant connections between them, stemming not least from their common colonial experiences, meaning there are important parallels in political culture and public administration.

The voluntary sector and its relationship with government agencies hugely influences policy making in both countries (the principle of ‘subsidiarity’ in Ireland can be fruitfully compared with that of ‘Panchayati Raj’ in India). In India, however, there is no forum for NGOs and the government to come together whereas ‘social partnership’ has been central to Irish social policy. In both countries, young people have been profoundly affected by rapid economic change and globalisation presents them with a range of challenges and opportunities, social and cultural as well as economic. Deep-seated inequalities, different but overlapping, also persist in both. Significant differences remain in the nature of youth transitions but these may be converging, in a pattern that has broader global causes and implications.
Introduction

Young people today live in a globalised society characterised by a wide array of prospects and problems, innovations and challenges, promise and despair. They are confronted with unprecedented progress in connectivity and communication brought about by the Internet revolution, globalisation, new ideologies, multi-cultural and multi-ethnic exchanges between countries and within public and private sector institutions. Poverty and misery in a world of plenty, dependencies of various kinds including Internet addiction, deplorable human rights violations, disaffections and depressions arising from raised expectations and frustrated hopes are distinctive of this age. Young people are a vulnerable global majority that are influenced by these rapid developments. Their life situations and lifestyles are deeply affected by the various demographic, economic and social changes in the dominant society. This changing pattern among youth generates an intricate and at times conflicting relationship with other members of society, as well as with the state.

My experience of working with young people and studying youth work in India and in Ireland enabled me to reflect on the importance of these changes and their impact on young people. Globally, youth policy is a tool through which young people’s issues and needs are met and their wellbeing is assured by different welfare states, international, independent and voluntary organisations. The situation of youth further motivated me to investigate those factors and actors that influence different national youth policies. My familiarity with and experience of young people and different policy measures in India and in Ireland, as well as access to data, provided the key rationale for my choice of comparing Indian and Irish youth policies.

In this study, I set out to answer the following research question: What are the similarities and differences between Irish and Indian youth policies and how can these be explained in a socio-scientific context? There are obvious and significant connections between the two countries, stemming not the least from their common colonial experiences. While significant comparative research has been done at the European level in relation to youth, youth work and youth policies, there is very little research that compares the European and Asian contexts, and none specifically pertaining to Ireland and India. It is hoped that the inquiries made through this thesis
will raise challenging questions and issues which can be further addressed in both Irish and Indian youth policy contexts and development.

India and Ireland have a long history of political, social, and economic relations. On 26 January 1950, Éamon de Valera was asked to be guest of honour at a reception in Birmingham to celebrate the declaration of India as a Republic and the organisers’ (somewhat emotive) explanation for such an invitation was:

We and the Irish had strong ties of friendship. We suffered under the same tyranny for many centuries. They had the Black and Tans; we had the massacre of Amritsar. They had de Valera and Casement and MacSwiney; we had Gandhi and Nehru and Bose. They had Sinn Féin; we had our National Congress. They had the IRA; we had the INA. It is not only for the smile and the shamrock we know Ireland. It is for the toughness of their leaders and for the rebellion in their hearts (O’Malley, 2010: 10).

The Indian constitution was influenced by the Irish constitution and many of the provisions of the Irish Constitution were incorporated into the new draft (O’Malley, 2011: 149). For example, the Irish Constitution lists the Directive Principles of Social Policy in its Article 45, 45.1 and this provision was reproduced in Article 38, 37 of the 1950 Indian Constitution:

...Article 45 of the Irish Constitution stressed: the principles of social policy set forth in this Article are intended for the general guidance of the Oireachtas exclusively, and shall not be cognisable by any court under any of the provisions of this Constitution. The Indian Constitution followed this formula in its Article 37: The provisions contained in this part shall not be enforced by any court, but the principles therein laid down are nevertheless fundamental in the governance of the country and it shall be the duty of the state to apply these principles in making laws (Keane, 2011: 199-200).

In the Indian Yearbook of International Affairs in 1952 O’Normain (1952: 160) wrote that ‘perhaps the Irish Constitution’s greatest claim to future fame will depend on the extraordinary influence which its Directive Principles had on the Constitution of India’. In the nineteenth century, Ireland and India, though not technically defined as colonies, were both treated as such by Britain. Since the Act of Union of 1800, Ireland was de jure a part of the imperial power, but was de facto a colony and thus simultaneously both the colonised and coloniser. The concept, developed in the 1860s,
of ‘governing Ireland according to Irish ideas’ was influenced by Indian practice (Foley and O’Connor 2006: xiii). O’Malley (2011: 145) states that ‘Ireland and India had established a mutually beneficial, anti-imperialist relationship during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century, one based on their shared colonial histories within the British Empire’. The Ireland-India Council (2010) also asserts that

Irish-Indian relations were mostly built and established during the freedom struggles of the respective countries against a common imperial empire, the United Kingdom. Political relations between the people of these two countries have largely been based on socio-cultural and moderate political ties; although, since last decade economic ties have also helped to build stronger relations in the present time. Indo-Irish relations were greatly strengthened by luminaries like Jawahar Lal Nehru, Éamon de Valera, Rabindranath Tagore, W. B. Yeats, James Joyce, and, above all, by Annie Besant and Mother Teresa.

Ireland and India have a rich tradition and history related to the development of young people. Though there are geographical, cultural, social and economic variations, this research strives to present a clearer understanding and growth of youth policy development in both countries. Another reason to undertake such a comparative study is, as Hantrais (2003: 8) states, ‘to find out more about other cultures, to broaden perspectives and advance knowledge about other systems’ and in this case about youth policies in the two countries. As already stated, the central research question for this thesis is as follows: ‘What are the similarities and differences between Irish and Indian youth policies and how can these be explained in a socio-scientific context?’ The question has been addressed using a combination of key informant interviews and documentary analysis in both Ireland and India.

Chapter One begins with a discussion of social policy in broad terms referring to the development of different perspectives and models. It also deals with the comparative dimensions of social policy and elaborates Gough’s model of social policy since his model is employed in this thesis as a framework for comparison. Having situated youth policy within social policy, the chapter continues by defining the term ‘youth’ and then considers the conception and development of youth policies in the European and Asian contexts. It further argues for a need for comparative study and builds the base for analysing the similarities and differences of Indian and Irish youth policies.
Chapter Two is a presentation of the conceptual framework for comparing youth policies. It attempts to contextualise this comparative study and outlines Gough “five I’s” framework in more detail, suggesting that it provides a useful approach to the study of youth and youth policy.

Chapter Three considers the methodology adopted in this research. It presents the story of how this study was conceived, its development, design, research methods, analysis and ethical considerations.

Chapters Four and Five give a detailed account of Indian and Irish youth policies respectively: their historical development and emergence; the Indian and Irish youth profiles; and the various factors and actors that have shaped and influenced their conception, policy making and implementation using Gough’s framework.

Chapters Six and Seven are analyses of findings from Indian and Irish key-informants’ interviews respectively. All the findings are discussed and summarised within Gough’s framework of the “five I’s”.

Chapter Eight interprets and discusses the data presented in the previous chapters in order to assess the similarities and differences in the youth policies of India and Ireland.

Some suggestions are also made in the concluding chapter for further enquiry and study based on this comparative research.
Chapter One
The Conception and Development of Youth Policies in
Europe and Asia

The present demographic, political, ideological, economic and social changes around the globe affect the life situation, wellbeing and lifestyles of young people in every country. They live in a prolonged and complex period of transition from childhood to youth and to adulthood. Young people need to cope with a longer period of financial dependency and uncertainty over the suitability of their occupational choice in relation to whether it will provide them not only with an income but also full social recognition as an adult member of society (Biggart and Walther, 2006: 41). In general, young people are trapped in the dichotomous paradigm of being simplistically portrayed either ‘as a problem’ or ‘as a human resource’. It is often stated that young people's opinions are overlooked in the public policy sphere. Often, because their voices are not heard the concerns or opinions of youth never reach the top of the political agenda (United Nations, 2003).

A greater knowledge and understanding of present-day youth and youth policies are of paramount importance for researchers, policy makers, practitioners and others who work for and with young people. Since youth policy falls within the broader parameters of social policy, this chapter begins with a consideration of the different perspectives and models of social policy; it analyses the comparative dimensions of social policy with particular reference to Ian Gough’s comparative model. This will help to provide a context for addressing the key research question: What are the similarities and differences between Irish and Indian youth policies and how can these be explained in a socio-scientific context?

1.1 Development of Different Perspectives, Approaches or Models of Social Policy: Ideologies

This section commences with a brief introduction to social policy. According to Titmuss (2008: 139) the word ‘policy’ can be taken to refer to the principles that govern action directed towards given ends. This signifies that action is about means as
well as ends and it therefore implies change: changing situations, systems, practices, behaviour. Policies are living things, not just static lists of goals, rules or laws and they are blueprints that have to be implemented, often with unexpected and sometimes with disastrous results. It is clear that social policies are what happen ‘on the ground’ when they are implemented, as well as what happen at the preliminary decision-making or legislative stage (Blakemore and Griggs, 2007: 1). Alcock (2008: 2) states that social policy can be regarded as referring to the ‘actions taken within society to develop and deliver services for people in order to meet their needs for welfare and wellbeing’. Social policies are necessary for nation-building because the benefits of economic growth do not automatically reach all. Inadequate social policies ultimately limit growth in the medium and long term. Social policies are justified not only from a humanitarian viewpoint; they are an economic and political need for future growth and political stability, minimally designed to maintain citizen support for their governments (Ortiz, 2007: 9).

Throughout the nineteenth century, issues of poverty, child labour, education, and health enabled the growth of social policy (Blakemore and Griggs, 2007: 5). In the first four decades of the twentieth century, a different set of principles and a different model of social policy gradually replaced the classic, laissez-faire ideas of the nineteenth century (Blakemore and Griggs, 2007: 49). In today’s social context, every developed and developing country has formed its own social policy based on different ideologies and beliefs. Midgley (2006: 2) states that scholars have identified and developed different perspectives used in various countries, called ‘normative’ perspectives, which are classified into two categories: the residual social policy model and the institutional social policy model. Midgley (2006: 2-3) identified another approach called ‘developmental model’ because the residual and institutional perspectives did not accurately describe the social policies of the governments of many developing countries, which were seeking to promote economic development and seeking to integrate social policies with economic policies.

Up until the mid-1960s studies of social policy were usually based on a reformist or Fabian approach and the state intervention was considered as a solution to the problems of capitalist society. For a long time this view was largely unchallenged. In the 1970s, however, there was a resurgence of liberalism which challenged both
reformism and radicalism. This new-right approach saw the welfare state as damaging the operation of the market system (Burden, 1998: 4).

The utopian socialists in Europe and scholars such as Henri Saint Simon and Auguste Comte in France were among the few who challenged the dominance of laissez-faire and Social Darwinist theories in the 19th century and they proposed that social science knowledge should be applied to government planning (Midgley, 2006: 3). The development of different ideological perspectives not only influenced Britain and Western countries but also other countries. The three main Western ideologies are: liberalism, conservatism and socialism and later from liberalism emerged neoliberalism, then libertarianism and communitarianism (Lister, 2010: 29-30).

Beveridge, a social liberal, integrated Scandinavian social liberal ideas with those of his colleague, the economist John Maynard Keynes, and initiated a new theoretical construct for the welfare state in the UK: universal state services and social security systems, including a national health service (Aspalter, 2008: 781). The ideas of Beveridge and Keynes were implemented by successive governments after 1945 and have been described as evolutionary (Cochrane et al., 2000: 2). In the 1980s, Margaret Thatcher challenged the ideology of Beveridge and Keynes with the new idea of neoliberalism, and at the same time similar changes were taking place in many countries of the developed capitalist world, especially in Western Europe and North America (ibid). The ‘discrediting’ and demise of Keynesian macro-economic management and its replacement by a neo-liberal agenda emphasising deregulation, privatisation and free trade are all elements of a new era of global capitalism (Kennett, 2001: 1-2).

The Third Way was introduced in the late 20th century by Bill Clinton in the US and Tony Blair in Britain and was used to signify the shift in the nature of social democratic politics. This new Labour's Third Way was considered as an alternative to the Thatcherism which was prevalent for the previous two decades (Lister, 2010: 46). There are critics who argue that ‘the third way is simply a continuation of the neo-liberal and social authoritarian philosophy of the new right: the wolf of neo-Thatcherism in social democratic sheep's clothing’ (Lister, 2010: 47 citing Hall, 2003; Gray, 2007; Marquand, 2007) but this was denied by the Labour party.
1.2 Comparative Dimensions of Social Policy

Joan Higgins (1981: 7) states that ‘acts of comparing are part of our daily lives’. For example, parents compare their babies ‘to see whether they are unusually fat or thin, or small or large’ and also a photographer who places a figure in the foreground of a mountain. Amenta (2008: 93) sees it not as a theory or a specific method or technique, but as an approach that has been undertaken by scholars with varied academic, theoretical, and methodological affiliations and preferences. Kennett (2004: 1) asserts that the field of comparative social enquiry has grown dramatically since the 1960s, in relation to the number of studies being undertaken, the range of approaches used and the countries analysed. Comparative social policy might be regarded as a subset of comparative public policy which developed in the 1970s as a field of study within political science and comparative politics (Clasen, 2004: 93).

The focus and reflection on the policy and welfare contexts of individual countries is changing. As one commentator remarks: ‘International forces are increasingly shaping the policy agendas of national governments, so that welfare provision is less’ (Alcock, 2001: 4). Clasen (1999: 4) also argues that ‘growing interdependence between and similar challenges across countries have put into question social policy research which remains locked into analysing developments within one country.’

In the present context, the world in which we live has a fluid and dynamic environment. The social, cultural and economic manifestations are imported and exported across borders while people flow between countries (Kennett, 2000: 1). The pressures on policy making need to be viewed within the context of globalisation and its accompanying burgeoning capitalist economy, whereby international agencies are seeking to control social policy in individual countries (Harris, 2007: 28). Thus, for example, the increase of international agencies such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the World Bank, the European Union (EU) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the number of transnational companies which have no specific national base is immensely influential on the social policy of different countries (Kennett, 2000: 1). What is called for, therefore, is a comparative study of social policies of different countries.
Today countries are becoming more interdependent and the socio-economic trends and challenges they face are similar. Their response to social problems are also similar in some cases but different in others, for example: unemployment or poverty, demographic ageing and low birth rates (Clasen, 2007: 601). In this context, there emerges ‘the need for a better understanding of the common features and crucial differences between not only individual welfare states but particular policy programs in order to unravel why and how welfare needs, or demands are being transformed into social policy’ (Clasen, 1999: 4). There are also countries proactively engaged in examining the policies of other nations with the possible intention of transferring policies into their own contexts. Harris (2007: 28) states that these comparisons are also opportunities to learn from the mistakes of others. Jones (1985: 4) also states the necessity of comparative study on three grounds:

- promote a better understanding of the home social policy environment; broaden ideas as to what may be done in response to particular issues or problems and perhaps suggest ‘lessons from abroad’; and open the door to a greater breadth and variety of case material that may not be possible on the basis of home country experience and materials alone.

Clasen (2004: 94) states that ‘all social sciences might be regarded as ultimately comparative in the sense that observed phenomena are compared against a certain point of reference, which is either explicitly stated or implicitly assumed, and which allows differences and similarities to be analysed, interpreted or evaluated’. There are various types of comparative research such as comparisons across time, between gender and age categories within countries, across countries as well as some comparative studies that might find greater diversity within rather than across countries (e.g. within India) (Harris, 2007: 27). Cross-national comparative research may be undertaken at either the micro or the macro level. At the micro level, individual programmes are compared usually within nations with similar political and social structures. Macro comparisons are attempts to examine whole ‘systems’ over a range of countries and across time (ibid).

There are four approaches to cross-national research. First, theoretical studies ‘attempt to explore, and to explain, the differences between the different welfare systems of different countries and to assess the extent to which they are the result of
internal policy making or external dynamics’ (Alcock, 2001: 5). The second approach focuses on particular sectors across nations, such as social security, childcare policy, housing, and health; the third, stresses on evaluating policy effectiveness across states which rely on qualitative data gathering techniques and ‘emphasise cultural sensitivity and specificity, agency and reflexivity in the policy research process’ (Kennett, 2001: 7). Finally, the fourth approach emphasises comparisons between countries, involving comparisons of welfare provisions in selected countries and this approach focuses on regime theory and makes use of welfare state typologies (Harris, 2007: 27).

Clasen (2007) suggests that systematic cross-national analyses can be distinguished by three methods: providing descriptive information about other countries, comparative policy evaluations, and theoretical explanations of cross-national variation.

Descriptive accounts which are informative comparisons go back to the 1960s and 1970s, initially concentrating on social administration and later social policy per se. Evaluative comparisons is a second branch of cross-national social policy analysis focusing on the evaluation of articuler types of social policy intervention, or on particular problems such as poverty. A third branch of comparative social policy is more directly aimed at the generation of theory or theory testing, ranging from two-country comparisons to comparisons involving a relatively large number of advanced welfare states (Clasen, 2007: 606-607).

The most common way to take a systematic look at cross-national differences in social policy development is to examine the concept of ‘welfare regime’ as articulated by Gøsta Esping-Andersen (1990). Esping-Andersen argues that the provision of social policy and the interaction between markets, states, and families follows a certain logic which differs across the three clusters of welfare states (Clasen, 2007: 609). According to Esping-Andersen (1990), there are three welfare regimes in developed societies - liberal, conservative, and social democratic and these regimes consist of clusters of countries that, despite their differences, share major similarities (Béland, 2010: 47). Empirically Esping-Andersen distinguished the three clusters by their respective degrees of ‘decommodification’ and ‘stratification’ (Clasen, 2007: 609):
Liberal regimes are ‘highly commodified and welfare is therefore seen as something that people can purchase for themselves’ (Hothersall, 2010a: 51). These, by and large, are English-speaking countries – such as the USA, Canada and, increasingly, the UK and Ireland – that have relatively modest levels of public spending on social policies, where welfare benefits tend to be means-tested, and where public services may be selectively provided (Dean, 2006: 29).

Conservative regimes are ‘usually highly decommodified, but not necessarily universal’ (Hothersall, 2010a: 51). These, by and large, are Western continental European countries such as Germany and France that have higher levels of public spending on social policies, where welfare benefits tend to be social insurance based, but where particular importance is placed on the role of families as opposed to public services (Dean, 2006: 29).

Social democratic regimes are ‘highly decommodified in that welfare services are provided by the state for all citizens irrespective of income, status or any other particular characteristic and welfare services are universal’ (Hothersall, 2010a: 51). These, by and large, are Scandinavian countries – such as Sweden and Denmark – that have the highest levels of public spending on social policies (Dean, 2006: 30).

It is clear from the above and other comparative studies that Europe offers a natural and well-studied landscape of differing social policy responses to broadly similar social problems. Since there are multiple routes to broadly similar goals, a major analytical task is to understand the reasons behind these differences (Gough, 2008: 40). The task becomes more complex still when we move beyond the European context. For this Gough’s comparative model of social policy may be greatly beneficial.

1.3 Gough’s Comparative Model of Social Policy

According to Gough (2004: 239), the welfare regime paradigm development within Northern social studies can provide a rich, open and rewarding framework for understanding the nature and diversity of social policy in the South. Gough (2008: 39) evolved a simple model of social policy making by comparing welfare states in Europe to provide two types of lessons for developing countries: (a) models of social policy
action to follow or avoid and (b) forms of social policy analysis that help address emerging social problems.

Figure 1.1 presents a modified form of a basic textbook model of policy making, based on Easton (1965) and Hill (2003). It first distinguishes three explanatory factors: industrialisation, interests, and institutions. Interestingly, these were developed roughly in this historical order in the literature. Two other factors are also considered: (a) ideas and ideologies (which can operate both through interest groups in civil society and through governmental institutions) and (b) international influences (the original model focused entirely on internal explanatory factors) (Gough, 2008: 44).

**Figure 1.1: A Simple Model of Social Policy Making**

![Model of Social Policy Making Diagram]

Source: Gough (2008: 44)

The diagram above shows how each factor and actor influences the other and how they work together to influence social policy and its outcomes. In this model, industrialisation, interests, institutions, ideas and international environment are considered as independent variables; social policy as an intermediate dependent variable; and welfare outcome as a dependent variable. Through this research, Gough (2008: 63) derives two analytical lessons from the emergence of European welfare states over the past century:

First, a combination of structural factors, interest based mobilisation, political institutions, and policy discourses have determined patterns of social policy development. …Social policy must always be embedded in structural, political, and
institutional contexts. A second analytical lesson from European social policy is more contestable. It is the importance of path dependency: how, once established, patterns or constellations of social policies tend to reproduce and are rather impervious to radical change, short of encountering a major crisis or external intervention.

It is clear that social policy was framed initially to control and support the capitalist system. Much stress was given to the rights and duties, particularly, of the poor and in general of all. In the past and present, when dealing with social policy issues, scholars focussed mainly on their areas of interest: ‘economists tend to focus on incentives and fiscal constraints, sociologists are more likely to attend to the relationship between social programs and specific forms of inequality and political scientists often emphasise the impact of political parties and interest groups on welfare state development’ (Beland, 2010: 10). There are also different factors which influence the development of social policy both in the North and the South such as industrialisation, interest groups, institutions, ideas and international agencies (Gough, 2008).

It is apparent that studying national social policy in isolation seems increasingly questionable due to the growing impact of external influences on national social policy formation and the increasing interdependence between countries (Clasen, 2007: 601) and therefore comparative study is gaining momentum. It is very obvious that we live in times of rapid and large-scale change, with global economic restructuring and high rates of technological innovation. Economic, technological, environmental and social changes have complex interrelations and consequences for each other, interacting and shaping each other’s development. These processes of change demand new, vigorous and coordinated policy responses (Room, 2008: 345). The modern world experiences similar issues and the response of each country depends on its government's ideology. Carnes & Mares (2007: 882) stress the need for ‘research on social policy to become more unequivocally comparative in its orientation’.

In this context, Gough’s comparative model of social policy is a clear example of the value of the comparative approach and it will be returned to in the next chapter. The prevailing forces in modern society to which social policy seeks to respond also have a profound impact on youth and youth policy. In light of the comparative analysis
of the social policies of different countries and of the argument for their augmentation presented above, I now present a descriptive analysis of the purpose, development, ideology and comparative dimensions of youth policy.

1.4 Definition of ‘Youth’

According to Denstad (2009: 12) ‘a society changes rapidly and continuously in a global world. So too do the social conditions for young people, as well as young people’s expectations of the role of government’. Williamson (2008: 70) states that in such a changing society, “the most tedious aspect of any youth policy debate is returning to the question of definition – what is ‘youth’?” Chisholm et al., (2011: 12) also agree to the challenges that underpin “the meaning of the concept of ‘youth’, its social and historical construction, as well as the social and political implication for the understanding of young people’s lives”. The meaning of the term ‘youth’ varies in different societies. Furthermore, definitions of youth have changed continuously in response to fluctuating political, economic and socio-cultural circumstances (United Nations, 1995: 10).

Young people’s lives are defined by age-specific policies and laws which mark them out as belonging to a separate category of the population apart from adults and children and which serve to legitimise the difference in treatment. Often they are viewed as ‘citizens in the making’ and ‘not yet adult’ and they do not deserve equal treatment in policy terms (Heath et al., 2009: 6). Each young person has to make the transition from childhood to adolescence and to adulthood. This transition is recognised differently in each society. Youth generally refers to the time of life that is neither childhood nor adulthood, but rather somewhere in-between. As both an idea and a word, ‘youth’ denotes the position of a person in the social hierarchy (Lalor et al., 2007). Selvam (2008: 206) argues persuasively that youth is a stage in life between childhood and adulthood. Although this definition appears deceptively simple, in fact, it brings out clearly two important facets of youth, namely, its relativity and vulnerability.

Youth as a category lacks a clear definition. In some situations, it may be based on one’s social circumstances rather than chronological age or cultural position. Such related categories as adolescence, the teenage years or young adulthood provide a
greater degree of specificity concerning age, but they also vary in their application across contexts (Bucholtz, 2002: 526). In a similar vein, Tyyskä (2005: 3) argues that in global context the terms ‘youth’, ‘adolescent’, ‘teen’, and ‘young adult’ are used interchangeably, often meaning the same thing, only occasionally differentiated:

In western context usage, the category of youth is elastic. For example, Galabos and Kolaric (1994) distinguish between ‘young adolescents (10-14), ‘teens’ (15-19), and ‘young adults’ (20-34) years of age. Furthermore, in common Anglo-American usage, the term ‘teen’ is reserved to those 13-14 years of age. The term ‘adolescent’, previously used for a wider age category (15-24) is now interchangeably with ‘teens’ and the term ‘tweens’ was introduced in the 1990s to refer to young people aged 10-12.

Allen (1968: 321) argues that ‘it is not the relationship between ages that creates change or stability in society, but change in society which explains relations between different ages’. In keeping with such a view, Denstad (2009: 14) maintains that the concept of youth is socially constructed rather than biologically determined, because it differs with time, socio-economic development of a society, and even according to whom you ask. According to Tyyskä (2005: 3), both in everyday usage and government policy there is no consistency in defining the category of youth and this variety signifies the fluidity of age categories and the degree to which they are contested globally. In defining ‘youth’, there is no international consensus on what the term implies or a clear-cut indicator such as age intervals to define it.

A comparison between countries shows clearly how broadly the term can be defined. In general the definition of youth depends on a variety of political, social and cultural factors. Age continues to be an important matter of government consideration in development of policy relating to young people. The age parameters of youth vary according to different contexts and institutional definitions: for most purposes the United Nations classifies youth as persons who are 15–24 years old; the World Bank begins defining youth as 12–24 year olds; and in various youth policies in developing countries the outer limits of youth extend to 40, the expected age of economic independence and marriage (Herrera, 2006: 1427). Definitions of youth in Europe vary due to factors that influence the transition from earlier ‘childhood’ to later ‘adulthood’ such as economic independence, independent living and separate family formation. In light of the above definitions of youth presented in a wide context, I turn to a more
detailed consideration of definitions of youth proffered in the European and Asian contexts.

1.5 Age Definition in European and Asian Youth Policy

Wallace and Bendit (2011: 151) state that ‘the target group for the youth intervention derive partly from the conceptualisation of youth as an age group’. Age definition is an important aspect of any youth policy. It varies from country to country. In Europe, youth policies of different countries define their target group as young people between 15 and 25 years or, in some cases, between 14 and 30 years. In most countries of the EU, age limits differ in line with the field of interest, such as education, work, health, housing, welfare and financial support (Bendit, 2006: 55). Wallace and Bendit (2009: 447-448), distinguish between countries according to the width or narrowness of age range for the definition of youth:

- Countries with a wide age definition ranging from birth to age 25 or 30 are Austria, Belgium, Germany and Finland;
- Countries with a medium age definition of youth ranging from early primary school to 25 years include Ireland, the Netherlands and Luxembourg;
- Countries with a narrow age definition of the youth age group, extending from 11 or 13 years to 25 years include France, Iceland, Norway and the United Kingdom;
- Countries with a very narrow concept of youth, meaning those between the end of lower secondary education and 25 or 30 years, are Denmark, Spain, Greece, Portugal and Sweden.

Wallace and Bendit (2011: 151), add another dimension to the wide and narrow age range in terms of targeting youth in general (i.e. the whole generation of youth) or targeting only certain groups (i.e. problem group or disadvantaged). They state that, for example, the UK and Ireland target particular youth groups or disadvantaged groups whereas Germany, Austria and France target all notwithstanding their special programmes for the disadvantaged. Atal (2005: 12) states that in many countries the core groups of their youth definition further divided into a number of subgroups to address issues relating to the particular age. Obviously, those aged 10 to 15 and 24 to 35 have different problems compared with the core group and it can also be subdivided between 15-20, and 20-24. It is also true that there is no consistent pattern within each
country related to the definition of youth. Different administrative parts of the state define youth differently. For instance, definition of youth for criminal justice purposes may not coincide with educational definitions (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 448).

In Asian context too, there is no consistency with regard to the age definition of youth as it varies from 10-15, 15-24, or 10-35 years. Gale and Fahey (2005: 3) argue that the definition of youth proposed by various countries is determined by different cultural assumptions in such areas as marriage, parenthood, employment and voting. Table 1.1 shows how the definition of youth in terms of age differs in the Asian and Pacific region where ‘youth’ is defined as being anywhere from six to forty years (ESCAP, 1999: 27):

**Table 1.1 Age Definition of Asia and the Pacific Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian and Pacific Region Countries</th>
<th>Definition of Youth Age</th>
<th>Asian and Pacific Region Countries</th>
<th>Definition of Youth Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>15-25 years</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>12-35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>15-30 years</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>15-30 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>15-25 years</td>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>09-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>14-28 years</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>15-35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>15-29 years</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>15-29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>15-40 years</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>15-29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>16-35 years</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>15-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesia (Federated States of)</td>
<td>6-35 years</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>12-25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>15-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>15-29 years</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>15-35 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though many countries have attempted to define and classify ‘youth’ it is not easy to select an appropriate common age. The following are some of the factors that make defining ‘youth’ in Asia and the Pacific region a challenge: the different definitions of youth used within a country by various groups; the lack of international consensus; the vast variations that generally exist between young people (ESCAP, 1999: 26). Wallace and Kovatcheva (1998 cited in Chisholm et al., 2011: 13) state that the ongoing process of ‘constructing’ a definition of youth in Europe is influenced by
the following factors: educational reforms; beginning of state intervention; regulation of working conditions, particularly concerning child labour; reorganisation of criminal justice systems; recognition of leisure as a specific feature of youth experiences; erosion of vertical traditional forms of social control and the consequent emergence of new horizontal socialising agencies. Having considered the variation in the definitions of youth used in the youth policies of Europe and Asia, I now proceed to an analysis of youth in these two continents.

1.6 Youth in Europe and Asia

In all countries, youth are both a major human resource for development and a key agent for social change, economic development and technological innovation. Their imagination, ideals, considerable energies and vision are essential for the continuing development of the societies in which they live. The ways in which the challenges and potential of young people are addressed by policy will influence current social and economic conditions as well as the well-being and livelihood of future generations (United Nations, 1995: 10).

The global situation of young people today is characterised by striking paradoxes, extreme disparities in terms of economic, technological, social and cultural resources, which vary enormously across regions, countries, localities and population groups (UNESCO, 2005: 4). Globalisation has also become one of the dominant forces in the psychological development of young people. It is a process that has emerged and deepened in recent centuries, during which cultures have increasingly influenced each other through trade, migration, and other forms of exchange (Arnett, 2005: 32).

1.6.1 Youth in Europe

The European Union (EU), which has its origin in the European Coal and Steel Community established in 1957 with six member states, gradually grew and was strengthened through many treaties including the Treaty of Rome (1957), the Treaties of Maastricht (1993), Amsterdam (1999), Nice (2003) and Lisbon (2009). At present, the EU has twenty-eight member states. The Council of Europe (CoE) is a different organisation; it was established in 1949 in the aftermath of the Second World War, by ten founding members (including Ireland). Its purpose is the promotion of democracy,
the rule of law, human rights and cultural cooperation across the continent. It had forty-seven member states after the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (Devlin, 2010: 66).

Youth are a priority of the European Union’s social vision (European Commission, 2009: 2) and also in the Council of Europe. There is ambiguity with regard to the definition of youth at European level. Different definitions of ‘young person(s)’ or ‘youth’ may be found in the Council Directive on the protection of young people at work, in which young persons are those under 18 years of age (Council Directive 94/33/EC), the Eurobarometer surveys which refer to the youth population as usually aged between 15-24 (or more recently 29) and the European Commission’s recent strategy document ‘Investing and Empowering’ which speaks of teenagers and young adults from 13 to 30 years old (European Commission, 2009: 2; Chisholm et al., 2011: 27).

Chisholm et al., (2011: 27) argue that the difference in definition of youth in Europe “provides us with an important insight into the circumstances and experiences of young people, the sometimes fraught nature of their relationships with social institutions and the ‘mixed messages’ they may think, with good cause, they are receiving from policy makers and officialdom”. It is projected that the 15-29 age group will represent 15.3 % of Europe's population by 2050, whereas currently it is 19.3%. These demographic changes affect families, intergenerational solidarity and economic growth (European Commission, 2009: 2).

According to January 2011 statistics, there are approximately 95.2 million young people aged between 15 and 29 living in the EU-27. But this youth population has been declining steadily over the past 25 years due to a reduction in the fertility rate in Europe following the end of the demographic boom of the 1950’s, ’60’s and ’70’s. From this time onwards, fewer births, longer life expectancies and ageing have led to a fall in the youth population. This situation is different in some countries like Cyprus and Luxembourg where the youth population actually grew between 2000 and 2010 and also in Ireland which has a distinctive demographic pattern, to which we will return later. The overall trend however is towards an increased dependency ratio between the young (0 to 14 years old) or old (65 years old or over) and the working
age population (15 to 64 years old). These significant demographic changes affect the lives of the youth directly and indirectly (European Commission, 2012: 9-11).

At present, moreover, Europe is undergoing a crisis that has caused unprecedented levels of youth unemployment and greatly increased risk of social exclusion and poverty. *Europe 2020*, the EU strategy for ‘smart, sustainable and inclusive growth’, sets the framework for a coordinated European response in order to emerge stronger from the crisis and to improve the long-term prosperity of Europe's citizens. *Europe 2020* focuses strongly on young people, with a headline target of reducing early school-leaving and increasing tertiary attainment. Two other headline targets share a clear youth dimension – to reduce the risk of poverty and to increase the share of the population in employment (European Commission, 2012: 2).

Bendit (2006: 50-51) states that young people in Europe live in a society experiencing accelerated structural and technological changes which in turn affect young people and the concept of youth. The technological and economic modernisation processes taking place in the context of globalisation and Europeanisation have deep consequences not only for the labour market but also for everyday life and the personal opportunities of young people. Though there may be some variation within Europe, he argues that the following factors affect the development of young people:

…The lengthening of school education since the ’50s - this development has had two main consequences: a delay in young peoples’ entrance into the labour market and the postponement of family formation and birth of the first children. The delay in transition to work has also lengthened the duration of the economic dependence of young people on their parents. …the dominance of the typical nuclear family has been eroded by post-nuclear families, that is, families formed by divorced or single (usually female) parents… (Bendit, 2006: 50).

1.6.2 Youth in Asia and the Pacific

As in Europe, youth in Asia and the Pacific region is not a homogeneous group. The needs and issues affecting young people in developing and developed countries within the region vary greatly. The similarities and differences in the situation of youth
within the region can be related to different social, political and economic structures of the countries. Asia has undergone sweeping demographic and social changes in recent decades, much of it involving youth. These dramatic changes led many nations to consider young people as a problem as well as a resource (Xenos and Kabamalan, 1998: 1). Contemporary generations of youth in Asia, as well as in other parts of the world, have created a new public space and multiple virtual identities through modern technology and the Internet (Gale and Fahey, 2005: 5).

Young people make up a significant proportion of the population, with many countries experiencing a ‘youth bulge’. Youth bulge is defined as a ‘significant increase in the absolute number of adolescents and young adults as well as a rise in the proportion of this age group in the population as a whole’ (Xenos et al., 1999: 1). The youth bulge brings with it new opportunities and challenges for the policy makers while the young people themselves demand a special attention.

According to the UN categorisation (15 to 24 years) ‘youth’ represents almost 18 per cent of the current global population. The vast majority of the 1.2 billion youth in the world today live in developing countries (84 per cent in 1995 which is projected to increase to 89 per cent by 2020) (ESCAP, 2007b: 1). The UN defines ‘adolescents’ as those aged 10-19. ‘Young people’ is a term used by the UN to include both adolescent and youth, and 61% of the world’s young people live in the Asia-Pacific region. Young people account for 30-50% of the total population, and ‘youth’ around 20% (ESCAP, 2011a: 4; ESCAP, 2012: 1). According to 2010 statistics there are just over 4.2 billion people living in the Asia-Pacific region, constituting 61% of the world’s population. Population growth rates in this region have declined from 1.5% in the early 1990s to 1.0% in 2010 due to declining birth rates and a stabilisation in death rates over the last two decades. For example, in the two most populous countries of the region (China and India), the growth rates fell to 0.5% and 1.2%, respectively in 2010. At the same time, these statistics hide the wide variations between the countries of the region (ESCAP, 2011b: 1). The decline in the birth rate and the stabilisation in the death rate in this region have increased the representation of youth in the working force. This presents both an opportunity and a challenge for the policy makers and for the wider society.
Education and employment are the two most important areas that attract the attention of policy makers in the Asia-Pacific region. From the 1960s, young people of this region have been struggling to raise their voice for better education and employment (Atal, 2005: 15). In this region although the majority of young people may be able to participate productively in society, many others experience poverty, gender inequality, limited access to education, poor health including disability, insecure housing, violence, and other social problems (ESCAP, 2011a: 4).

Young people in hierarchical societies tend to have great respect for elders but have very little opportunity to voice their own opinions. However, there is a growing recognition of the need to involve young people in decision-making processes. The vast majority of young people lead very different lives to that of previous generations:

…they generally have better access to health and education; they live in large cities in increasing numbers; they are ‘growing up global’ with increasing access to new media and exposure to values and images from around the world; for many young people there is an increasing gap between their expectations and the opportunities available to them (ESCAP, 2011a: 5).

In today’s context, there is virtually no part of the world that has been left untouched by the long and relentless reach of globalisation (Arnett, 2005: 22). Young people in the Asia-Pacific region are no exception to the impacts of globalisation: with economic development, young people spend longer in education, marry later, have fewer children, and more women work outside the home (Gale and Fahey, 2005: 4). Labour market opportunities for youth in the Asia-Pacific region force the policy makers to base their strategies to reinvigorate economic growth on job creation, social inclusion and better regional integration. The changing socio-economic situation in this region demands special attention to young people. The renewed economic growth in the region depends largely on the skills, drive and capacity for innovation of its youth (ILO, 2012: 1). It will also depend on the approach adopted to youth policy, a subject to which we now turn.
1.7 The Purpose, Process, Benefits and Dimensions of Youth Policy

Youth policy is broadly accepted as a necessary dimension of public policy. Yet youth policy remains unclear and contested, in relation to its breadth and depth (Williamson, 2002: 70). It is increasingly recognised as a key factor and an important indicator for social and human development (Ministry of Youth in Egypt, 2005: 5). It is necessary to have an adequate understanding of youth issues in order to achieve a proper formulation and implementation of youth policy at national and international levels.

A national youth policy is an important investment for the future. It is nowadays commonly argued that such policy has to emerge from national dialogue and a fruitful partnership with relevant stakeholders (i.e. partners): in concrete terms, it must define objectives, strategies, concrete steps, target groups, timeframe, monitoring and evaluation (Ministry of Youth in Egypt, 2005: 7). A national youth policy should be formulated and owned by the government, young people and other key stakeholders. It is the government’s commitment and practice towards ensuring good living conditions and opportunities for the young population of a country (Denstad, 2009: 13). A comprehensive youth policy is aimed at young people in general as well as at specific sub-groups within the general population such as young women, young offenders and ethnic minorities.

Williamson (2008: 5) argues that youth policy is not only about helping young people to become adults but also about helping the young to be young. It is about ‘being’ as well as ‘becoming’; it concerns the quality of the present as well as preparing for the future. A youth policy creates a framework for a country to provide resources, support and services that will allow young people to fulfil their potential and contribute to social, cultural and economic growth. Strategies for youth policy must empower young people actively to influence and to shape the political agenda; the experiences of young people should inform the development of appropriate interventions and services and enable traditional decision-makers to work not only for young people, but also with them (UNESCO, 2005: 5).

A well-framed national youth policy does not depend solely on the allocation of budgets but on a clear strategy that analyses and addresses the real needs of the
youth population. It should develop concrete goals and objectives and apply measures, which, to the best possible extent, achieve the goals that have been set (Denstad, 2009: 15). The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP, 1999: 5), using different policy documents as guidelines, gives a general definition of what a national youth policy should be: ‘a practical demonstration that youth are a priority; a declaration for youth development; a gender-inclusive statement; a vision statement; a framework for political action; a blueprint of the status, rights, responsibilities and roles of youth.’

The United Nations Organisation for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO, 2005: 6-7) states that a national youth policy must articulate a vision statement, co-ordinate all policies affecting young people, and ensure a wide-ranging consultation with all parties and in particular the young people. A youth policy can have different perspectives, some of which mirror how the government perceives the role of young people in society. The perception of youth, on the one hand, as resource, and, on the other hand, as a problem has been clearly articulated as follows:

In countries where youth is chiefly perceived as minors (not legal minors, but social) and – consequently – more like children than adults, there will most likely be a tendency to consider young people as a potential problem, as being in danger, as people that must be protected against threats to their development. On the contrary, in countries in which youth policy is based on the narrower and more adult point of view, there seems to be a tendency to regard youth as a resource more than a problem. However, there are some major departures from these general correlations. The United Kingdom, in which youth policies cover adolescents and young adults is the country where the image of youth as a problem is most obvious. And in Finland, where youth policies cover both children and youth, the image of youth as a resource is predominant (IARD, 2001: 58).

An important aim of youth policy is the integration of young people into adult society. Whilst this may be seen as a goal of youth policy in general, it takes different forms depending on the social and political contexts (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 446). It has come to be generally accepted that young people should be at the heart of youth policy, not as clients, but as actors and contributors to this dynamic process (Council of Europe, 1998: 1). In 1991, on the occasion of the Asia-Pacific Youth Seminar, Tunku Abdul Rahman, the first Prime Minister of Malaysia, stated: ‘If we are to be
true statesmen, we must take into account the needs, desires and the ambitions of the generations for whom we plan our development. No architect would build a house without consulting the wishes of those who live in it, and designing the house to their way of life’ (ESCAP, 1999: 4).

ESCAP (1999: 7-8) illustrate the rationale for a national youth policy through three important elements. First, the youth constitute a unique group within society. While they are often considered one of the most vulnerable groups within the social fabric, they are also regarded as the greatest source of hope for a nation’s future. Second, they represent a significant portion of the world’s population. Third, there is a rich regional and international history of recognising the importance of the youth policy formulation processes. This mandates nations to take immediate steps to ensure that they have a national youth policy and an accompanying plan of action.

According to ESCAP (1999: 5), a successful national youth policy should empower, enable and encourage youth, maximise their participation in society and ensure stronger coordination between the various organisations concerned with its delivery. The ESCAP (1999: 10) outlines the benefits of a national youth policy:

- It fosters a stronger spirit of cooperation between young and old;
- It creates common goals for youth, the government, NGOs and the private sector;
- It provides a way to plan for the future of youth;
- It raises the profile of youth as an important group within society;

In a similar vein, UNESCO (2005: 5) states that when there is an effort to formulate a national youth policy, it serves as a symbol of that society’s commitment to its young citizens. It can provide for an engagement of young people in decision-making processes within their own country through active participation in the formulation and implementation of youth policies.

The successful implementation of a national youth policy requires the involvement of different agencies. The ESCAP’s (1999: 5) assessment of national youth policies asserts that ‘effective youth policies can play a major role in creating an enabling environment in which youth can develop their full potential and aspirations through the
creation of a framework of action for all agencies and organisations interested in the
needs and contributions of young women and men’.

The main pre-condition of the policy formulation process should be the
development of appropriate policy-development vehicles which involve young people
and NGOs from the early stages. A successful policy-formulation process comprises
the following elements:

- The allocation of adequate resources (time, human resources and budget);
- A strong partnership between key stakeholders;
- The active participation of young people at all stages of the formulation process;
- The coupling of national youth policies with action plans;
- The mainstreaming of youth policies in the policy environment (UNESCO, 2005: 5).

The importance and relevance of national youth policy formulation processes have
been recognised in the Asian and Pacific region for nearly two decades. In 1981, as a
direct response to the question, ‘Why do we need a national youth policy?’ youth
workers at an ESCAP meeting suggested that a national youth policy must have the
following elements:

- Provides the parliament with an effective means of declaring to the nation the
  importance of youth in national development;
- Acts as a sign and symbol of the commitment of the nation to the priority it attaches to
  youth;
- Provides a rallying point, a means of challenge and appeal to the youth generation to
  mobilise their resources and participate effectively in national development;
- Provides an appeal to all citizens to give priority to youth concerns;
- Demonstrates the distinctive and complementary roles of governments, non-
governmental organisations (NGOs) and youth groups in youth development and
  provides a framework of common goals and the development of a spirit of cooperation
  and coordination;
- Identifies the needs and aspirations of youth;
- Provides, through the processes of both formulation and subsequent discussion, an
  example of how youth can engage in the decision-making process of the country
  (ESCAP, 1999: 7).
Although these responses were made almost twenty years ago, they remain relevant today. They provide a solid basis for understanding the rationale for the formulation of youth policy. According to the World Bank’s World Development Report 2007 on ‘Development and the Next Generation’, there are three main reasons why it is difficult to develop successful policies directed at young people. First, a successful youth policy requires working across many sectors to develop one coherent, holistic and inter-sectoral strategy, with clear priorities and measures for concrete action. Second, youth policy fails because young people have not had a voice in the design and implementation of the policies that affect them. Third, success in youth policy is challenged by the fact that there are few success stories and examples of best practice (World Bank, 2007: 211-212).

Youth policies are more likely to be successful if youth issues are well integrated into national planning and implementation mechanisms. Williamson (2002: 35), who has played a central role in the international youth policy review process of the Council of Europe, has argued that there are five component features to youth policy, which can be labelled “the five C’s”:

- Coverage (geographical area and social groups that are covered, plus policy domains);
- Capacity (the role and relationship of government and youth NGOs);
- Competence (the question of training and qualifications);
- Co-operation, co-ordination and coherence (hierarchically and horizontally);
- Cost (the financial and human resources required).

Williamson (2002: 49) states that a national youth policy framework needs to address certain key ‘arenas’ or ‘domains’ and issues as follows:

**Table 1.2: Key Policy Domain and Key Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Policy Domain</th>
<th>Key Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education (schooling and non-formal learning/youth work);</td>
<td>opportunities for participation and citizenship;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-compulsory education and training;</td>
<td>safety and protection;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment and the labour market;</td>
<td>combating social exclusion and promoting inclusion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the provision and use of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• health, housing and family welfare;
• social protection and income support;
• criminal justice;
• leisure (including sports and arts);
• national defence and military service.

information (including new information technologies);
• mobility and internationalism;
• multiculturalism;
• equalities.

1.8 Development of Youth Policy in Europe and Asia

Wallace and Bendit (2009: 441) state that ‘youth policy may be a marginal field of social policy, and in many countries, the idea of youth as an object of social policy is hardly acknowledged at all.’ Williamson (2008: 66) holds that no more than 15 years ago, there was little or no talk of ‘youth policy’ at national, let alone European level. It did exist, of course, in various forms in different countries, but was not debated or constructed through any rational, reflective, transversal or coherent mechanism. It should be noted, however, that the Irish government had appointed a National Youth Policy Committee (NYP) as early as 1983 with twenty-four members, chaired by a High Court judge and former parliamentarian Declan Costello (Devlin, 2008: 41).

It has already been suggested that youth policy can be best considered as a subset of social policy. In its modern form, social policy began to emerge in ‘western’ societies in the late 19th century as a response to changes and challenges associated with industrialisation, urbanisation, technological innovation and intellectual/ideological ferment. Philanthropic individuals, organisations, researchers and individuals have also played a key role in providing innovative responses to pressing social problems (Chisholm et al., 2011: 26).

Williamson (2007b: 100) points out that all countries have a youth policy - by intent, default or neglect which has an effect on young people and on their future hopes. Young people have to live their lives, whether the context is active or passive, purposeful or punitive, enabling or restrictive, supportive or regressive. The policy of neglect implies that some countries do very little for young people. By reducing or
diminishing their active focus on young people, some countries resort to a policy of
default. However, an increasing number of countries subscribe to a policy of intent,
which stems from the age-old saying that their young people are their future, and so
they endeavour to frame policies purposefully on their behalf (Williamson, 2007a: 57).
The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP, 1999: 1)
states that in 1990s ‘within Asia and the Pacific a variety of countries have taken up
the national youth policy formulation and action plan challenge. Many countries in the
region were in the initial phases of the youth policy formulation process. Attempts are
also being made to maximise youth participation in both the policy formulation arena
and within civil society as a whole’.

1.8.1 The Development of Youth Policy in Europe

In contemporary Europe, youth issues seem to enjoy a higher profile through
the European Union and the Council of Europe than they do in many (but not all) other
national contexts (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 441). The concept of youth policy is well
established in Europe. European institutions (EU and CoE) have become strong
advocates for the development of national policies that aim to improve the situation of
young people (Denstad, 2009: 9). These institutions have significance ‘for youth,
youth work and youth policy’, as illustrated by Devlin (2010: 66). Although there are
differences in dealing with issues and priorities of young people in each of the member
states of the EU, there are also possibilities for a common, shared agenda in the social,
economic and political objectives of the countries of Europe (Williamson, 2007a: 57).
Some European countries have intentionally committed themselves to formulate
policies and programmes to facilitate the inclusion and participation of young people
(Williamson, 2002: 15-16). A clear example has been articulated as follows:

In countries with a long tradition for a national youth policy and an extensive youth
sector – primarily countries in Northern Continental Europe – the static youth policy
concept is predominant. In countries where a co-ordinated youth policy has been
introduced rather late, and in countries where major revisions of youth policies are
being implemented – the Mediterranean countries, the British Isles, and Denmark – the
youth policy concept is more dynamic and emphasis is put on recent changes in youth
work, in youth provisions and on the interaction between policy actors (IARD, 2001:
Part I-2).
Youth policies in European countries vary considerably for a number of reasons: different welfare regimes, different traditions of youth work, different conceptions of youth, and the absence of a consistent national youth policy and state regulation which results in youth policies frequently being delegated to local or regional level. A further complication is the involvement of different NGOs, actors and institutions (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 442). There is also some variation in responding legislatively to the issues of the young people within European institutions. Some examples are as follows:

- **BELGIUM**: Laws and legislative acts pertaining to young people's rights and wellbeing exist in all Communities (Flemish, French and German-speaking);
- **DENMARK**: There is no specific youth law or youth legislation;
- **GERMANY**: Legislation on child and youth;
- **ESTONIA**: The Youth Work Act was adopted in 1999; the renewed law came into force in 2010;
- **IRELAND**: The Youth Work Act was adopted in 2001;
- **FRANCE**: There is no specific youth law. However, legislation which covers young people exists in various areas, such as education, employment, social affairs, health, justice, professional training (European Commission, 2012: 10).

An important catalyst for the development of youth policy in the European context was the 1968 student unrest, which drew the attention of governments towards the aspirations of young people. Following this event, both the European Economic Community (EEC) as it was then called and the Council of Europe initiated different programmes including the Youth Colloquium and the European Youth Centre in Strasbourg respectively. By the 1980s, focus on young people and engagement with them widened in Europe. Young people received recognition during the UN International Youth Year (1985) and the value of participation, dialogue and intercultural links was appreciated across the EU. During this period, the first Council of Europe Conference for Ministers of Youth met in Strasbourg with a resultant increase in interest and concern towards intercultural learning and tolerance. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the consequent expansion of the Council of Europe and of the EU led to a systematic European focus on young people and on youth policy (Williamson, 2007a: 58).
The European Institutions (EU and CoE) contributed to the development of youth policy in Europe through individual and collective initiatives. Devlin (2010: 66) observes: ‘The CoE has played a pioneering role in these matters, and has had a significant influence on the approach adopted by the EU. In fact the two work closely together and in more recent years have formalised their collaboration through the EU-CoE Youth Partnership’. Moreover, for more than twenty years, the main priorities of the European Commission have been to promote opportunities for mobility and to develop mechanisms for exchange and cooperation among young people (Denstad, 2009: 34).

From the first meeting of the Ministers of Youth (CoE) in Strasbourg (1985) to the sixth meeting in Thessaloniki (2002), a wide programme of action on behalf of youth was articulated as follows: ‘participation’, the need for ‘comprehensive’ youth policies, gender equality, meeting the needs of young people at risk, promoting youth mobility, cultivating enterprise, improving training, ensuring youth rights, enhancing access to information (Williamson, 2007a: 60). Although the idea of a European ‘youth policy’ remained somewhat fragile, at the meeting of the European Youth Ministers in Bucharest (1998), the idea of ‘the youth policy of the Council of Europe’ was formally articulated as follows:

- To help young people meet the challenges facing them and achieve their aspirations;
- To strengthen civil society through training for democratic citizenship, in a non-formal educational context;
- To encourage young people’s participation in society;
- To support the development of youth policies;
- To seek ways of promoting youth mobility in Europe (Williamson, 2007b: 100).

In July 2010, the two major European institutions signed a new framework partnership agreement, informed by their respective strategic priorities as set out in the Council of Europe’s Agenda 2020 (2008), the European Commission's Investing and Empowering (2009) and the subsequent Resolution of the Council of the European Union (2009). From 2010 to 2013, the Youth Partnership adopted priority objectives in relation to social inclusion of young people as follows: democracy and human rights; democratic citizenship and youth participation; intercultural dialogue and diversity (Devlin, 2010: 78).
The European institutions initiated an action plan to create an evidence-based youth policy concept, developed and supported by the European Knowledge Centre on Youth Policy (EKCYP) and the Pool of European Youth Researchers (PEYR) (Devlin, 2010: 79). The European intergovernmental institutions (CoE and EU) and international agencies became strong advocates of the development of national youth policies in Europe through their resolutions and documents. They set a way to develop a European/international standard of youth policy. Not all of their initiatives led to a blueprint for a national youth policy since they only suggest certain criteria, indicators and lists of areas to be covered within such a policy (Denstad, 2009: 21-22). In 2010, an important EU Council resolution on youth work supports and recognises the following:

- Young people as an integral part of society;
- The participation of young people in democratic life;
- The benefits, complementary nature and the role of youth work;
- The link between youth policy, youth work and other related programmes;
- The value of research in youth work and youth policy;
- The structured dialogue with young people (Council of the European Union, 2010; Devlin, 2010: 73).

When Ireland held the presidency of the Council of the EU for the 7th time from January to June 2013, various key measures and programmes to promote jobs and growth were undertaken. The Irish presidency also supported and recognised the contribution of youth policy and quality youth work in achieving the development, wellbeing and social inclusion of young people in line with the strategy of Europe 2020 (European Commission, 2013).

1.8.2 The Development of Youth Policy in the Asia-Pacific Region

Growth in Asia’s youth population, defined as those in the 15-24 age group, peaked at just over 750 million in 2010, according to the most recent estimates (United Nations, 2011; Mason and Lee, 2012: 61). As already sated, the youth population in the Asian-Pacific region is vast as well as being socially, economically and culturally diverse. In this region, young people currently have better opportunities than ever before. They participate in, and benefit from, advancement of social, economic and
political developments. They also have to face major challenges (ESCAP, 2007: vii). In the 1960s, young people in this region were influenced by the student unrest in the West. They joined the protest movement against the political system, first by expressing their solidarity with the West, and then by showing their own discontent with government programmes. This situation forced international agencies to intervene, to place youth on their priority agenda and to initiate programmes for youth in the West, some of which were implemented worldwide (Atal, 2005: 9). It has been suggested that governments and international agencies developed programmes for youth, rather than specifically for students because in the West, the categories of youth and student are almost synonymous (this is of course debatable). Furthermore, youth was a neutral category compared to students who were spearheading protests. Leaders felt the need to stem the growing alienation among them (ibid).

The General Assembly of the United Nations (in its resolution 60/2 of 6 October 2005) urged world governments to develop holistic and integrated youth policies (based on the World Programme of Action for Youth) in consultation with youth organisations. It recommended that each country develop a long-term, consensus-based, integrated and cross-sector youth policy (ESCAP, 2007: vii). During the International Year of Youth 2010-2011, the Asia-Pacific Interagency Group on Youth urged governments and civil society to place young people on the policy agenda and to develop and implement policies that address the rights of adolescents and of youth within their regions (ESCAP, 2011a: i).

The responses to issues affecting of young people vary from country to country with national youth policies in varying stages of development. For example, in this region, Australia, China, India, Malaysia, the Republic of Korea and Singapore have shown considerable interest in formulating and implementing a comprehensive and integrated youth policy at national level. They also have differences in how they respond to youth issues and needs (ESCAP, 2007a: 4). Furthermore, a large number of countries in the region have adopted national policies and legislation on youth-related issues: education, employment, health, and youth participation. However, the implementation of such policies and programmes remains problematic due to a lack of commitment, resources, coordination, and implementation mechanisms (ibid: 2). A review of youth policies from the Asia-Pacific region shows the variety of approaches
to developing and implementing policies about and for youth. This review states that countries may have elements of the following policies:

- One national youth policy that looks at all significant issues relating to young people;
- A number of sector-specific policies to target young people: health, education, youth employment, or alcohol and drug prevention;
- Youth issues mainstreamed through existing national policies such as national injury prevention or drug and alcohol policies, and those addressing gender and reproductive health policy practices situated in strategy documents or legislation (ESCAP, 2011a: 9).

In 1931, the Commonwealth, which India joined in 1947, established and influenced the development of youth policy in Asia. In 1974, the Commonwealth governments established the Commonwealth Youth Programme (CYP) to promote the wellbeing and development of young men and women throughout the Commonwealth. CYP’s three major strategy areas are National Youth Policy, Human Resource Development and Youth Empowerment (Government of India, 2008: 20). The Commonwealth also encourages, through various international exchanges for youth, the promotion of ideas, values and culture amongst the youth of different countries and the development of international understanding (Government of India, 2011: 22-23). The main objectives of the Commonwealth Youth Programme are as follows: to work towards the empowerment of young women and men in society; to enhance their creativity and skills; to facilitate full participation at every level of decision-making, development, to promote Commonwealth values of international co-operation, social justice, democracy and human rights (Government of India, 2008: 20).

1.9 Comparative Dimensions of Youth Policy

Comparing youth policy in Europe and Asia is very challenging because of the immense diversity in culture, political systems, conditions of young people, conception and definition of youth, conceptualisation of youth policy, etc. (IARD, 2001: 2). There is a continuous struggle in Europe and Asia to develop and to identify youth-related indicators that need to be compared. For example, various EUROSTAT initiatives compare different countries focusing directly or indirectly on the life conditions of young people in Europe in areas such as education, employment, housing, health, etc.
(Bendit, 2006: 66). In 1980, UNESCO conducted a survey in nine countries to identify different youth indicators that can be used for comparative study (Atal, 2005: 12). The results of the questionnaire were published under the following indicators: youth and unemployment; youth in slums; political socialisation of youth; drug abuse among youth; youth attitudes and aspirations (Agrawal and Aggarwal, 1988: 221).

In comparing the youth policies of different countries, it has been found helpful to develop typologies so that various policies can be categorised (Walther et al., 2002: 27). The welfare regime approach of Esping-Andersen (1990) influenced Walther (2006), Pohl and Walther (2007), Wallace and Bendit (2009) and others in identifying different youth policy regimes. In Europe, Wallace and Bendit (2009: 445) and the Instituto di Ricerca (IARD, 2001) report on the ‘state of young people and youth policy in Europe’ suggest that youth policy can be divided into four categories corresponding to the types of welfare regimes identified by Gallie and Paugam (Walther et al., 2002: 30). These welfare regimes may be re-labelled according to the most important characteristics of youth policies such as the universalistic model, the community-based model, the protective model and the centralised model (Walther et al., 2002: 30; Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 445).

With the realisation that dawned after the student unrest of the 1960s, youth across the globe came to be considered as the future and the greatest resources of both Europe and Asia. In both continents, most of the countries have youth policies, some with underpinning legislation and others based on programmes and policy documents. Many local and international agencies have intervened to take initiatives to coordinate and to support individual countries in the formulation of their respective youth policies.

Despite the vast diversity that exists in defining youth due to the social, political, cultural, economic and historical contexts of Europe and Asia, as illustrated in the present chapter, a comparative study of youth policies might reveal certain similarities and differences that would aid a better understanding of youth issues and contribute to improved policy responses. Employing Gough’s (2008; 2011) five determinants of social policy, this thesis seeks to compare the youth policies of Ireland and India. These industrialisation, interest groups, institutions, ideas and international
agencies “Five I’s” are used as a conceptual framework for this study and are outlined in more detail in the next chapter.
Chapter Two

Conceptual Framework: Comparative Youth Policy

A major objective of international comparative studies is to discover the differences and similarities in issues concerning youth within societies, cultures or social systems. A further aim is to acquire a better knowledge and understanding of one’s own society and culture by taking an ‘external’ reference point. Many governments have engaged in joint efforts to improve young people’s lives and to involve them at all levels of decision-making on issues that impact on them. There is, for instance, a continuous struggle in Europe and in Asia to develop and to identify youth-related indicators that may become the subject of comparative studies. However, comparing youth policies in Europe and Asia is very challenging because of the immense diversity in culture, political systems, conditions of young people, concepts of youth and conceptualisation of youth policy. This chapter seeks to define and to contextualise the youth policies of Ireland and of India by offering a comparison between the two countries.

Ian Gough’s model of social policy-making, based originally on a study of the revenue system in welfare states, provides a useful conceptual framework for pursuing a comparative study on the youth policies of India and Ireland. A detailed study of the “five I’s” model will therefore be presented in this chapter, with a specific focus on youth and youth policy.

2.1 Ian Gough’s “Five I’s” and the Youth Context

The “five I’s” Gough (2008: 44) included in his social policy-making model are as follows: industrialisation, interests, institutions, ideas and international environment. Youth policy comes under the broad umbrella of social policy and therefore Gough’s model of social policy-making is used as a conceptual framework to compare youth policy in Ireland and in India. The uniqueness of my research is that in drawing on Gough’s “Five I’s”, along with some additional sub-categories that are used as an analytical lens to look at the factors and actors that influence youth policy in Ireland and in India, Gough’s model moves beyond the European context and is, therefore, highly suitable for my research. His model has already been presented in
Chapter One and I have reflected further on his conceptual framework and added additional arrows in order to indicate the mutual influences of these factors and actors.

As mentioned in Chapter One, the reason why I chose this particular framework is because in the course of my research I discovered many different models used for comparative study including Esping-Andersen (1990) whose welfare regime model (liberal, conservative, social democratic) is applicable only in the European context. Based on his approach, Walther (2006), Pohl and Walther (2007), Wallace and Bendit (2009) and the Instituto di Ricerca (IARD, 2001) report on the ‘state of young people and youth policy in Europe’ identify different youth policy regimes which are also used in the European context. These welfare regimes may be re-labelled according to the most important characteristics of youth policies such as the universalistic model, the community-based model, the protective model and the centralised model.

Gough’s framework is not used to prove or test any theory but is rather used as an analytical lens for comparative purposes. The sub-categories under each of the “Five I’s” are not exhaustive and additional ones may be added. As shown in the figure below under each of the “five I’s” the sub-categories are only minutely modified from their original formulation. All of the “five I’s” are interrelated and influence each other as indicated by the arrows. These different factors and actors influence the institution (state) to formulate policies and legislation (output) and to create a better and safer environment for the well-being (outcome) of the young people. An adapted version making reference to youth policy is provided in Figure 2.1.
Each dimension in this model is discussed in more detail below.

### 2.2 Industrialisation

Industrialisation has brought about economic, demographic, social, educational and technological changes that have affected the wellbeing of young people and forced national governments and international agencies to intervene with new or amended policies. These changes have influenced young people’s relationships with family and friends, experience in education, the labour market, leisure and lifestyles and the ability to become independent adults (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997: 1). Industrialisation also created its own unique class structures which have undergone significant changes in recent decades, with the rise of post-industrial societies. The persistence of such class-based inequalities in capitalist societies suggests that there is still the existence of class with its impact on youth and wider society (Hout et al., 1993: 270).

#### 2.2.1 Economic Change

The classic sociological theorists struggled to understand and to explain the changes they witnessed in the nineteenth century as upheavals, associated with the birth of the modern society brought about a new world. This new world was
significantly different from the traditional, feudal or peasant society that had existed previously in Europe. Marx, for instance, emphasised the force of the economy as the motor of change while Weber and Durkheim placed a greater emphasis on culture, belief and the growth of rationality as a principle of organisation (Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998: 3-4). The fact remains, however, that rapid industrialisation brought about economic upheavals that needed immediate attention.

In order to meet these changing requirements, every industrial society was under pressure to develop income and occupational structures underpinned by social policies. This, in turn, as Burden (1998: 25) has shown, necessitates the following important structural changes in society:

- A mass educational system in order to ensure that the required skills and knowledge were available and that employers had the widest possible pool from which to draw;
- Health services to ensure a healthy and contented workforce;
- Social services to reduce dependence on the extended family, allowing social and geographical mobility which is needed for the efficient use of labour.

The changes in the 1970s with the ‘de-industrialisation’ of some Western-European societies involved the closure of traditional manufacturing and extractive industries such as mining, steel production and ship-building or their transfer to developing countries and more recently to Eastern Europe. This led to the disappearance of jobs in some traditional areas (Wallace and Kovatcheva, 1998: 5). At the same time, the arrival of post-industrial society identified a number of major shifts in the structure of Western society, notably the move from a manufacturing to a service economy. Other important changes include the apparent decline of the working class and the rise of professional and technical groups which in turn contributed to the expansion of the universities from the 1960s. These changes were seen as presenting a fundamental challenge to the basis of industrialism, with the creation of a different kind of society, one that is dominated by technology and automation (Phillipson, 2009: 58).

The evolution of industrial society in developed countries and the erosion of traditional systems of social support based on kinship and patrimonial agrarianism increased expenditure in the welfare state. This in turn created new demands on public
spending. Furthermore, dependence on wage labour created new vulnerabilities among those with little or no labour to sell, such as the old, the sick, and – most relevant in the present context - the young (Myles and Quadagno, 2002: 36). In general researchers agree that ‘economic growth and its demographic and bureaucratic outcomes are the root causes of the general emergence of the welfare state’ (Gough, 2008: 44). The demographic change included rising life expectancy and the expansion of an ageing population. As one commentator remarks: ‘If there is one source of welfare spending that is most powerful, a single proximate cause, it is the proportion of old people in the population’ (Wilensky, 1975: 47). Obviously such demographic change also has profound implications for youth and youth policy, and it is therefore discussed further below.

2.2.2 Demographic Change

Before the significant demographic shifts resulting directly from the industrial revolution, life was short, the birth rate was high, growth was slow and the majority of the population was young. During the transition, first mortality and then fertility declined, causing population rates first to accelerate and then to slow again, moving towards low fertility, long life and an older population. The transition began around 1800 with declining mortality in Europe and has now spread to all parts of the world. This global demographic transition has brought momentous changes, reshaping the economic and demographic life cycles of individuals and restructuring populations (Lee, 2003: 167).

Today the world’s population is very young. Almost half of the current global population is under the age of 25 with 1.2 billion young people worldwide. The next generation of youth (children presently below the age of 15) will be significantly larger, numbering 1.8 billion (United Nations, 2012). For young people in almost all parts of the world, the transition to adulthood is perhaps more complex and contested than in any previous era. The sheer speed of neoliberal economic and social reforms in many parts of the world has resulted in profound changes in young people’s experiences. Nations are implicated in a changing global order in which government disinvestment in welfare measures, transnational economic competition, high rates of unemployment, and economic recession are increasing pressures on parents and young people (Jeffrey and McDowell, 2004: 131). European as well as Asian countries have
experienced substantial demographic change both as a cause and as a consequence of the social and economic transformation of the region (Hugo, 2005: 60). The demographics of youth (defined as persons between ages 15–24) reflect tectonic shifts in health, education, and the economy.

In Europe and Asia, the changes in fertility and mortality rates have produced major shifts in age structure (Hugo, 2005: 62; Gough, 2008: 45). As Westley and Choe (2002: 57) point out, the youth bulge ‘is the result of a transition from high to low fertility about 15 years earlier. The youth bulge consists of large numbers of adolescents and young adults who were born when fertility was high followed by declining numbers of children born after fertility declined’ (Hugo, 2005: 62). Some writers have defined the so-called ‘youth bulge’ as a situation in which at least 20 per cent of a national population are aged 15-24. A ‘youth deficit’, on the other hand, occurs when the proportion falls below fifteen per cent. Commentators have ascribed particular problems to societies experiencing these bulges and deficits. On the one hand, countries experiencing youth bulges are considered to be more volatile since the large numbers of young people coming into the labour market may be frustrated by the status quo (Fuller and Hoch, 1998 cited in Hugo, 2005: 67). On the other hand, where there are youth deficits there may be problems of labour shortages (Xenos, 2001 cited in Hugo, 2005: 67).

There is a relationship between economic growth and demographic transition which is usually analysed with the dependency ratio and the support ratio. In Europe and Asia, there is a rapid change in age structure which policy makers need to note in making effective policy. Since World War II, developing countries have been undergoing a demographic transition at varying rates and times, from high to low rates of mortality and of fertility. The Asian youth bulge represents “a ‘boom’ generation – a generation that is larger than those immediately before and after it – that is gradually working its way through nations’ age structure” (Bloom, Canning and Sevilla, 2003: xii). The passage of this bulge through the age structure can produce a ‘demographic dividend’ of economic growth when the bulge passes into the working age groups, and as a result, the workforce grows faster than the overall population (Hugo, 2005: 67). The dividend arises – or has the potential to arise – as each generation passes through a particular point in its demographic transition. During these years, the maximum proportion of the population moves into the key working and income-earning age
groups, and the minimum (comprised of youth and the elderly) is notionally dependent
(Jackson, 2001: 83). For example, the East Asian nations were at the forefront of this
transition; other regions, including Latin America, began their transitions later, in the
1960s and 1970s. Yet other areas, notably some countries in the Middle East and
Africa, have not yet fully begun this transition, or are in the early phases (Bloom et al.,
2003: xiii).

Moreover, David Bloom, David Canning and Jaypee Sevilla (2003) contend
that by focusing on age-structural changes (rather than on simple population growth) it
is possible to explain the link between demographic change and economic growth. The
‘demographic dividend’ is amplified as ‘fertility rates fall during the demographic
transition, if countries act wisely before and during the transition, a special window
opens up for faster economic growth and human development’ (Ibid). Thus, for the
instance, in the Republic of Korea, as the birth rate fell in the mid-1960s, elementary
school enrolments declined and funds previously allocated for elementary education
were used to improve the quality of education at higher levels. Indeed, in 2000 the
population pyramids for Korea and Nigeria demonstrate that there are different
population dynamics at work. In Korea, the bulge is at the working ages whereas in
Nigeria the young who are dependent stand out in that predominantly poor country. It
is clear that the demographic dividend does not last forever and is not automatic (Ross,
2004: 1). According to Bloom et al., (2003: 40-41) the demographic dividend is
delivered through a number of mechanisms and the most important are labour supply,
savings, and human capital investment.

With proactive and timely investment in the youthful base of the population,
there is potential to convert the demographic dividend into two successive economic
windfalls. The first occurs as fertility decline causes youthful dependency to fall and
the last large waves of young adults flood into the work force. The second occurs at the
youth move on into the higher income earning age groups. However, the window of
opportunity to invest in the first dividend is shown to be fleeting while failure to invest
in that stage seriously compromises the second (Jackson, 2001: 83).

The demographic dividend is not permanent or automatic and governments
need to make use of the opportunity by formulating appropriate policies at the right
time and to invest in education and health of young people which will in turn help the
growth of the nation. ‘A failure to act on these issues could have a damaging effect on future prospects, as unemployment rises, the social fabric crumbles, and rising numbers of old people begin to overwhelm available resources. …Embracing and understanding demographic challenges must therefore be a priority for all governments…’ (Ross, 2004: 7). For example, the decline in economic growth rates following the Asian economic crisis of 1997-98 threatened to reduce the favourable economic impact of the demographic dividend in Asia (Hugo, 2005: 69). Gubhaju (2013: 10) states that “since the 1970s, all sub-regions of Asia have experienced significant increases in their working-age populations during various stages of demographic transition. This growth of a working-age population that has fewer dependent children and elderly to support is known as the ‘demographic dividend’ because it provides a window of opportunity to build human capital”. It should be noted, however, that demography influences policy development, including youth policy, whether or not there is such a ‘dividend’.

2.2.3 Social-Structural Change

2.2.3.1 Individualism

In the process of modernisation, western societies became evermore individualistic. At the individual level, this involved both greater awareness of one’s own preferences and greater ability to act independently. At the societal level, individualisation involved greater freedom and a change in social regulation from normative prescription to negotiation. These developments are linked to several other modernisation processes, such as the growing division of labour, the extension of youth and the expansion of education (Veenhoven, 1999: 157). Individualistic values tend to characterise cultures in industrialised countries with free-market economies, because such economies reward individual initiative and individual striving (Arnett, 2005: 30).

There is also a growing concern regarding the concept of collectivism and its opposite, individualism, in explaining cross-cultural differences in behaviour, customs and values (Hofstede, 2001 and Schimmack et al., 2005 cited in Power et al., 2010).
Realo et al., (2008: 448 cited in Power et al., 2010) clearly define these two related terms as follows:

Collectivism considers a group (e.g., family, tribe, or state) as the primary unit of reality and requires that individuals sacrifice themselves for the alleged interests of the collective. Individualism in turn is a system of beliefs, attitudes, and values according to which a human being should think and judge independently, respecting nothing more than the sovereignty of his or her own interests and goals.

The impact of globalisation and economic development also challenge Asian youth to move from collectivism to individualism. Thus, for example, Xiaoying (2005: 187) states that in China ‘youth are being influenced by Western culture, to prefer individualism to collectivism and mass propaganda and ideological control are no longer effective’.

The neoliberal theory assumes the individual to be a naturally autonomous and self-determining agent and claims that an individual performs best without the constraints of social institutions (Harvey, 2005). Recent studies on the individual by Ulrich Beck and others emphasise the tensions between the increasing demands for individuality, choice, and freedom on the one hand, and the complex and unavoidable dependence of individuals on social institutions on the other (Beck, 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002; Giddens, 1991; Giddens, 1992). Although there is a certain form of social constraint from family, kinship, community, and social class, the modern social structures, as evident in Western and Asian urban society, compel people to become proactive and self-determining individuals who must take full responsibility for their own problems (Yan, 2011: 207).

Today, some countries promote youth autonomy. For example in the Nordic countries, young people are rather independent of their families, since they tend to leave home and live independently at a relatively young age as compared with other European regions. They are effectively ‘paid to be young’ and supported as such by the welfare state. However, in the Southern European countries, concern with youth autonomy comes from a different source. In these countries, there is a lengthy dependence upon the family and most young people live at home (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 446). Fahey and Gale (2005: 4) state that because of the impact of globalisation
and economic development in Asia ‘young people spend longer in education, marry later, have fewer children, and more women work’.

2.2.3.2 Family

According to William Goode’s famous model of world revolution and family patterns (1963), industrialisation and urbanisation inevitably lead to a shift from an extended family system to a conjugal family system, that is, “toward fewer kinship ties with distant relatives and a greater emphasis on the ‘nuclear’ family unit of couple and children” (Goode, 1963: 1). Goode’s argument has been challenged by a series of historical studies demonstrating that nuclear families prevailed long before industrialisation in Western Europe, (Stone, 1975; Mitterauer and Sieder, 1982). Further, evidence from developing countries like India reveals that extended families may fit well into market economies undergoing industrialisation (Dasgupta et al., 1993: 339-358).

The most important part of Goode’s thesis is his interpretation of the worldwide trend towards the centrality of the conjugal relationship in family life, rather than the dualism of extended families versus nuclear families (Yan, 2011: 207). Goode’s arguments on the influence of industrialisation on the family may be presented as follows: geographic mobility, social mobility, ‘achieved’ occupational status, and increased specialisation and functional differentiation of the social structure (Starbuck, 2001: 3).

The family is undoubtedly the most important institution in people’s interpersonal lives, yet it has been changing dramatically in ways that affect both young people’s interpersonal experiences and what will be required of them as adults (Larson et al., 2002: 33-35). Tomasik et al., (2012: 31) refer to the following trends in the changing nature of family: ‘family size and composition, the institution of marriage, urbanisation and increased family mobility and parent adolescent relationships.’ These factors affect young people’s lives positively as well as negatively. Quah and Ghaleb, (2003: 3) also observe through their study that ‘Asian families have undergone structural changes over the past decade the following are the prominent features: longer postponement of marriage and an increase in divorces’.
They also state that there is a significant variation across Asian countries in the nature and intensity of those changes.

The current socio-economic changes in society and global awareness and recognition of the rights and needs of people, both in rich and poor countries have challenged the existing traditional family institution. This important change in the traditional family unit affects young people and challenges governments and policy makers to respond appropriately. Drucker (2009: 830-831) states that ‘today in most societies the prevailing family and community structures are organised in ways that maintain and perpetuate male domination of women, heteronormativity, and other inequitable social relations. …This means that family and community structures dictated by ideology and tradition need to be modified, starting from the dynamics of struggle and self-organisation’. At the global level, the struggle continues in different developed and developing countries in recognising rights and needs of the lesbian / gay / bisexual / transgender (LGBT) people. The change in family pattern with reference to same-sex union was recognised in 1989 when the government of Denmark implemented a national same-sex union (SSU) policy (Kollman, 2007: 329). In the intervening period, many other countries have legislated in a similar manner. These include Ireland, where same-sex civil partnership has been legislated for and same-sex marriage has become a matter of political discussion.

2.2.4 Education, Employment and Health

Economic growth has created an urgent need for trained young people as well as for change in educational and occupational structures in ways that give young workers a competitive advantage (Pampel and Weiss, 1983: 350). The modern labour market is characterised by a decline of routine work, growth in information technologies, and a shift towards a service economy. There is an increased need for teaming up with others and to prepare youth for these challenges. At the global level, educational systems have been forced to change. Schools and colleges have begun promoting knowledge management and soft skills, such as communicating effectively, critical thinking, and problem solving (Jerald, 2009).

Education has long been considered as a universal catalyst for poverty reduction, health improvements and overall social-economic development (Worthman,
Jeffrey and McDowell (2004: 132) state that both in Western and non-Western countries the value of formal education is recognised as a means of combating entrenched privilege and creating human capital by the young people themselves, the family, government, non-governmental organisations, and local people. Yet such ideas have routinely been the subject of criticism: from the radical de-schoolers to scholars who stress the role of formal education in creating failure as a social label. Others have pointed to the role of school and post-school education in the reproduction of overt national, religious, gendered, class identities and class beliefs. Young people in many areas, and particularly the poor, are trapped between declining state support and increasing familial and personal ambitions (ibid). Although this is a worldwide trend, considerable differences among countries exist, depending on the legislation regulating access to secondary and higher education and on economic prosperity. Furthermore, individual characteristics, such as family socioeconomic status, remain important determinants of participation in further education (Tomasik et al., 2012: 28-29).

Young people’s experiences are key in shaping the future of society. Their ambitions, goals and aspirations for peace, security, development and human rights are often in accord with those of society as a whole (United Nations, 2005: iii). The basic objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives, but this is often forgotten in the immediate concern with the accumulation of commodities and financial wealth (Ul Haq, 1990: 9). The word ‘development’ has various meanings that reflect foundational assumptions about relationships between the individual and society, particularly with regard to human welfare and these assumptions permeate research, policy, and programmes (Worthman, 2011: 434). Human development on the societal level (society human development, or SHD) may be defined as “‘a process of enlarging people’s choices’, particularly the acquisition and use of capabilities ‘to lead a long and healthy life, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living’. Additional choices, highly valued by many people, range from political, economic and social freedom to opportunities for being creative and productive, and enjoying personal self-respect and guaranteed human rights” (Ul Haq, 1990: 10).

The educational and health initiatives for human development have achieved results on a global scale that include worldwide school enrolments at 67.5 percent of all age-appropriate children, literacy rates of 83.9 percent among adults over age 15,
and a life expectancy of 67.5 years by 2007 (Klugman, 2009). On the other hand, thanks to the global consensus that led to the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), young people are increasingly the focus of international attention because there are over 200 million youth living in poverty, 130 million illiterate, 88 million unemployed, and 10 million living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (HIV/AIDS) (United Nations, 2005: iii). In 2010, the global youth unemployment rate remained at 12.6 per cent (compared to 21.1 per cent in the European Union), dramatically overshadowing the global adult unemployment rate of 4.8 per cent. It is unsurprising, therefore, that during economic downturns, young people are often the ‘last in’ and the ‘first out’ – the last to be hired, and the first to be dismissed (United Nations, 2012). A recent analysis of global trends in labour market detected scant progress towards improving the position of youth in labour markets and concluded that ‘young people still suffer disproportionately from a deficit of decent work opportunities’ (International Labour Organization, 2009: 12).

The gap between economic growth and human development is neatly captured in a formative document of the SHD which asserts that ‘economic growth is essential for human development’ and also that ‘there is no automatic link between economic growth and human progress’ (Worthman, 2011: 439). This situation demands further investment in young people. Moreover, world leaders must also commit themselves to ensuring the well-being of the next generation and the achievement of many of the MDGs (United Nations, 2005: iii).

2.2.5 Technological Revolution

Industrialisation and urbanisation have been accompanied by a number of waves of technological innovation that have shaped the modernisation process. Since the 1980s, the most recent technological revolution has brought about significant changes in both Western and non-Western countries. Among the factors contributing to this have been the flow of information, new ideas, ideals and lifestyles which have altered the way in which citizens develop their aspirations, make sense of their lives, and take actions based on their own decisions. This has had an impact on rural as well as urban and industrialised areas (Yan, 2011: 206).
Young people today are sometimes seen as being in a somewhat privileged or advantageous situation as they are exposed to and trained in the use of modern technology from an early age, and they are often considered more future-oriented, more technologically aware and more interested in technology than adults. This has led some commentators to describe young people today as the ‘Net Generation’, but others criticise such a view and highlight the fact that there are young people who have no opportunity to use modern technology (Lee, 2005: 316).

Since the 1990s, one of the major changes in society has been the adoption of information and communication technologies by a large percentage of the youth population. The Internet and cell phones have become agents of social change because they facilitate the rapid diffusion of information, the creation and maintenance of social networks, and the acceleration of the process of autonomy from parents (Mesch, 2012: 97). Online communication has become an integral part of youth culture. Indeed, its widespread diffusion is associated with the ‘network effect,’ referring to teens’ extensive use of e-mail, instant messaging, and social networking sites. Given that networks reflect social similarity, an important developmental question concerns the extent to which networks used by young people have undergone change (ibid: 98).

Among the consequences of the increased use of the Internet have been an increase in cyber bullying and increased reporting of cyber harassment (Tokunaga, 2010). At the same time the expansion and diversification of young people’s social networks, as well as the perpetual contact with peers, create new social demands and opportunities. The expansion of a young person’s network and the inclusion of strangers can open up new avenues of access to valuable information for the performance of adult roles. Such access may provide access to vocational and labour markets, overcoming restrictions imposed in the past by residential segregation according to socioeconomic status and ethnicity (Mesch, 2012: 103). This situation demands that social systems and families use different strategies to support and guide young people.

Peer relationships and experiences occurring during the early adolescent developmental period can have a long-lasting impact as they are likely to shape identity formation in later adolescence and early adulthood. Bullying is a form of aggressive behaviour that is most pervasive during adolescence. Likewise, long-
standing patterns of victimisation may have their roots in the early adolescent developmental period (Fanti and Kimonis, 2012: 617). It is clear that such critical issues as peer pressure and cyber bullying are now dominant in the formulation of youth policy.

2.3 Interests

Interest groups that can influence youth policy include political parties, youth movements and the voluntary sector. Birkland (2005: 53) explains that there are two categories of participants in policy making: ‘Official and Unofficial actors’. The official actors are involved in public policy because they are given responsibility in law or in the Constitution. Thus, they have the power to make and to enforce policies. The legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the state are clearly official institutions that are explicitly mentioned in the Constitution. The unofficial actors include those who play a role in the policy process without any explicit legal authority (or duty) to participate in the decision-making process. Birkland states that such interest groups are involved in politics not because they are sanctioned in law, but because they are an effective way for many people collectively to express their desires for policy (ibid).

2.3.1 Youth Movements

Youth movements represent an organised and conscious attempt on the part of young people to initiate or resist changes in the social order, including in the policy context. They often emerge when a country undergoes rapid transformation (Braungart and Braungart, 1990: 157). Youth problems and politics took on a new importance in the 1960s when unprecedented numbers of young people began to question society and the wisdom of its leaders. The vast majority of youth at that time, however, were willing to accept the status quo, while smaller numbers withdrew into counter-cultural movements and fewer still took to the streets to dramatise their political views (Braungart and Braungart, 1986: 359). For example, in 1968 alone, 60 countries reported major instances of political protest and disruptions by the youth: 15 countries in Europe, 15 countries in Latin America, 16 countries in Africa and the Middle East, 11 countries in Asia, and 3 countries in North America (Katsiaficas, 1987). The root
cause of the 1960s youth protest partially grew out of the inequalities of the post-World War II era, with young people focusing on five issues:

(1) the destruction and reform of existing colonialist and racist political regimes, (2) unity with workers and the poor around the world, (3) the formation of an international student movement, (4) university reform and (5) the creation of autonomous youth cultures and countercultures (Braungart and Braungart, 1990: 158).

While they have a history in Europe that goes back several centuries, youth movements spread throughout the world in the 1980s. Comparing youth movements in the 1960s and the 1980s, it is clear that there were some similarities and some differences (Braungart and Braungart, 1990: 178).

**Table 2.1: The Youth Movements of the 1960s and 1980s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1960s Youth Movements</strong></th>
<th><strong>1980s Youth Movements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similarities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. International scope;</td>
<td>1. In contrast, in 1980s many youth movements represented a rejection of the legacy of the post-World War II era, signalling that the Cold War, military weapons build-up and superpower interference in local affairs were unacceptable vestiges of a bygone age;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Same issues: university reforms, getting out of an unpopular war, the creation of youthful countercultural movements, an end to social inequalities and injustices;</td>
<td>2. Youth movements indicated a lack of fit between ‘nation’ and ‘state’, evidence by the growth in social movements based on national separatism or mini-nationalism, ethnic and cultural independence and self-determination;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Same tactics used: sit-ins, student strikes, marches, theatrical ‘happenings’, disruptions and riots.</td>
<td>3. Youth movements expressed a diffuse set of issues and goals, with wide regional variations: ecology, and anti-nuclear technology in western Europe and the United States; human rights and liberation movements in Latin America; religious ethnic divisions in the Middle East and South Africa; and freedom and democracy spreading throughout Eastern Europe and China.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Differences</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Many youth movements grew out of the inequalities of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries;</td>
<td>1. Many youth movements grew out of the inequalities of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They were due to the forging of national liberation movements into new nation-states;</td>
<td>2. They were due to the forging of national liberation movements into new nation-states;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Youth movements were relatively homogeneous ideologically;</td>
<td>3. Youth movements were relatively homogeneous ideologically;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issues that provided the basis for the youth protests in 1980s tended to criss-cross different regions. Among the most notable youth movements were those involving racial, ethnic and religious conflicts, which occurred within countries scattered throughout all geographical areas (South Africa, Israel, Northern Ireland, England, United States, China, Soviet Union, India, Iran and Lebanon). Demand for university reform and changes in governmental educational policies were issues that galvanised youth in countries with diverse political systems, such as France, Spain, Italy, China and the Philippines (Braungart and Braungart, 1990: 177). For example, the Asian Youth Movements (AYMs) of the 1970s and 1980s which were influenced by black politics and a version of secularism that became a unifying force between different religious communities and the AYMs remain a powerful example of independent self-help organisations and of a movement that mobilised at grass-roots level (Ramamurthy, 2006: 39-58).

Another powerful example is that of the ‘Arab Spring’ movements that started in early 2011 leading to revolutions, reforms and even civil war in the Arab world. This involved young people and spread through media propaganda (Stepanova, 2011). The ‘Arab Spring’ brought about socio-political and socioeconomic changes in many countries in the Middle East. Rayman (2013) states that ‘the popular uprisings across the Arab world that began more than two and a half years ago transformed the politics of the region and ousted four entrenched leaders.’ This has been compared to the revolutions of Eastern Europe in 1989.

Throughout the 20th century, there was a significant growth in youth movements worldwide, linking over 20,000 national and transnational youth organisations in major global networks throughout the world (Angel, 1990: 8). Youth movements retain the potential to act as powerful instruments for change in society. All over the world, youth continues to use similar tactics such as sit-ins, student strikes, marches, theatrical happenings, disruptions and riots to express their discontentment and to work for policy change. An important related sector is voluntary organisations which will be considered below.
2.3.2 The Voluntary Sector

The voluntary sector or Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) play a significant and growing part in the national and international arenas either by exerting pressure for particular policies or services or in providing services directly as the agents of governments or of international bodies. Today the NGOs not only influence policy but are increasingly being taken on by official agencies in a partnership role in the making and implementation of policy (Burden, 1998: 221). The voluntary sector plays a very important role in influencing the social policy process. Voluntary organisations can also play an important role at international level, such as the European Youth Forum.

Jones et al., (1978: 78) state that there is always a conflict between those who believe in the ‘voluntary principle’ and those who believe in statutory services and public responsibilities. According to the European Youth Forum, the youth NGOs do not only provide young people with democratic representation, but they also gather and structure their expertise in the policy areas that concern them. NGOs provide spaces where young citizens can experience democratic processes and serve a very strong educational role, contributing to the shaping of opinions and the development of social attitudes (European Union, 2008: 1).

2.3.3 Political Parties

Social and youth policies are greatly influenced by the approaches taken by political parties on different parts of the political spectrum. Political and social thought on the right takes a variety of forms, although there are essentially two main strands, conservatism and liberalism. In a conservative society, the maintenance of order is its prerequisite. Political parties stress the importance of the nation, tradition and religion as sources of identity. Power is paternal in most of these societies. Further, acceptance of hierarchy is important for social stability. Liberalism, on the other hand, emphasises individualism and personal freedom while the state is perceived as having only a minimal role. It should ensure internal and external order and establish orderly conditions for economic activity and markets must to operate freely (Burden, 1998: 12).
Each political party works with its own philosophy and contributes significantly to the process of developing and implementing youth policies and services. Birkland (2005: 87) suggests that the following are important functions of the political parties in the policy process: first, party labels provide voters with cues for voting; second, political parties provide a rough way of transmitting political preferences from the electorate to the elected branches; third, political parties help elected officials and their supporters to create packages of policy ideas that can be used to appeal to voters and then to shape legislation; finally, political parties are crucial to the organisation of the legislative branch. It goes without saying that political parties have a crucial influence on the formulation of youth policy as well as on the participation of young people in politics. It is not surprising therefore that most major political parties, in Ireland and elsewhere, have youth wings or branches.

2.4 Institutions

‘Institutions’ play an important role in shaping youth policy through the constitutional and legislative frameworks, state structures and the political system. The ways in which ‘youth policies are co-ordinated in different countries are heavily influenced by the constitution of the country, the administrative systems and the division of labour and of power between different levels of government and administration’ (IARD, 2001: 73). The response of the government to the needs and issues of the young people differs from country to country both in Europe and Asia. According to Wallace and Bendit (2009: 449), there are different ways in which the youth sector is organised in Europe. ‘In some countries, there is a dedicated youth ministry or directorate while in other countries youth policy can be found dispersed across a number of ministries or agencies, with no special responsibility for youth.’ For example:

…there are countries with a specialised youth ministry and youth directorate (or similar administrative structure) and this group includes Germany, Austria, Luxembourg and Liechtenstein. Second, there are countries where youth policy is allocated to one ministry and where youth matters are handled by a youth directorate. This group comprises Sweden, Ireland, Portugal, Greece, Spain, Belgium, Finland, and Norway… (ibid).
2.5 Ideas

‘Ideas’ play an important role in influencing youth policy both directly and indirectly through other dimensions such as industrialisation, interest groups and institutions. Gough (2011) states that social policy is influenced by cultural systems, ideas-based ideologies, and epistemic communities, and the same can be said of youth policy.

2.5.1 Ideology

The responses of the state to issues related to young people will always reflect in some way the ideas of the people in power: these ideas can be referred to as ideologies (Hothersall, 2010a: 51). An ideology is a body or collection of ideas about the world, about human nature, morality, society and politics, often or usually having some kind of relation to institutions such as political parties, political movements or state regimes (Alcock et al., 2008: 185).

We can distinguish the normative orientation of ideological theories from scientific knowledge, to signal that ideology stands between fact and value, between evaluation and description, with a foot in both camps. In social policy one of the most significant roles of such ideologies is in legitimisation - in justifying particular arrangements and, by implication, directing attention away from approaches which might lead to different conclusions (Taylor-Gooby, 1994: 71).

Policy change may be explained by reference to changes in background ideas about the state, the society and the individual as determined by influential persons, groups, movements and political parties. When ideas change, policies also change. It is not quite so simple, however, for two reasons: first, the importance of ideologies as tools for explaining social and political change should not be exaggerated. Ideas shape practical action, but action also influences ideas; thinkers and ideologues respond to the social environment and pressures which surround them (Marquand, 1996: 6). With social change comes ideological change; ideological change and social change are interdependent variables, rather than one being dependent and the other being independent. Second, the relationship between the beliefs of the various actors and policy change may be an ambiguous one (Alcock et al., 2008: 185).
The late 1980s and early 1990s with the ideology of neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism, the policy actions of Margaret Thatcher in the UK and of Ronald Reagan in the US had worldwide implications with significant shifts away from state-controlled forms of welfare organisation to market-oriented forms. This shift, both practically and ideologically, is best represented by the emergence of a ‘contract culture’ whereby social work and other related services are offered by local authorities (Hothersall, 2010a: 58). In this context, Orton (2011: 352) suggests that the original idea of the capability approach developed by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum acts as a new thinking for UK policy on employment, work and welfare. The capability approach may be used to tackle deeply-entrenched problems beyond adherence to neo-liberalism.

There has been a lot of debate about whether the stock of political ideologies has run its course. Bell (1960), Fukuyama (1989), Giddens (1994) Heywood (2002) (cited in Hothersall, 2010a: 64) argued for and against the existence and the death of ideologies in this era. Giddens (1994) argues that ‘conventional ideologies are becoming less and less relevant because as we move away from modernisation and into a period of post-modernity characterised by globalisation, increasing fragmentation, consumerism and individualism, different ideological positions begin to lose their relevance as we are all enveloped into a meta-ideology and we must therefore rethink our notions of ideology’ (Hothersall, 2010a: 64). Others however would argue that ‘traditional’ ideological distinctions continue to shape different approaches to political and social issues, and to social policy and youth policy.

At national and international levels, religious ideologies have also influenced social and youth policies. Catholic social thinking provided a distinctive anti-socialist and anti-liberal rationale for public social policies. The principle of subsidiarity that policies be enacted at the lowest effective social level not only recognised the crucial role of family, community, workplace, and church, but also advocated a significant place for local, regional, and national public bodies (Gough, 2008: 52). In a related sense, the principle of subsidiarity within the EU means that European youth policies can only act as complementary and supporting measures to national policies. This principle of subsidiarity was formally enshrined in the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 which also provided and strengthened the legal basis for European action programmes in the field of youth under Article 149 (Wallace and Bendit, 2009: 453).
One particular factor that distinguishes youth policies in different parts of Europe and Asia is the concept of youth - the extent to which young people are seen as a problem or as a resource. For example, according to Wallace and Bendit (2009: 444):

In countries where young people are seen as a problem, there is a focus upon issues such as unemployment, homelessness, AIDS, drug abuse and prevention of youth delinquency. This is very clearly the case in the UK and Ireland, for example, where youth policies are discussed in the context of social exclusion at a national level. …In countries where young people are seen as a resource, there is a focus upon youth policies helping to develop young people as a resource for themselves or as a resource for society as a whole. …The best example of this approach can be found in the Nordic countries …we can also find countries that draw upon both models of youth as a resource and as a problem. Countries where youth are seen as a mixture of resource and problem would include Germany, the Netherlands and Greece. In these countries, the principal target group is both youth in general and specific groups of youth who may be identified as problems (or as having problems).

2.5.2 Youth Culture

Culture is the ensemble of practices - linguistic, stylistic and religious - that together form a way of being in a given social community and is the language through which one learns to read the world (Heaven and Tubridy, 2003: 152). According to Franzén (2002: 47), ‘the specificity of modern youth culture is both cultural and social. Socially, it is grounded in a social category, an age group; culturally, it is stamped with modernity, crossing not only local but also national boundaries, inverting the relation between the generations’.

Youth, through their way of living, are sometimes seen as a barometer and a mirror of the society and world in which they live. The modern connotations of the term ‘youth’ emerged during and after the industrial revolution; that is, by the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Before that, children were classified as part of the working community and, as such, there was not a sharp distinction between children, youth and adults (Cloete, 2012: 1-2). The rapid passage from childhood to adulthood had ceased, making way for a new understanding of the young as a cohort in need of specialisation through a liminal stage of education, thereby paving the way for the arrival of the ‘adolescent’ (Root, 2007: 28). Kotesky (1991: 42) states that the term ‘adolescence’
only came into use after 1904, when Stanley Hall wrote a book entitled Adolescence with the lengthy subtitle ‘its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion and education’. Kotesky takes a ‘constructionist’ view that modern youth (including the ‘teenage years’ and adolescence) is a ‘cultural invention’ created and driven by social and economic forces.

The developments brought about by industrialisation and the labour market led to a separation of children and adolescents from the category of adults and, slowly but surely, a new subculture emerged, namely youth culture. Youth culture has also been referred to as an anti-culture, which exists in opposition to adult culture (Nel, 2000: 32). Youth culture as an ideological phenomenon emerges from the development of Western modernity and the growing sophistication of advertising and market-segmentation strategies and now looms quite large in the cultural landscapes of the global cultural economy. The dominant dimensions of this ideology are identity, style, and cultural innovation (Kjeldgaard and Askegaard, 2006: 232).

Within youth culture research, quite a common view is that a modern youth culture saw its beginning in the 1950s, with rock ‘n’ roll as its icon right from the start, according to Hobsbawm (1994: 324). Although there is nothing new in specific age groups, the youth culture of the 1950s introduced three novelties. First, youth was no longer conceived as a preparatory stage of adulthood, but rather as complete stage in itself. Second, the role of the generations was reversed: children had nothing to learn from parents compared with what parents could learn from their children. Third, the new youth culture was an international phenomenon, at least in the West (Ibid). Cameron White of the University of Houston aptly frames the current state of the debate on youth culture in general: ‘Youth culture is at the centre of societal controversy and debate at present. Many from one end of the spectrum criticize its very nature and suggest censorship and the like. Many on the other end of the spectrum also criticize the nature of youth culture and suggest that it only perpetuates the status quo and enhances corporate and American hegemony’ (Sealey-Ruiz and Greene, 2011: 340).

Youth in every part of the world are affected by globalisation; nearly all of them are aware, though to varying degrees, of a global culture that exists beyond their local culture. Those who are growing up in traditional cultures know that the future
that awaits them is certain to be very different from the life their grandparents knew (Arnett, 2005: 32). The growth of a global culture has taken place through the organisation of mass communications by giant media transnational corporations (TNCs). These make widespread use of common programming patterns exposing many national populations to the same ideas, images and symbols. Developments in electronic communications such as satellites and fibre-optic cables have accelerated this aspect of globalisation (Burden, 1998: 202).

The globalisation of culture has the effect upon culture of ‘increasing connection of the world and its people’ and is perhaps nowhere more visible than in the changing nature of the relationship between the world’s youth and their sense of identity (Solomon & Scuderi, 2002: 13). Young people today are most receptive, or, alternatively, susceptible to foreign cultural practices. The young are seen as that part of society that is most likely to engage in a process of cultural borrowing that is disruptive to the reproduction of traditional cultural practices, from modes of dress to language, aesthetics and ideologies (Heaven and Tubridy, 2003: 149).

As already suggested, in industrialised countries around the world, young people are by far the most enthusiastic users of new communication technologies such as multiplayer games, virtual environments, social networking sites and other online activities which are now an integral part of young people’s lifestyles. Understanding them is crucial to understanding changes in young people’s values, attitudes and social activities (Lehdonvirta and Rasanen, 2011: 61-62). Recent discussions around the online activities of young people focus on websites as virtual spaces where they can ‘hang out’ and ‘mess about’ (Chau, 2010: 65). Today most of the young people in developed and developing countries have access to mobile Short Message Service (SMS) Multimedia Messaging Service, (MMS), photo-sharing (Flickr), video-sharing (YouTube), and social networking (Facebook, MySpace, Twitter). They are influenced and affected by new media and technology which bring along with them the development of new popular youth culture (Luschen and Bogad, 2010: 452). This popular youth culture challenges every government to frame policies that will safeguard the rights and responsibilities of young people.

According to Hobsbawm (1994: 327), youth culture builds upon two factors: educational and economic. The lengthening of full-time education expanded the social
constituency of new youth culture. So too did the prosperity of the full-time labour market in what he calls the Golden Age, the era from World War II to the oil crisis. Young people at work now earned more money than ever before and were not obliged to contribute to the family budget. This made it easier for youth to discover material or cultural symbols of identity.

In an industrialised society, young people are forced to spend a long time and face challenges in qualifying and searching for the right job that matches their interests. This has created identity confusion for some people (Arnett, 2005: 29). Identities structure the way a person understands themselves and their world in both a descriptive and a prescriptive sense. From infancy onwards, a person is addressed by others through identities that invite the addressee to regard them in a certain way. Culturally specific ways of being masculine or feminine are among the first identities that most people will encounter, along with the identity of infancy itself (Heaven and Tubridy, 2003: 152).

As a consequence of globalisation, the challenges of creating a viable identity are perhaps greater for today’s youth than they have been in the past. The central feature of the transition that youth worldwide are undergoing today is that it results in transformations in identity, i.e., in how people think about themselves in relation to the social environment. There are four aspects of identity that stand out as issues related to youth in transition in a globalising world, and that therefore have implications for youth policy makers:

First, most youth have now developed a bicultural identity, one rooted in their local culture and the other stemming from an awareness of their relation to the global culture. Second, the pervasiveness of identity confusion may be increasing among young people in non-Western cultures, caught between the local culture and the global culture. Third, in every society there are youth who choose to join self-selected cultures with likeminded persons who wish to have an identity that will be untainted by the global culture and its values. Fourth, identity explorations in love and work are increasingly stretching beyond the adolescent years (roughly 10-18) into a post-adolescent period of emerging adulthood, roughly between ages 18-29 (Arnett, 2005: 23).
As youth became an established and recognised group in society, their way of living and new ideas as part of the youth subculture were seen both as sources of social change and as a potential threat to the existing social order and this has often generated a ‘moral panic’ over youth (Krinsky, 2008: 1; Cloete, 2012: 2). But young people are not a homogeneous group. Diversity is a fundamental characteristic of all cultures and all identities, traversed as they are by competing and interrelated specificities of class, gender, generation and sexuality. Multiculturalism refers to ways of being, and policies or programmes, that encourage the development of societies in which diverse cultures and identities co-exist (Heaven and Tubridy, 2003: 153). Young people grow and live in an increasingly multicultural context and face both the challenges and opportunities this creates. The failure of governments to respond in an adequate and timely manner to social changes such as these may result in deleterious consequences for young people and the wider society.

2.5.3 Youth Research

Youth research institutes, nationally and internationally, contribute to the evolution of youth policy not only through their research or evaluation activities but also by providing experts to commissions and councils on youth and by producing knowledge (IARD, 2001: 71). The ideas of policy innovation and learning are received through the ‘epistemic communities’ which are defined as ‘networks of professionals with recognised expertise and competence and, authoritative claims to policy-relevant knowledge within a domain or issue area’ (Haas, 1992: 3). According to Drake and Nicolaïdis (1992: 40), the epistemic community’s membership has two layers:

The first includes personnel from governments, international agencies, and private firms - individuals who work for organizations with direct interests in alternative policy solutions. In contrast, the second layer includes academics, lawyers, industry specialists, and journalists - individuals whose stakes, if any, are more purely intellectual or a matter of professional entrepreneurship. But the members of the first and second layers share a conceptual framework and agenda, and this, coupled with the latter's organizational independence, help legitimate the former's views in the eyes of cautious policy makers.

Research in the field of youth has played an important role in shaping the theory, policy and practice for many countries. British research on youth culture and
subculture during the 1970s presented a critique of dominant representations of particular groups of young people as ‘troubled’ or ‘troubling’ in relation to specific social problems such as teenage pregnancy, youth crime, drug abuse and school dropout or exclusion which has implications on targeted programmes (Griffin, 2001: 147-148).

European and Asian countries place a high value on research and seek ways to face the challenges and issues of the young people. In Europe a lot of youth-related research is supported by the European Commission. Day (2006) has suggested that the European Commission is ‘the only organisation that is paid to think European, and is able to come up with solutions that have helped the member states to achieve their own objectives with long-term capacity to deliver, shape and frame policies’. The Youth Partnership of EU and CoE have agreed to promote ‘knowledge and evidence-based’ youth policy by developing and providing efficient tools, through the European Knowledge Centre on Youth Policy (EKCYP). In addition an online resource/database and Pool of European Youth Researchers (PEYR) have been established (Devlin, 2010: 80). All of these initiatives at international level, combined with research programmes at national level and the activities of public and private research organisations, help to create and shape the ideas that inform the policy process.

2.6 International Environment

2.6.1 Role of International Agencies

According to Burden (1998: 203), global organisations have been playing an increasingly important part in social policy over the past few decades. The World Health Organization (WHO) and bodies like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) also have a role in social policy and in youth policy formation:

- Their influence may come from control of resources which they can dispense to states for specified purposes;
- They may also be able to intervene in domestic debates on social policy through publication of reports, conferences and other public events;
- They may be able to influence policy at ‘insider’ level through direct contact with policy makers such as politicians and civil servants.
Other different international agencies who intervene in the youth policy-making process include those already mentioned above, the European Union and the Council of Europe, as well as the UN and its various agencies, the United Nations Educational, the Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia (UNESCAP). However, as Devlin (2010: 76) states, ‘the international bodies can facilitate, support, encourage and exhort but without commitment from national (and in some cases regional) governments their pronouncements remain for the most part aspirational’.

2.6.2 Globalisation

Today there is virtually no part of the world unaffected by globalisation, no culture that has been left untouched by globalisation ‘long and relentless reach’ (Arnett, 2005: 22). The term ‘globalisation’ has become one of the most used (and possibly abused) concepts of recent times in the media, within politics, and in academic discourse. There is an increasingly common assertion that globalisation is having a profound impact on people’s lives (Lavalette, 2006: 274). ‘Globalisation’ has become an established term in social science and more recently in social policy (Yeates, 2002: 69). The major advantages and disadvantages of globalisation are often expressed in economic terms.

Globalisation is likely to be one of the dominant forces in the personal, social and economic development of youth in the 21st century. In modern society, the transition of the individual from youth to adulthood intersects with the transition of the world toward a more integrated, more interdependent, and more globalised society. Everywhere, but especially in developing countries, youth are growing up in a very different environment than that of their parents and grandparents (Arnett, 2005: 22). In some ways, globalisation has been going on for centuries: cultures have long influenced each other through trade, migration, and war. In other ways, it is just beginning: in many cultures today, people who are middle aged or older can remember a time when their culture was firmly grounded in enduring traditions, barely touched by anything global, Western, or American. However, few young people growing up today will have such memories in the decades to come (ibid: 32).
The dramatic increase in globalisation in recent years has not only spawned worldwide economic interdependence but also advanced connections among different cultures and geographical areas. This has resulted not only in positive growth but also in stressful experiences for young people in Western and non-Western societies. Globalisation encouraged young people to attain higher levels of education and obtain more professional qualifications, even though these may not necessarily guarantee job security (Seiffge-Krenke, 2012: 107).

Jerald (2009: 6-7) shows that globalisation has not taken place independent of technological change. For instance, the spread of Windows-enabled computers, fax machines, and dial-up models soon after the fall of the Berlin wall set the stage for a global society. The Internet boom of the 1990s also fuelled investment in the hardware (fibre optic cables) and software (web browsers) necessary for the emergence of an ‘information super highway’ along which all kinds of digitised work products could travel and create a new platform for conducting business, one that allowed for much more sophisticated collaboration across much greater distances. Jerald goes on to state that automation and globalisation have tended to eliminate many of the same kinds of jobs, since tasks can be reduced to rules that can be programmed on a computer or scripted and outsourced to someone thousands of kilometres away (Jerald, 2009: 7). These modern forms of rapid communication have, in turn, affected the education and work culture of young people and this new demand has challenged governments to come out with innovative policies.

Buchholz and Blossfeld (2012: 17-18) explain that globalisation has increased productivity and improved the general standard of living in modern societies. At the same time, it created growth in unexpected and unpredictable market trends and led to a significant shift in power relations in the labour market. Employers have increasingly tried to shift their burden of risk by demanding greater ‘flexibility’ on the part of employees and developing asymmetric employment relationships such as subcontracts or fixed-term work contracts. In such cases, employers enter into only a short-term commitment with their employees and retain the option of dismissing them again as soon as markets or orders decline. According to one view, in today’s society, fewer and fewer specific groups should be affected permanently by risks such as poverty and unemployment and such risks, where they do exist, should have a temporary character (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2002). This argument links a strong general increase in
employment flexibility with a decline of (existing) social inequalities (Buchholz and Blossfeld, 2012: 18). Breen, however, has made the opposite assertion, namely, that the processes of globalisation have led to a selective re-commodification of the already disadvantaged labour market groups and, therefore, to a strengthening of existing social inequalities. According to Breen, processes of re-commodification take place especially with the shifting of market risks to the already disadvantaged and less attractive groups of the workforce (ibid: 19).

Globalisation is most evident in the economic sphere with the opening up of world markets. The world economy is now dominated by transnational corporations (TNCs) (Burden, 1998: 202). This in turn has consequences in the lives of young people in relation to education and work which demands that governments act in order to cope with the world economy and markets. Globalisation has also brought about great change and an increase of individualism, a cultural factor implicated in the delays and decreases in marriage and the increase in singlehood, cohabitation, non-marital childbearing and divorce. In this context, social movement organisations at national and international levels have advocated for women’s equality in the paid labour force. This has led to an increased independence from marriage and a male breadwinner and has also contributed to the augmentation of the rights of gay/lesbian couples to have the right to legally recognised marriage and domestic partnerships (Sheppard, 2009: 102). The cumulative effects of globalisation pose significant challenges for legislators internationally in the formulation of youth policy.

2.6.3 Migration

Another impact of globalisation is migration. Hugo (2006: 2) argues that if the net effect of globalisation is the increased migration of the ‘brightest and the best’ among Asian youth to OECD nations, the effects on the young migrants themselves will be predominantly beneficial. However the impact of the loss of these people may be negative for their families, communities, regions or countries. This situation poses a great challenge to the governments to initiate new policies to develop ‘human capital’ and to create an environment to utilise those young people’s capabilities for the development of the country.
In Europe and Asia, there is also a rural to urban migration which brings with it certain consequences for the lives of young people and of the society. Rye (2011: 170) states that rural-to-urban migration concerns far more than the move in physical space from one place to another. It is as much a journey in social space where the drive to the cities by young people is filled with expectation for the new lives that will set them apart from their peers and parents whom they have left behind. As young people migrate away and begin to assert their independent adult identities, the identity of their rural community may become eroded (Jones, 1999: 1). For example, one of the most dramatic changes in Asia’s population in recent decades has been an exponential increase in personal mobility, especially among young adults. One of the major elements in this mobility has been that from rural to urban areas. This contributes to Asian cities having considerably younger age structures than rural areas (Hugo, 2005: 69). In the city, however, there are large concentrations of young adults placing considerable pressure on education services and on the labour market to continue to absorb large numbers of people entering the labour market for the first time each year. This concentration of the young also tends to be selective in that only the more highly-educated youth population moves to the city and thus have relatively high levels of unemployment. In Asian cities, unemployment levels are low by European standards because the poor cannot afford to be unemployed where there is no formal social security system (ibid).

In addition to ‘forced’ migration it is important to take account of voluntary migration and ‘mobility’. In both Europe and Asia, national and international organisations actively encourage the ‘youth mobility’ within and between countries to promote social, economic and occupational integration through study and voluntary work. In Europe ‘promoting opportunities for mobility, exchange and cooperation among young people have been a priority for the European Commission for more than twenty years’ (Devlin, 2010: 67). The European youth mobility policy encourages member states:

- to provide further opportunities for cross-border mobility within education, training and volunteering, thereby transforming mobility into a widespread phenomenon;
- to take steps to attain the objectives of the current European Union (EU) programmes for education, youth, culture, citizenship and research;
to build on the work of the High Level Expert Forum in order to facilitate the participation of all young people in mobility schemes and enhance the mobility of all educational staff;

to take action at various levels and in partnership with various stakeholders to increase opportunities for mobility (European Union, 2008).

2.7 Youth Policy Output

As shown in figure 2.1, the ‘output’ of the “five I’s” can refer to the implementation of legislation and the provision of specific services in the field of youth policy (Gough, 2008: 42). National youth policy needs to be open to the factors and actors that affect the wellbeing of young people. National youth policy varies from country to country and there is no prescriptive formula for its conception, structure or content. However, national youth policies adopted by member states of the European Commission or the United Nations or Commonwealth may take into consideration youth policy structures recommended by international agencies. Angel (2003: 35) states that a national youth policy is understood as a policy adopted by government in cooperation with non-governmental youth organisations. This clearly defines the place and role of youth in society and the responsibility of society to youth. National youth policy considers the needs, problems and aspirations of youth of the present and for the future. It promotes the establishment of appropriate services and structures to meet the needs of youth by, for and with youth, and finally it encourages youth to participate actively in the life of society and in its decision making processes.

There are important roles for governments to design programmes based on the needs and issues of the young and to allocate sufficient funding and design proper implementation mechanisms by promoting youth service within a national youth policy. The European Commission, the United Nations and other international agencies take many initiatives to encourage governments to ‘invest in youth and youth policy’ as an answer to the changing needs of society.

There are two approaches which are prevalent in the policy-making process. First, there is an ‘evidence-based policy’ which is defined as an approach which ‘helps people make well-informed decisions about policies, programmes and projects by putting the best available evidence at the heart of policy development and
implementation’ (Segone and Pron, 2008: 1). The second, in contrast, is the ‘opinion-based policy’ which relies heavily ‘on either the selective use of evidence (e.g. on single studies irrespective of quality) or on the untested views of individuals or groups, often inspired by ideological standpoints, prejudices, or speculative conjecture’ (ibid). The first approach matches the definition of the UN in the MDG Guide which refers to a ‘policy process that helps planners make better-informed decisions by putting the best available evidence at the centre of the policy process’. Evidence may include information produced by integrated monitoring and evaluation systems, academic research, historical experience and ‘good practice’ information. Many governments and organisations are moving from ‘opinion-based policy’ towards ‘evidence-based policy’ (Segone, 2008: 27). Angel (2003: 38) stresses the importance of stronger coordination between national youth policy and national youth service in order to achieve maximum impact and benefit to young people and to society. National youth policy will remain only at the level of theory unless adequate measures are taken to implement it by all stakeholders, and unless it is allocated sufficient and sustained public and private-sector funding.

2.8 Youth Welfare Outcomes

Many analysts of social policy have suggested that the intentions that lie behind policies are less important than what they actually achieve. Richard Titmuss (1968), when seeking to define the academic discipline called ‘social policy’, headed his list with ‘the analysis and description of policy formation and its consequences, intended and unintended’ (Baldock, 2003: 19). It is also true to say in the case of youth policy that the ‘intended and unintended’ outcomes are important for the wellbeing of young people. A youth policy is, therefore, effective and meaningful when its goals are achieved through proper monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

All of the “five I’s” have an influence on youth policy which in turn can bring about effective changes in a young person’s wellbeing and the development through its welfare outcomes. According to Gough (2008: 42), ‘outcomes’ refer to the final effects on individuals or on social distributions. Bamber (2012), Devlin and Gunning (2009) state that an effective youth policy practice brings about changes in knowledge, behaviour, skills or attitudes in individuals and as well change in institutions, systems, socio-economic conditions or populations.
It is hoped that this chapter shows how Gough “five I’s”, viewed in the light of the contemporary youth situation, and provides a useful framework for undertaking a detailed comparative study of the youth policies of Ireland and India. The next chapter presents the methodology which is used to realise the objectives of this study.
Chapter Three
Methodology

The main objective of this dissertation is to examine and to compare the youth policies of Ireland and India through the following parameters that are widely known as Gough’s (2008) “five I’s”: ‘Industrialisation, Interest, Institution, Ideas and International Environment’. I realise that comparing the youth policy development of Ireland and India would give a better understanding and clarity to the field of youth development in both countries. This research follows ‘the spiralling research approach’ of Berg and Lune (2012: 25): ‘Idea → Literature review → Design → Data collection and Organisation → Analysis and findings → Dissemination’. In this chapter, I will attempt to provide a brief outline of my method: the research question; comparative research; design; methods; analysis; and ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Question

In order to achieve the objectives of the research, the following leading question is posed: ‘What are the similarities and differences between Irish and Indian youth policy and how can these be explained in a socio-scientific context?’ To realise the objective of the main question, it is further split into nineteen sub-questions under “five I’s” (Appendix, 1). It seeks to use the “five I’s” as shown in figure 2.1, as an analytical lens to compare Irish and Indian youth policies and to explore the different factors and actors that influence them. The framework which is outlined in Chapter Two, will help to explain similarities and differences between the youth policies of India and Ireland. It is hoped that this thesis will help to identify further research in this field.

3.2 International Comparative Research

Social scientists in general agree that international comparative studies require ‘individuals or teams to compare specific issues or phenomena in two or more countries, societies or cultures, without expressly excluding the possibility of comparison over time’ (Hantrais, 2009: 2). There are different terms used to refer to this type of comparative research between countries that include the following: ‘cross-
national, cross-societal, cross-cultural or international’ (Hantrais, 2009: 5). Oyen (1990: 1) considers that the following forces promote comparative research: ‘the growing internationalisation and the concomitant export and import of social, cultural and economic manifestations across national borders’. This study is an international comparative research between Ireland and India on youth policy which is ‘the most effective approach on the ground that systematically analyses the relationship between the social phenomenon under study and relevant characteristics of the country’ (Peter Grootings, 1986: 285-287 cited in Hantrais, 2009: 2).

States, kingdoms, and principalities have been compared for approximately 2,500 years and in the history of the social sciences, comparisons between the nations as a focus of research arose late (Deutsch, 1996: 3). Durkheim insists that ‘comparative sociology is not a particular branch of sociology; it is sociology itself, in so far as it ceases to be purely descriptive and aspires to account for facts’ (Durkheim, 1938: 139 cited in Mills et al., 2006: 619). Allardt (1990: 183) states that the term ‘comparative research’ is clearly reserved for comparison of large spatial units such as countries, nations, states, and ethnically-distinct regions.

The widely shared general rationale is that ‘cross-national research is needed and conducted because it is the closest approximation to the controlled laboratory experiment of the natural scientist which is available to social scientist’ (Lisle, 1978: 475 cited in Antal et al., 1996: 9). In the most concise definition available, the field of comparative public policy is described as ‘the study of how, why, and to what effect different governments pursue a particular course of action or inaction’ (Heidenheimer et al., 1983: 2-3). Another related reason for conducting comparative research stems from the increasing interdependence which characterises the world today. The policies of one country may strongly affect other countries (Antal et al., 1996: 11).

The comparative method traditionally has been treated as the core method of comparative social science, the branch of social science concerned with cross-societal differences and similarities (Easthope, 1974 cited in Ragin, 1989: 1). Despite this tradition, there is substantial disagreement today concerning the distinctiveness of comparative social science in general and of comparative methods in particular. Several scholars who promote the comparative approach have objected to the idea that comparative social science is distinctive in any important respects from social science
in general (Grimshaw, 1973: 18 cited in Ragin, 1989: 2). According to Smelser (1976: 5 cited in Ragin, 1989: 2), the continuity between comparative and non-comparative work exists because their respective goals are identical in explaining social phenomena by establishing controls over the conditions and causes of variation. The purposes of comparative research are as follows:

- To develop concepts and generalisations at a level between what is true of all societies and what is true of one society at one point in time and space;
- To contribute to the development of a relevant knowledge base for both domestic and foreign policy;
- To locate those variables amenable to planned change by policy-making agencies as well as those which are beyond the control of the policy makers;
- To support in the specification of the conditions under which one country can learn from another (Antal et al., 1996: 9-10).

An international comparative perspective has the potential to broaden the view on the national youth policies and their inherent paradoxes (Coussée, 2009: 8). International comparative studies are done with view to gaining a deeper understanding of observable phenomena, advance knowledge, develop new insights, and generate and test a theory (Hantrais, 2009: 45). This research aims at gaining a deeper understanding, knowledge and insights about the youth policies of both countries. It is common to define comparative research as an examination of comparable data from at least two societies. And in this research the data from Ireland and India are used for comparison and discussion. This definition emphasises the fact that the data of comparative social science are cross-societal (Andreski, 1965: 66; Armer, 1973: 49 cited in Ragin, 1989: 4).

In this thesis, the factors and actors in youth policies of Ireland and India are studied, compared and discussed. To facilitate this exploratory process, the comparative research method is the preferred method. The effectiveness of the international comparative study also depends on the researchers’ basic skills such as ‘those of carefully constructing concepts and typologies, and securing ties between data and theory, as well as making inference’ (Oyen, 1990: 11). In this study, a conceptual framework was formed using Gough's “five I's” to compare factors and actors that influence youth policy of both countries: Industrialisation, Interest, Institution, Ideas and International Environment.
3.3 Research Design

The research question evolved from the research literature review. In order to answer the research question, I have attempted to follow the appropriate methodology. The Saunders et al., (2009: 137) research ‘onion’ model gives a clear framework for a suitable research philosophy, research method and strategies required to answer my research question. The different layers of research design are shown in the figure 3.1 below:

Figure 3.1: The Research ‘Onion’ Model

As shown in the outer layer of the research ‘onion’ model, the research philosophy which holds important assumptions about the way in which the researcher views the world and the research strategy and the methods are based on this (Saunders et al., 2009: 108). Saunders et al., (2009: 116) note that interpretivism advocates that it is necessary for the researcher to understand the differences between humans in their respective roles as social actors. This emphasises the difference between conducting research among people rather than objects such as trucks and computers. Using this philosophy, the researcher has to adopt an empathetic stance and face the challenge of entering into the social world of research subjects and understand their world from their point of view.
In this research, an interpretive approach is used. It stresses the nature of social phenomena such as documents as being socially constructed. John Codd (1988 cited in McCulloch, 2004: 47) considers ‘the policy document as being socially constructed as in the interpretive standpoint, but goes beyond this to make use of critical discourse theory in challenging the ideology and underlying contradictions of the policy itself’. For Berg, (2001 cited in Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009: 309) generating concepts or variables from theory or previous studies is also very useful for qualitative research, especially at the inception of data analysis.

As shown in the second layer the research ‘onion’ model, there are deductive and inductive approaches that can be used in research. Saunders et al., (2009: 124) note that ‘the deductive approach, in which a researcher develops a theory and hypothesis (or hypotheses) and designs a research strategy to test the hypothesis and the inductive approach, in which a researcher would collect data and develop theory as a result of the data analysis’. Gray (2011: 14) also states that ‘deduction begins with a universal view of a situation and works back to the particulars; in contrast, induction moves from fragmentary details to a connected view of a situation’.

Flick (2006: 12) argues that in the rapid social changes and the resulting diversification which result in new social contexts and perspectives, social researchers are forced to use inductive strategies instead of starting from theories and testing (deductive strategy) them. However, the inductive process is influenced by pre-existing theories or ideas when approaching a problem (Flick, 2006: 12; Gray, 2011: 15). In this research I use a combination of both deductive and inductive approaches. This study uses the deductive approach through which a conceptual framework is framed from existing literature. This framework is then used as an analytical lens with the research topic that is new but on which there is little existing literature. The inductive approach is used to generate data and by analysing and reflecting upon the emergent theoretical themes, the requisite data is assembled (Saunders et al., 2009: 127).

The next layer denotes different types of strategies that can be used in research. In this study, I use case study strategy to achieve the objectives. Case study strategy is used because it gives a rich understanding of the context of the research and the processes being enacted (Morris and Wood, 1991 cited in Saunders et al., 2009: 146).
It has helped generate answers to the question ‘why?’ as well as to ‘what?’ and ‘how?’; although the latter questions are closely related to the survey strategy (Saunders et al., 2009: 146). The goals of a case study are to reconstruct and analyse the case from a sociological perspective.

Robson (1993: 5) defines a case study as ‘a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence.’ Yin (2009: 13) also highlights the importance of context, adding that, within a case study, the boundaries between the phenomenon being studied and the context within which it is being studied are not clearly evident. Yin (2009) identifies three types of case studies: the exploratory study, the explanatory study and the descriptive study. Robson (2002: 59) states that the object of descriptive research is ‘to portray an accurate profile of persons, events or situations’. The explanatory research emphasis is on ‘studying a situation or a problem in order to explain the relationships between variables’ (Saunders et al., 2009: 140). The purpose of this study is both descriptive and explanatory where description is normally the precursor to explanation (Saunders et al., 2009: 591).

The fourth layer refers to types of methods that can be used to collect data. In this research, I used multi-method which ‘refers to those combinations where more than one data collection technique is used with associated analysis techniques, but this is restricted within either a quantitative or qualitative world view’ (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003 cited in Saunders et al., 2009: 152). A multi-method qualitative study is used to collect data through interviews and documents. The fifth layer refers to the time-horizon used in research. This dissertation is a cross-sectional study of a particular phenomenon (or phenomena) at a particular time. This cross-sectional study employs case studies which are based on interviews conducted over a short period of time (Saunders et al., 2009: 155). The last layer refers to data collection and data analysis. In this study, I have utilised the technique of key-informants in-depth interviews and official and other government documents to collect data and to do thematic analysis.
3.4 Research Method

In social science both quantitative and qualitative research methods of inquiry are employed which are differentiated by their data collection techniques and data analysis procedures. Dabbs (1982: 32 cited in Berg and Lune, 2012: 3) in his attempt to differentiate between qualitative and quantitative approaches clearly states that ‘the notion of quality is essential to the nature of thing and on the other hand, quantity is elementally an amount of something’. Furthermore, Saunders et al., (2009: 151) also note that ‘quantitative is predominantly used as a synonym for any data collection technique (such as a questionnaire) or data analysis procedure (such as graphs or statistics) that generates or uses numerical data. In contrast, qualitative is used predominantly as a synonym for any data collection technique (such as an interview) or data analysis procedure (such as categorising data) that generates or use non-numerical data’.

In order to achieve the overall aim of this study, I have selected the qualitative approach. This is a holistic approach that takes into account contexts within which human experiences occur and is thus concerned with learning from particular instances or cases. Qualitative research seeks to access the inner world of perception and meaning-making in order to understand, describe, and explain social process from the perspective of study participants. It allows the researcher ‘to get at the inner experience of participants, to determine how meanings are formed through and in culture, and to discover rather than test variables’ (Corbin and Strauss, 2008: 12). Corbin and Strauss (1990 cited in Gray, 2009: 166) state that ‘qualitative studies can be used in circumstances where relatively little is known about the phenomenon, or to gain new perspectives on issues where much is already known’ (Corbin and Strauss, 1990 cited in Gray, 2009: 166). It should be noted that there is very little comparative study done on youth policy between Ireland and India.

The major characteristics of qualitative research are induction, discovery, exploration, and theory/hypothesis generation. The researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and qualitative analysis. Results are more easily influenced by the researcher’s personal biases and idiosyncrasies (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004: 18-20). The weakness of this method is that data collection and data analysis is expensive and time consuming. There are many ways of collecting
qualitative data such as: ‘interviewing, focus group, ethnography, sociometry, unobtrusive measures, historiography, and case study’ (Berg and Lune, 2012: 3). For the purposes of this study, I have used interviews with key-informants and documents of both countries for the collection and analysis of data.

In this comparative research, the researcher does not attempt to measure or count but rather attempts to explore the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of (Berg and Lune, 2012: 3) youth policies of Ireland and India. Hoepfl (1997 cited in Golafshani, 2003: 600) argues that ‘unlike quantitative in which the researchers seek causal determination, prediction, and generalisation of findings, qualitative researchers seek instead illumination, understanding, and extrapolation to similar situations’. Qualitative research is preferred for the following reasons: it provides the researcher with in-depth knowledge; although this is usually not generalisable, it is more useful for exploring phenomena in specific contexts, articulating participants’ understandings and perceptions and generating tentative concepts and theories that directly pertain to particular environments (Schulze, 2003: 12).

According to Golafshani (2003: 600), in quantitative research validity and reliability refer to research that is credible, but in qualitative research the credibility depends on the ability and effort of the researcher. Further, Golafshani argues that reliability and validity are treated separately in quantitative studies but in qualitative research it is not treated separately instead, ‘terminology that encompasses both, such as credibility, transferability, and trustworthiness is used’. Guba and Lincoln (1985 cited in Morse et al., 2002: 5) also states that reliability and validity in qualitative study can be substituted with the parallel concept of ‘trustworthiness,’ containing four aspects: credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability. Seale (1999: 266 cited in Golafshani, 2003: 601) states that ‘trustworthiness of a research report lies at the heart of issues conventionally discussed as validity and reliability’. Morse et al., (2002: 11) state that in qualitative inquiry, reliability and validity can be ensured through proper verification strategy which includes ensuring: ‘methodological coherence, sampling sufficiency, developing a dynamic relationship between sampling, data collection and analysis, thinking theoretically, and theory development’.
According to Gray (2009: 190) there are two ways through which the validity of qualitative research can be explored: internal validity and external validity. The issue of internal validity revolves around the question of how far the constructions of the researcher are grounded in the constructions of those being researched (Flick, 2006). One important aspect of external validity is the extent to which it is possible to generalize from the data to other cases or situations (Gray, 2009: 190). In qualitative research ‘the reliability refers to the stability of findings and which is improved, if not guaranteed, by triangulation, gathering information, for example, from multiple sources or by using multiple data gathering tools’ (Gray, 2009: 193). According to Flick (2006: 370) the need for reliability in qualitative research can be explained in the following two ways:

First, the genesis of the data needs to be explicated in a way that makes it possible to check what a statement is of the subject is and where the researcher's interpretation begins. Second, procedures in the field or interview and with the text need to be made explicit in training and rechecking in order to improve the comparability of different interviews or observers' conducted. Finally, the reliability of the whole process will be better the more detailed the research process is documented as whole (Flick, 2006: 370).

‘Objectivity and Subjectivity’ in qualitative research is very important to clarify because of the close involvement of the researcher in the process of data collection and analysis. The researcher’s role is important in qualitative research. Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Strauss and Corbin (1990) state that researchers have to be ‘insightful, demonstrating the capacity to understand and the ability to differentiate between what is important and what is not’ (Gray, 2009: 183). The impact of the researcher in qualitative research is far more obvious than in quantitative method (Breuer et al., 2002). Qualitative methodology recognizes that the subjectivity of the researcher is intimately involved in scientific research and it encourages reflecting on the values and objectives he/she brings to research and how these affect the research project (Ratner, 2002).

The theoretical material that supports this comparative research has been gathered through access to different libraries in India and Ireland and also through eBooks and articles online through a variety of search engines. I also obtained various articles and books through inter-library loans. Some of the key-informants were also
very helpful in giving their published articles, books and suggested references related to the topics. There are a few books and articles I obtained through writing to the authors themselves. According to Patton (2002: 4) there are three kinds of qualitative data collection: interviews, observations and documents; for this thesis, I have used data from interviews and documents. Purposive sampling was used to collect data from interviews and documents.

### 3.4.1 Sampling

According to Mason, (2001: 81) ‘sampling and selection are principles and procedures used to identify, choose, and gain access to relevant units which will be used for data generation by any method. These units will belong to or relate to a relevant wider population or universe’. By sampling is meant the process of selecting a suitable representative sample of the population for the purpose of determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population (Gray, 2009: 148). The success and failure of the inferences depends on how well the sample represents the population (Berg and Lune, 2012: 50). There are two types of samples, probability (often called random samples) and non-probability. In probability sampling, people are chosen as a representative cross-section of the whole population being studied and which is used for a large quantitative study. Non-probability sampling is conducted without knowledge about whether those included in the sample are representative of the overall population (Denscombe, 2003: 12). In non-probability sampling:

The investigator does not base his or her sample selection on probability theory. Rather, efforts are undertaken (1) to create a kind of quasi-random sample and (2) to have a clear idea about what larger group or groups the sample reflect. Non-probability samples offer the benefits of not requiring a list of all possible elements in a full population and the ability to access otherwise highly sensitive or difficult-to-research study population (Berg and Lune, 2012: 50).

In this research, non-probability sampling is preferred. Non-probability sampling methods can be divided into four broad types: Convenience, Purposive, Snowball and Quota (Berg and Lune, 2012: 50). Purposive samples are sometimes called judgmental sampling (Hagan, 2006 cited in Gray, 2009: 152). Black (1999: 124) states clearly that in purposive samplings, the researcher ‘hand-picks subjects on
the basis of specific characteristics, building up a sample of sufficient size having the desired traits’. The logic and power of this sampling comes from choosing information-rich cases for in-depth study. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance for the purpose of the inquiry (Patton, 2002: 230). Patton (2002: 244-245) states that ‘there are no rules for sample size in qualitative inquiry but the validity, meaningfulness and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher than the sample size’. The disadvantage of purposive sampling is that the researcher may inadvertently omit a vital characteristic or may subconsciously bias the sample (Gray, 2009: 152-153). Despite some serious limitations (e.g., the lack of wide generalizability), purposive samples are often used by researchers (Gray, 2009: 152). In this research, the problems of subjectivity and reliability are overcome by careful selection of key-informants who have extensive knowledge and experience in the field which is evident from the list of interview participants (Black, 1999: 124).

For the purposes of this research, I set out to select a sufficient number of key-informants to ensure that all major constituencies within youth sector in each country were included in particular policy makers, NGO representatives, practioners and educators of those who work with young people. However, it was also important that the individual participants had sufficient expertise to speak authoritatively on the research topic. I also thought it important that, as far as possible, the sample would have gender balance. As a result of taking the above factors into consideration, I achieved a purposive sample of eleven key-informants for each country. There was also a snowball sampling element in my selection of key-informants because some respondents recommended other possible interviewees. Further details of the composition of sampling of interviewees are provided in the chapters six and seven. For further information on the sampling of documents, see section 3.4.3.

3.4.2 Face-to-face Interview

Interviews are more than just conversations and they involve a set of assumptions and understandings about a situation not normally associated with conversation (Denscombe, 2003: 163). Interviews are “open-ended questions and probes yield in-depth responses about people’s experiences, perceptions, feelings, and
knowledge” (Patton, 2002: 4). There are four types of interviews used in social research: structured, semi-structured, unstructured and group interview (May, 2002: 121). For the purposes of this research, I used semi-structured face-to-face interviews which yielded rich insights into people's experiences, opinions, values, aspirations, attitudes and feelings. In order to understand the perceptions of participants or learning how participants come to attach certain meanings to phenomena or events, interviewing provides a useful means of access (Berg and Lune, 2012: 115). The flexibility of the semi-structured interview allowed me both to ask a series of regularly structured questions permitting comparisons across interviews, and to pursue areas spontaneously initiated by the interviewee. This resulted in a much more textured set of accounts from participants than would have resulted had scheduled questions only (Berg and Lune, 2012: 114). Legewie (1987: 141 cited in Flick, 2006: 37) suggests the following three considerations to validate the interviews: ‘(a) That the contents of what is said are correct, (b) that what is said is socially appropriate in its relational aspect… and (c) that what is said is sincere in terms of the self-presentation” of the speaker’.

Interviews were conducted with the practitioners, policy makers, educationists of two countries with different background and experience. In order to elicit information, the researcher needs to ask a few prop questions beyond the standardized questions related to their field of expertise and experience. The interview was conducted in their work place and it was for 30 to 45 minutes but in some cases it lasted more than one hour. They were contacted through emails and phone. They were very passionate about sharing their experiences and opinions.

The interviews were recorded on an MP3 player with the consent of the participants and in addition I also maintained field notes with contextual details and non-verbal expressions for data analysis and interpretation (Tong et al., 2007: 356). As Tong et al., (2007: 351) suggest: in semi-structured interview, the researchers encourage participants to talk about issues pertinent to the research question by asking open-ended questions, usually in one-to-one interviews and also the interviewer might re-word, re-order or clarify the questions to further investigate topics introduced by the respondent. In this research, I have used open ended questions during face to face interview to get information from the interviewees.
3.4.3 Documents

Documents are a frequent source of qualitative data and they are considered as receptacles, agents in their own right or a resource for further action (Prior, 2003 cited in Woodhouse, 2006: 347). Documents are written materials and other documents from the organizational, clinical, or programs records; memoranda and correspondence; official publications and reports; personal diaries, letters, artistic works, photographs, and memorabilia; and written responses to open-ended surveys (Patton, 2002: 4). Documents can be a ‘rich source of information, contextually relevant and grounded in the contexts they represent’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985: 277 cited in Woodhouse, 2006: 348).

Like other analytical methods in qualitative research, documentary analysis requires that data be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Rapley, 2007 cited in Bowen, 2009: 27). Documentary analysis in qualitative inquiry yields excerpts, quotations, or an entire passage from organisational, clinical, or program records: memoranda and correspondence, official publications and reports, personal diaries, and open-ended responses to questionnaires and surveys (Patton, 1990: 10). The nature of this type of research is exploratory and open-ended.

Over the past twenty years, at least, social scientists have favoured interviews, questionnaires and direct observation as the basic tools of social research but documents are seen as only of marginal utility (McCulloch, 2004: 4). Flick (2006: 248) states that the first criterion is to address the question of whether the document is a primary or secondary document. In this research original policy statements, reports and laws explicitly related to youth have been used as a primary documents and other scholarly works, articles and commentaries are used as secondary documents. Bowen, (2009: 29-30) suggests five specific functions of documentary material:

- Documents can provide data on the context within which research participants operate;
- Information contained in documents can suggest some questions that need to be asked and situations that need to be observed as part of the research;
- Documents provide supplementary research data. Information and insights derived from documents can be valuable additions to a knowledge base;
• Documents provide a means of tracking change and development. Where various drafts of a particular document are accessible, the researcher can compare them to identify the changes;

• Documents can be analysed as a way to verify findings or corroborate evidence from other sources.

The documents that were selected for this study fit into the conceptual framework and were chosen for their ‘authenticity, credibility, accuracy and representativeness by taking into account the original purpose of each document, the context in which it was produced, and the intended audience’ (Bowen, 2009: 33). According to Patton (1990 cited in Bowen, 2009: 28), triangulation helps the researcher guard against the accusation that a study’s findings are simply an artifact of a single method, a single source, or a single investigator’s bias. Wolff (2004 cited in Flick, 2006: 249) suggests that while analyzing the documents, they ‘should be seen as a way of contextualizing information rather than using them as information containers, they should be seen and analyzed as methodologically created communicative turns in constructing versions of events’.

Guided by the above considerations, the primary policy documents selected for analysis in this thesis are those which specifically address the needs and circumstances of young people in Ireland and India. These are expressly named as such and are presented in the table below. In the case of Indian national youth policy my analysis was initially of the draft version published in 2012. The final version which included number of changes was published in 2014 a short time before the submission of this thesis and the text has been amended to take a current account of the changes.

Table 3.1: The Primary Policy Documents: Ireland and India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irish Policy Documents</th>
<th>Indian Policy Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>A Policy for Youth and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Development of Youth Work Services in Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Data Analysis

Qualitative research is not given to mathematical abstractions, it is nonetheless systematic in its approach to data collection and analysis. Framed by a focus of inquiry, whether data is collected through interviews or questionnaires, open-ended questioning allows study participants to articulate their perceptions and experiences freely and spontaneously. The underlying goal of this comparative analysis is to search for similarity and variance which not only uncover differences between social entities, but also reveal unique aspects of a particular entity that would otherwise be virtually impossible to detect (Mills et al., 2006: 621). This research attempts to find the similarities and differences in youth policy by analysing the data gathered through face to face interviews and the comparison and thematic analysis of documents from both countries. The primary data analysed for this study include (a) the transcripts of 22 key-informants’ interviews from India and Ireland and (b) youth policy documents from both countries. The secondary materials analysed are books and articles related to the topic. This study analyses the data in order to come up with findings that meet its objectives. As Antonesa et al., (2007: 95) state ‘the complete process of analysis requires that the data be organised, scrutinised, selected, described, theorised, interpreted, discussed and presented’.

The process of data analysis achieved in this study based on the principles of thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006: 79) state that it is preferred because ‘it is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data and it
minimally organizes and describes your data set in (rich) detail’. As Maykut and Morehouse (1994: 18) point out: ‘words are the way that most people come to understand their situations; we create our world with words; we explain ourselves with words; we defend and hide ourselves with words’. Thus, in qualitative data analysis and presentation: ‘the task of the researcher is to find patterns within those words and to present those patterns for others to inspect while at the same time staying as close to the construction of the world as the participants originally experienced it’ (ibid). The thematic analysis is ‘a form of pattern recognition within the data, with emerging themes becoming the categories for analysis’ (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006 cited in Bowen, 2009: 32).

This study uses a combination of deductive and inductive reasoning in order to discover answers to the research question. According to Gray (2011: 15) the inductive and deductive process are mutually inclusive. Dewey (1933 cited in Gray, 2011: 14) outlines a general ‘paradigm of enquiry that underpins the scientific approach, consisting of inductive discovery (induction) and deductive proof (deduction). Deduction begins with a universal view of a situation and works back to the particulars; in contrast, induction moves from fragmentary details to a connected view of a situation’. Ali and Birley (1999: 2) state that ‘researchers may find themselves in situations where they would like to make use of existing theory to guide their investigations. However, they may also see the research developing rather than testing theory, in which case the data may need to be gathered on an inductive/qualitative basis’.

This study uses deductive reasoning which in turn utilises the existing model of Gough’s (2008) “five I’s” as a guiding analytical lens for investigation. The present study also uses inductive reasoning to analyse data from face-to-face interviews and documents to create a new model of youth policy making using the same analytical lens of Gough. The combination of deductive and inductive reasoning is also used in the various phases of data analysis. Qualitative analysis is typically inductive which involves discovering patterns, themes, and categories in one’s data (Patton, 2002; 453). According to Robinson (1951 cited in Bryman and Burgess, 2002: 4) analytic induction comprises the following sequence of steps: ‘it begins with a rough definition of a problem or issue; appropriate cases are examined; and a possible explanation of the problem is formulated and the investigator then examines further appropriate cases
to establish how well the data collected fit the hypothetical explanation’. In analysing data generated in this format, responses are not grouped according to pre-defined categories, rather salient categories of meaning and relationships between categories are derived from the data itself through a process of inductive reasoning. The thematic analysis approach offers the means whereby the researcher may access and analyse these articulated perspectives so that they may be integrated in a model that seeks to explain the social processes under study.

Although conceptual frameworks are very common in quantitative research, there are many qualitative researchers like Jane Gilgun, Corbin, Holroyd and many others who used conceptual framework in their qualitative research (Corbin and Strauss, 2008: 39-40). The use of conceptual framework in qualitative research is different from quantitative research. Corbin and Strauss, (2008: 42) argue that qualitative research method ‘does not define the variables to be studied nor does it structure the research in the same manner as it is done in quantitative studies but it tends to be used more as justification for the use of a particular methodology or as a guiding approach to the research’. In this research, in light of a careful literature review, I found Ian Gough's (2008) “five I’s” model of social policy-making model was closely suited to my research. I decided to use it to compare youth policy in Ireland and India, a position supported by Corbin and Strauss (2008: 39-41) and other qualitative researchers.

The key interviews of twenty-two key-informants were recorded and they were transcribed by the researcher with the support of friends. An enormous amount of printed qualitative data and hand written notes were used for manual analysis. The process was expensive and time consuming especially in India where travelling and getting appointments with key-informants were very challenging. The active participation of different key-informants gave me motivation to continue the process effectively. The different context of the study enabled the author to bring out new themes from the data. The emphasis was not just in what key-informants were saying but in the way that they were saying it. Judgement and interpretive skills were used throughout the whole process of interviewing. Policy documents also were considered as an important source for the qualitative data analysis. The document analysis involved ‘skimming (superficial examination), reading (through examination), and interpretation’ (Bowen, 2009: 32). In this research youth-policy documents have gone
through the above mentioned three steps to answer the research question. The data from interviews and documents were analysed together which helped in the emergence of themes. In this research documentary evidence is combined with the interviews ‘to minimise bias and establish credibility’ *(ibid: 38)*. The data was gathered, coded and analysed according to the themes.

In this study I have followed the analytical process of coding, managing the codes and documenting the codes. Coding is fundamental to the qualitative data analysis. As Corbin and Strauss (2008: 66) state analysing data involves ‘what is commonly termed coding, taking raw data and raising it to a conceptual level’. Based on my qualitative data from the interviews and youth policy documents, I prepared a code list and marked those phrases or sentences that captured each code. This method involves breaking down the data into discrete ‘incidents’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) or ‘units’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1985) and coding them to categories.

The codes were ‘segregated, grouped, regrouped and relinked in order to consolidate meaning and explanation’ (Gribich, 2007: 21 cited in Saldana, 2012: 3) under different categories. The categories are evolved through two forms: one is derived from the participants’ customs and language, and other from those that the researcher identifies as significant to the project’s focus-of-inquiry; the aim of the former ‘is to reconstruct the categories used by subjects to conceptualise their own experiences and world view’, the aim of the latter is to assist the researcher in developing theoretical insights through developing themes that illuminate the social processes operative in the site under study; thus: ‘the process of comparative analysis between Ireland and India stimulates thought that leads to both descriptive and explanatory categories’ (Guba and Lincoln, 1985: 334-341).

Categories undergo content and definition changes as units and incidents are compared and categorised, and as understandings of the properties of categories and the relationships between categories are developed and refined over the course of the analytical process. In this process some categories that contained clusters of coded data go through further refinement into subcategories and then again the major categories were compared with each other and consolidated in various ways to progress towards the thematic, conceptual and theoretical (Saldana, 2012: 12). Richards and Morse (2007: 157 cited in Saldana, 2012: 12) clarify that “categorizing is how we get ‘up’
from the diversity of data to the shapes of the data, the sorts of things represented. Concepts are how we get up to more general, higher-level, and more abstract constructs”. As Taylor and Bogdan (1984: 126) write: ‘Using this method, the researcher simultaneously codes and analyses data in order to develop concepts; by continually comparing specific incidents in the data, the researcher refines these concepts, identifies their properties, explores their relationships to one another, and integrates them into a coherent explanatory model’. The detailed process of coding, managing codes and documenting codes is set out below.

3.5.1 Using Qualitative Data Analysis Software

Saldana (2012: 21) suggests that for coding and qualitative analysis first to use paper and pencil on hard copies of data entered and formatted with basic word-processing software only. First I manually coded the data with paper and pencil and entered and formatted in Microsoft office which gave me basic understanding of the data. Basit (2003: 143) compared personal experiences between manual and electronic coding and concluded ‘the choice will be dependent on the size of the project, the funds and time available, and the inclination and expertise of the researcher’ (Saldana, 2012: 22). Having the large amount of data I planned to use Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS) called NVivo to get best out of the software. NVivo is a software package developed as a CAQDAS in 1981 by Australian academic Richards (2009) to support her work as a family sociologist The CAQDAS import and handle documents saved in rich text format, enabling you to employ supplemental ‘cosmetic’ coding devices such as colour fonts, bolding, and italicizing in your data (Lewins and silver, 2007: 61 cited in Saldana, 2012: 23).

It is important to note that in using qualitative data analysis software, the researcher does not transfer the hermeneutic task to the logic of the computer; rather the computer is used as a tool for efficiency and transparency. It is not a tool which in and of itself conducts analysis and draws conclusions. As Fielding and Lee (1998: 167) explain, qualitative researchers ‘want tools which support analysis, but leave the analyst firmly in charge’. Importantly such software also serves as a tool for transparency. Arguably, the production of an audit trail is the key most important criterion on which the trustworthiness and plausibility of a study can be established. Qualitative analysis software’s logging of data movements and coding patterns, and
mapping of conceptual categories and thought progression, render all stages of the analytical process traceable and transparent, facilitating the researcher in producing a more detailed and comprehensive audit trail than manual mapping of this complicated process can allow. A qualitative research approach does not commence with a prior hypothesis to be tested and proved but with a focus of inquiry that takes the researcher on a voyage of discovery as it takes an inductive approach to data analysis, and research outcomes are not broad generalizations but contextual findings; qualitative researchers tend to speak of ‘transferability’ (from context to context) rather than generalizability.

In this study, I first familiarised myself with the transcribed data by reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas. Then the interview data collected was imported into an NVivo software and analysed through the eight discrete cycles of analyses. These cycles involve three separate set of cycles of coding, one cycles of managing codes, one for initial categorisation of open codes and third cycle which uses writing itself as a tool to prompt deeper thinking of the data (Bazeley, 2009) leading to findings from which conclusions may be drawn. Some of the managing coding cycles will also involve additional coding. The details of the process of these cycles of coding are explained below.

Phase 1 - In this phase, in order to generate initial coding I coded interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set. This is called ‘open coding’ which involves broad participant-driven open coding of the chronological interview transcripts recorded from study participants supported with definitions so as to deconstruct the data into initial codes. These codes have clear labels and definitions to serve as rules for inclusion (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994: 126-149) of units of meaning (text segments) which will be coded from the interview transcripts. I also used annotations to jot down my thoughts, create memos to capture details and observations (Appendix 5).

Phase 2 - In this phase, in order to search for themes, the codes which were identified in phase 1 were collated into potential themes. All data relevant to each potential theme were also gathered in this phase. I organised them into a framework that makes sense to further the analysis of the data. This phase also includes distilling, re-labelling & merging common codes from both India and in Ireland to ensure that
labels and rules for inclusion accurately reflect coded content (Appendix 6). The detail process of analysis is given below.

Phase 3 - This phase is called ‘coding on’. This process breaks down the now restructured themes into sub-themes to offer more in depth understanding of the highly qualitative aspects under scrutiny such as divergent views, negative cases, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours coded to these categories and to offer clearer insights into the meanings embedded therein (Appendix 7).

Phase 4 – This phase is called ‘in case analysis.’ It involves an analysis of all emergent themes and sub-themes as developed according to each research site so as to initially report on a country by country basis. This process involved running a query in NVivo known as a matrix. A matrix sub-divides all codes into the content from each research site to give the researcher two discrete views of the data: form and content. The ‘form’ view offers a tabular and more strategic view of the codes to show which codes from each country contain data and to what extent. The content view, allows the researcher to drill down and see the just coded content from that country. Memos, described here as ‘summary statements’ were then written to further synthesise the content into more manageable proportions and offer an overview of that countries position (Appendix 8).

Phase 5 – This phase is called ‘cross case analysis’ which involves a comparative analysis of all emergent themes and sub-themes as developed according to both research sites so as to report on similarities and differences between the two research sites under scrutiny. Matrices were also used as the primary tool for this stage of the analysis (Appendix 9).

Phase 6 – This phase refers to the writing of analytical memos against the higher level themes to summarise accurately their content and its codes and propose empirical findings against such categories. Writing analytical memos are a critical aspect of qualitative data analysis. It is a systematic review and documentation of coding framework. The following are the five key elements that these analytical memos set out to address:

1. The content of the cluster of codes on which report is based;
2. The patterns where relevant (levels of coding for example although this could be used to identify exceptional cases as well as shared experiences);
3. Considering background information recorded against participants and considering any patterns that may exist in relation to participants’ profiles;
4. Situating the code(s) in the storyboard – meaning considering the relatedness of codes to each other, and their importance to addressing the research question and sequencing disparate codes and clusters of codes into a story or narrative which is structured and can be expressed in the form of a coherent and cohesive chapter;
5. Considering primary sources in the context of relationships with the literature as well as identifying gaps in the literature.

Phase 7 – This phase refers to validation which involves testing, validating and revising analytical memos so as to self-audit proposed findings by seeking evidence in the data beyond textual quotes to support the stated findings and seeking to expand on deeper meanings embedded in the data. This process involves checking each memo for validity against the data to ensure that they provide a true account of participants’ attitudes, beliefs and views expressed during the interview. This also involves interrogation of data and forces the consideration of elements beyond the category itself; drawing on relationships across and between categories and cross tabulation with demographics, observations and literature. This phase results in evidence based findings as each finding must be validated by being rooted in the data itself and will rely on the creation of reports from the data to substantiate findings.

Phase 8 – This phase refers to synthesising analytical memos into a coherent, cohesive and well supported outcome statement or findings report. This phase results in the production of two chapters on findings of Ireland and India. It further leads to the interpretation and discussion chapter.

3.5.2 Stages and Process involved in Qualitative Analysis

The six-step approach to conducting thematic analysis as articulated by Braun and Clarke, (2006: 87) is set out now in Table 3.1. The purpose of this table is to show that the stages and processes deployed using NVivo as the data management tool were entirely consistent with Braun and Clarke’s guidelines (ibid):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical Process (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2006)</th>
<th>Braun and Clarke Practical Application in NVivo</th>
<th>Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Iterative process throughout analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing yourself with the data</td>
<td>Trancribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas Import data into the NVivo data management tool</td>
<td>Explanatory Accounts (Extrapolating deeper meaning, drafting summary statements and analytical memos through NVIVO )</td>
<td>Assigning data to refined concepts to portray meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Phase 1 – Open Coding- Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collecting data relevant to each code</td>
<td></td>
<td>Refining and distilling more abstract concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Phase 2 - Categorization of Codes – Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme</td>
<td>Descriptive Accounts (Reordering, ‘coding on’ and annotating through NVIVO)</td>
<td>Assigning data to themes/concepts to portray meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Phase 3 – Coding on - Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (level 1) and the entire data set (level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assigning meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>Phase 4 – Documentation (summary statements) - On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story [storylines] the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme and synthesizing content into more manageable proportions</td>
<td>Data Management (Open and</td>
<td>Generating themes and concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Producing the report

Phase 5 – Generating Analytical Memos - Phase 6 – Testing and Validating and Phase 7 Synthesizing Analytical Memos. The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis

3.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical principles in this research are considered important because they are directly related to the integrity of the piece of research and of the disciplines that are involved. In the field of social research, the researchers need to follow ethical rules of behavior to prevent them from doing harm to others and to protect themselves (Boeije, 2010: 45). To a large extent, concern about research ethics revolves around various issues of ‘harm, consent, privacy, and the confidentiality of data’ (ASA, 1997; Punch, 1994, 2005 cited in Berg and Lune, 2012: 61). The four main areas of ethical principles mentioned by Diener and Crandall (1978 cited in Bryman, 2004: 509) are checked and followed in the process of this research: ‘whether there is harm to participants; whether there is a lack of informed consent; whether there is an invasion of privacy; whether deception is involved.’

The key-informants were contacted with proper information along with a letter from the department through post or email. I also contacted informants by telephone to get their consent for the interview. Information relating to the nature, aims, method and benefits of the research were given to the participants before the interview and they were also informed about my identity as PhD researcher from the National University of Ireland, Maynooth. In this research informed consent is intended ‘to ensure that the participants are placed in a situation where they can decide, in full knowledge of the risks and benefits of the study, whether and how to participate’ (Endacott, 2004 cited in Boeije, 2010: 45). Before each interview the key-informants were asked to sign informed consent statements for the following two reasons: ‘Firstly, they systematically ensure that potential subject are knowingly participating in a study and
are doing so of their own choice. Second, signed consent slips provide a means by which to monitor the voluntary participation of subjects’ (Berg and Lune, 2012: 90-91).

A basic concept in qualitative research is trust (Boeije, 2010: 45). Throughout the process of interviewing, I tried to maintain trust which helped to gain more information and support. Interviews were recorded with the participants’ permission along with their consent for the publication of their statements. Maintaining confidentiality and anonymity throughout the process was agreed upon. Hence, the original names of those who participated in the interviews were changed in this research to ensure confidentiality. Honesty and integrity, respect for the rights and dignity of the youth worker were maintained. The recorded data from the interviews were safely stored and have been used in accordance with the highest standards as prescribed by the University’s Research Ethics Committee. The signed Informed Consent Forms will be retained by the researcher in a secure location for a period of three years and will then be destroyed (Berg and Lune, 2012: 91), (Appendix, 2-3).

The thesis is a descriptive and explanatory study which utilizes a qualitative method to gather in-depth information about the understanding of youth policies of Republic of Ireland and Republic of India. This method has proved to be appropriate for this research to address the research question. It helped to compare the factors and actors that influence the youth policies in Ireland and India. A good environment was created for the key-informants of youth policy both in Ireland and India to express their understanding and perception freely and openly. Through this methodology, an opportunity was created for the key-informants to participate actively in the one-to-one interview. Youth policy documents of both countries were also very useful to get factual information about youth policy which added strength to the interview data. The key-informants’ passion was evident throughout the interviews and this served to enhance the richness of the information obtained from the interviews. Ethical issues were given priority throughout the process of this research. In the course of this research, the author was able to contact many national and international researchers, educationists, policy makers and practitioners in the field of youth policy. This in itself was an enriching experience. Participating in conferences, seminars, workshops and publishing articles increased my understanding of the concept of study and research.
Chapter Four
Indian Youth Policy

India is a ‘multiparty, federal, democratic republic’ (Johari, 2011: 217) which may be described as welfare state in its approach; socialist and secular in its constitution (Shukla, 1989: 39). The Indian Constitution makes specific provision for the welfare of its citizens, one in the form of fundamental rights and the other as directive principles of state policy. The Indian directive principles of state policy have been inspired by the Directive Principles stated in the Constitution of Ireland and also by the principles of Gandhian philosophy (National Institute of Open Schooling, 2013: 48). India has been known to the world as a ‘land of mysteries’ and a country with enormous variety (Sahayadas, 2006: 19). India is characterised by diversity through its rich religious, multi-lingual population, its plethora of cultures and ethnicities, and the vastness of its landscape. India is governed under a parliamentary system consisting of twenty-eight states and seven union territories.

The arrival and influence of Aryans during 2000-1000 BC in Northwest India had led to the introduction of the Varna System through ‘Manu Shastra’. The Varna System became deeply rooted in the society and has made India vulnerable on its basis of ‘Casteism’ as an equivalent to racism and the class system in Western society (Harrison et al., 2007: 11). The caste system is a closed form of social stratification in which birth alone determines a person’s entire future, with little or no social mobility based on individual effort (Macionis, 2009: 209). The system divides people into four castes: Brahmins, Kshatriyars, Vaisiyas and Sudras. Each group has its own duty to perform in the society. The caste system has legal, religious and social sanctions. As Ambedkar (1990 cited in Raja, 2011: 5) says, ‘The Varna system has a religious sanction and it has the fullest social sanction from the Hindu society. With no legal prohibition, this religious sanction has been more than enough to keep the Varna system in full bloom.’

India’s natural riches have been a cause of war and invasion in the past. The vested interests of Parsis, Greeks, Portuguese and French made India a prime target. Finally, the British through the East India Company (1600 AD) conquered and colonised India after the Indian Mutiny in 1857, except for a few union territories which were under
the French and the Portuguese (Grover and Grover, 2002: 712). British rule for over 200 years paved the way for industrial development but with very negative consequences for native art and economy and with the emphasis on a supply-based production model to fulfil the needs of Great Britain (Chopra, 2010: 26). The far-reaching consequences of British rule for Indian society included:

- The age-old traditions began to decline due to new social and economic forces;
- The classical languages such as Sanskrit and Persian declined and English became the official language;
- The traditional handicrafts in the Indian countryside had a slow death as they were unable to withstand the competition of machine-made textiles and other goods brought by the British to the Indian markets from Manchester, Lancashire, Sheffield and London;
- The Indian villages were not able to continue as viable economic units (ibid).

In the 18th-19th centuries, British researchers found that the instruments for production (viz. plough, cattle, seed, manure, etc.) were held by the Indian family unit, but the land for production was held by the villagers in common under the village community system (Mukherjee, 2000: 333). As later admitted by Lord Bentinck (1829 cited in Mukherjee, 2000: 333), ‘this unified strength of the Indian peasants, artisans, and traders under the village community system was shattered by introducing the zemindary system in 1793 in Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa (the Subah of Bengal) as the Permanent Settlement of Land, and in due course spread all over India’.

However, British rule significantly contributed to the establishment of the modern education system with schools, technical and industrial training institutions, colleges and universities. The work of missionaries in developing educational institutions was notable from the time of Francis Xavier and Robert-de-Nobili. They introduced elementary schools, orphanages, established the printing press and offered services for the marginalised with hospitals and medical institutions as well as social service centres and other social reforms. In the year 1936-37, 14,341 missionary institutions were recorded (Grover and Grover, 2002: 701-703). The introduction of railway, tram and other automotive inventions revolutionised transportation. Though Ashoka, Samudrargupta in Ancient times and Akbar to Aurangzeb in medieval times had ruled India as a whole, the development of a unified India became possible and the political system developed along the lines of the British system. However, the positive effects
of modernisation need to be balanced by a recognition of the exploitation caused by colonisation (National Institute of Open Schooling, 2013b: 168).

4.1 The Emergence of Indian Social Policy

According to Paranjpe (1990: 2) the development of social welfare in India began with the social reforms and provision of specific services to the handicapped and disadvantaged individuals and groups provided voluntarily by the joint family, caste and religious institutions and the government had only limited responsibilities. Muzumdar (1964: 5) states that during the pre-colonial period, the field of welfare had rested on three pillars of solidarity: ‘extended families, village and religious or caste communities’. It was only during British rule, with such changes in Indian society as urbanisation and industrialisation that organised social welfare came into existence in urban areas but only for limited groups of people (Paranjpe, 1990: 2-3). Ehmke (2011: 6) opines that the arrival of colonialism, on the one hand, opened up the rigid determination of occupations by caste when the colonial industries and the military offered jobs and upward social mobility to some of the most oppressed groups. On the other hand, the pre-colonial economic order of the jajmani system was disturbed by the arrival of industrially manufactured goods, with which craftsmen could not compete. Those who lost their place in the old economic system became subject to a new mode of economic exploitation: as part of the forming working class.

The British colonial administration changed the heredity economy regime in India by introducing the permanent settlement of 1793 but at the same time failed to implement the early Poor Laws in India which were introduced in England under Queen Elizabeth I (Ehmke, 2011: 6). As Corbridge et al., state (2005: 52 cited in Ehmke, 2011: 6): The English, who had been among the first nations to install a poor relief at home, reacted to urban poverty in India with containment and zoning, and the problem of the rural poor was perceived as a result of their backwardness, untouchability and finally of ‘Indianness’ itself’. The British introduced ‘social security’ for a small group of people who were working for them by the Workmen Compensation Act of 1923 which was the beginning the institutionalisation of state welfare mechanisms in India (Ehmke, 2011: 6).
Soon after independence, social welfare policy received a greater impetus and direction due to the active intervention of the government. The goals of development have been enshrined in the constitution and various planning documents. The Indian Constitution which came into force on 26th January 1950 laid down the aim to build a socialist, secular and democratic polity (Chopra, 2010: 297). Ehmke (2011: 8) states that ‘a key moment for the institutionalisation of the Indian welfare regime came with the formulation of the country’s constitution’. India has not only a system of liberal democracy but also a federal polity, in which certain aspects of social policy such as land reforms, education, health, and rural infrastructure are either specifically ‘state government subjects’ or are concurrently under both state and central governments (Ghosh, 2002: 4). Article 58 of the Directive Principles of the Indian Constitution directs the State ‘to secure and promote a social order which stands for welfare of the people’ (Paranjpe, 1990: 3). This provision and the involvement of different political groupings in each state leads to much variation in terms of major demographic, economic and social factors across the states (Ghosh, 2002: 4).

Important policy and provision for youth is contained in seven articles under the directive Principles of State Policy, which however are not enforceable in a court of law. These principles are:

- Right to an adequate means of livelihood;
- Securing health and strength and not abusing the tender age of children;
- Protecting against exploitation and against moral and material abandonment;
- Right to work, education, public assistance in case of unemployment;
- Just and humane conditions of work and maternity relief;
- Provision of free and compulsory education up to 14 years of age;
- Promotion with special care of educational and economic interests of the weaker sections (Saraswathi, 1992: 165).

The welfare of citizens can only be achieved with proper planning. Hence, the National Planning Commission (15th March 1950) was formed under the Chairmanship of the then Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru which opted for Five Year Plans, akin to the ‘soviet’ model of economic growth. The Planning Commission tried to address the basic issues of national development with four long-term prime objectives with socialist orientation. They are:
To increase production to the maximum possible extent so as to achieve higher level of national and per capita income;
To achieve full employment;
To reduce inequalities of income and wealth;
To set up a socialist society based on equality and justice and to ensure absence of exploitation (Grover and Grover, 2002: 720).

The above four prime objectives were addressed in every Five Year Plan thereafter. The policy measures of the government meant that the state took the lead in business and restricted the power of private enterprise. Licensing of industries and import restrictions further circumscribed industry (Tripathi, 2003: 223).

The Government of India started the Central Social Welfare Board (CSWB) in August 1953 based on the recommendation of the Planning Commission in its First Five Year Plan. The creation of CSWB was an important milestone in the field of social welfare which aimed at promoting, developing and assisting voluntary effort to involve the voluntary sector in the development of welfare services. It also preceded the setting up of the Department of Social Security and enabled the national movement to think about the need for the social progress and removal of long-standing ‘backwardness’ (Paranjpe, 1990: 13). Up to the seventh Five Year Plan, there was no material change in the economic policies of the country.

The policies aimed at equitable redistribution of the national resources, a heavier taxation burden on the rich, provision of subsidised goods and services to the poor sections of the society, welfare of the poor and the ‘downtrodden’, restrictions on inflow of foreign capital investments, complete regulation of the economy, a prominent role of the public sector in industrial development and fixed prices for many goods and services (Tripathi, 2003: 226). The social and economic conditions and the international imperatives led the government to intervene with a New Economic Policy (NEP) package in 1991 which opened the door for liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation. This was reflected in the policy reforms of the Eighth Plan (1992-97) and then with the Ninth Five Year plan (1997-2002) as a result of which the direction of economic planning changed in India. This altered the monopoly of the public sector (ibid: 227). After the general elections of 2004 and the formation of the government under the United Progressive Alliance (UPA), there was a shift towards a rights-
oriented policy. The best examples are the Right to Information Act of 2005, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) from the same year and the Right to Education Act of August 2009. Also currently discussions on ‘an act that shall guarantee the right to food’ are underway (Ehmke, 2011: 10).

4.2 ‘Children’ and ‘Young People’ in Law and Policy

Dr. A.P.J. Kalam, former President of India, in his presidential address on 24th July 2004, stated that youth is ‘the powerful resource on the earth, under the earth and above the earth. It is the duty of the nation to notice what direction the youth force takes, and how to channelize this force constructively in the society’ (Devendiran, 2010: 45).

India is the most populous democracy in the world and also has the world’s largest youth population, with 70% of the population below the age of 35 years (Kingra, 2005: 127). According to 2011 Census, India’s population is next only to China with its count of 1,210,193,422. India has 550 million youth including adolescents (Government of India, 2011: 3). In 2020, it is estimated that the average Indian will be only 29 years old, compared with an average age of 37 years in China and the US, and 45 years in western Europe and Japan (DeSouza et al., 2009: xiv). It is also clearly stated in the Indian National Youth policy 2014:

Youth in the age group of 15-29 years comprise 27.5% of the population. …India is expected to have a very favourable demographic profile… The population of India is expected to exceed 1.3 billion by 2020 with a median age of 28 which is considerably less than the expected median ages of China and Japan. The working population of India, is expected to increase to 592 million by 2020, next only to China (776 million), pointing to the fact that youth will make a significant contribution to the economic development of the country. This ‘demographic dividend’ offers a great opportunity to India (Government of India, 2014: 10).

There are different views on how subgroups within the youth population should be categorised. For example studies by Regional Unit for Social and Human Sciences in Asia and the Pacific (RUSHSAP, 1987 cited in Devendiran, 2010: 47) use two sub-groups: namely, 15-19 age group constituting the entrants into the youth category and 20-24 age group who are preparing to enter adulthood. Saraswathi (1988) classifies
'youth’ as all those in the age group 15-34 years and subdivides them into three subgroups: ‘sub junior’ youth (15-19 years), ‘junior’ youth (20-24 years), and ‘senior’ youth (24-34 years) (Devendiran, 2010: 47).

As discussed earlier, defining and categorizing ‘youth’ differs from country to country, state to state. There are several Indian central and state legislations that define ‘youth’ for separate treatment. The Juvenile Justice Act – 1986 (JJ Act) states that a juvenile is a person below 18 years (for a boy) and 21 years (for a girl), while the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection) Act 2000 specifies 18 years for both the genders. The Planning Commission of India (2002) refers to youth as the age group between 15 and 34 year (ibid). The Constitution, under its fundamental rights, prohibits employment of children below 14 years of age in any factory, mine or in any hazardous occupation.

Indian national youth policies of 1988 and 2003 covered all young people in the age group of 13 - 35 years. However, those within this age group are unlikely to be homogeneous and they have numerous different roles and responsibilities (ESCAP, 2007: 39). Furthermore, the young people aged 13 to 19 years, which is a major part of the adolescent age group, is regarded as a separate constituency as compared to the group of people between 20-35 years. The changing needs and issues of young people forced the Indian government to review the national youth policy (NYP) and the NYP 2014 aims to cover all youth in the country within the age-bracket of 15 to 29 years (Government of India, 2014: 9).

Different classifications are used for other purposes. For example, the Indian government for the sake of welfare services classifies youth into target groups such as ‘student and non-student, rural and urban, employed and unemployed, affluent and poor, industrial youth and young farmers and males and females’ (Devendiran, 2010: 47).

4.3 The Emergence of Indian Youth Policy

During pre-independence period there was a slow growth in youth services as compared to child welfare services in India because it was taken for granted that the youths would take care of themselves. During British rule in India, youth services
started with the introduction of Bharat Scouts and Guides’ movement for Anglo-Indians only in 1909, and for Indian boys separately in 1914. And for Anglo-Indian girls, The Guides were established for Anglo-Indian girls in 1911 and for Indian girls in 1916. The organisations were initially under British control and aimed ‘to provide opportunities for developing those qualities of character which make the youth self-disciplined, self-reliant, willing and able to serve the community’ (Madan, 2007: 131-133). This Scouts and Guides movement was centralised in the 1980s funded by the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012a: 37).

In 1948, the National Cadet Corps Act was passed and the corps was organised in schools, colleges and universities all over the country. The aims of the National Cadet Corps (NCC) are three:

First to develop character, comradeship, the ideal of service and capacity for leadership in young men and women; secondly, to provide service training to young men and women so as to stimulate interest in the defence of the country; and thirdly, to build up a reserve of potential officers to enable the armed forces to expand rapidly in a national emergency (Madan, 2007: 136)

Amidst growing incidence of student unrest in the country in the late 1960s, as in many other parts of the world, the Government of India began to think of formulating an integrated youth service programme. In 1968, The Planning Commission appointed the Working Group on Programme and Policies for the Welfare of Non-Student Youth. It categorized youth as the age group of 12-30 years and it further divided into three stages, i.e., 12-17, 17-21 and 21-30 years (Madan, 2007: 131).

The Working Group was asked ‘to specify the objective of a comprehensive National Plan for Youth and to review the growth of youth movement in the country and the existing programmes for youth and to examine how and to what extent the existing programmes could be integrated in a national plan’ (Saraswathi, 2008: 55). This resulted in the Ministry of Education being registered as the Ministry of Education and Youth Services and it convened a conference of representatives of youth organizations, youth services agencies and youth leaders in April-May 1969
In 1969, during the conference the then Minister for education, V.K.R.V. Rao defined the objectives of the youth services as follows:

To provide opportunities to the non-student youth for self-expression, self-employment and cultural attainments, preparation and training for work and family life, enabling them to assume social and civic responsibilities; to develop in them a spirit of comradeship and patriotism, and a cultural outlook and to facilitate their participation in planning and implementation of the programmes of community and national development (Ministry of Education and Youth Services, 1969: 7).

This conference resulted in the formation of the National Youth Board with the Union Minister for Education and Youth Services as the chairman. The Board held its first meeting in December 1970 and it suggested the setting up of a state advisory board on youth in each state and a district youth board in each district. This was the beginning of an organisational set-up within the union government to cater for the exclusive needs of the youth population and to safeguard and promote youth interests in the national plans and programmes (Saraswathi, 2008: 56-58).

There was no explicit youth policy, named as such, prior to 1988. However, even in the absence of a youth policy, the Government of India had always expressed commitment to the development of youth and its importance to the process of nation building. It was this that lead to the initiation of well-organized youth programs like National Cadet Corps (NCC, mentioned above), National Service Scheme (NSS) and Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS) immediately after independence (Kingra, 2005: 128).

There are several programmes funded by the Planning Commission, included in the Five Year Plans for the welfare and development of youth in India. The First Five Year Plan (1951-1956) aimed at co-ordinating all the existing youth services at that time such as the Scouts’ and Guides’ organisation, the National Cadet Corps, the students’ unions, sports and athletic associations in or outside the colleges, dramatic clubs, and so on (Madan, 2007: 132). The plan pointed out that there is need to co-ordinate the work of all youth organisations into a single youth movement functioning through a national council of affiliated youth organisations. Such an organisation, whilst permitting its members to work for their own objectives and carry out their programme independently, would work to build up the individual and collective
strength of all youth organisations (Planning Commission, 1951). The perspective on youth and youth services underwent changes in the successive plans of the 1970s and the 1980s. The Fifth Five Year Plan (1975-79) stated the wealth of the community resources but included reference to intellectual and cultural heritage and stressed that young people from all backgrounds should get a proper share of this wealth (Planning Commission, 1975; Saraswathi, 2008: 60).

The Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85) described youth as a ‘vast human resource which is characterised by idealism, and zeal, active habits, positive attitude towards service to others, an urge to be self-reliant and a willingness to explore newer and non-conformist approaches to societal problems.’ The Plan also stated that if properly harnessed and utilised, the youth could be a ‘powerful instrument of social, cultural and economic change’ (Planning Commission, 1980; Saraswathi, 2008: 60-61).

The Sixth Plan (1980-85) recognised the need for a national youth policy that would integrate the work of relevant departments for effective implementation of programmes. The guiding principles adopted in this regard were:

1. To provide greater equality of opportunity to all among the youth;
2. To liberate their talent which is now lost to the society;
3. To ensure a higher average level of relevant basic skills and education through work and service;
4. To enable a smooth transition of the youth from childhood through adolescence to adulthood, as well as from the school to the world of work and service;
5. To channelize their energies, idealism and healthy aspirations towards development task, projects and programmes (Saraswathi, 2008: 61).

The Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90) envisaged development of human resources in all development programmes and qualitative improvement of education, skill formation, and health status (Planning Commission, 1985; Saraswathi, 2008: 62). During this time youth were the focus of attention of the government and non-governmental organisations. As a part of the re-structuring programme on 20th August 1986, India's young Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi announced ‘twenty points on youth development and participation’ which were integrated in the Seventh Five Year Plan (Chowdhry, 1988: 156).
The Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002) emphasised the importance of ‘youth power’ (Yuva Shakti) and the need to promote this resource in nation-building (Planning Commission, 1997). The Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007) recognised the very special needs of adolescents and the importance of providing them with the right stimulus, role models and environment so that they could grow as assets to the nation. These developments are reflected in the National Youth Policy adopted in 2003 (Planning Commission, 1997; Saraswathi, 2008: 67).

The Government of India, stating that it valued the importance and the resourcefulness of the youth population, formulated the National Youth Policy (NYP) in 1988. This initiative was also prompted by the United Nations International Year of Youth in 1985. The central theme of the policy was the promotion of ‘personality and functional capability’ of the youth.

The National Youth Policy of India adopted in 1988 did not mention any particular target group for special attention. As the first policy, it addressed the youth population in general to equip them to meet their obligations adequately and to give them their due share in the country's life and progress. The objectives then were to instil in the youth awareness and respect for the principles and values enshrined in the Constitution and willingness to further the rule of law, national integration, non-violence, secularism and socialism; to promote awareness of the rich cultural heritage of the nation; to develop in the youth qualities like discipline, self-reliance, justice and fair play; and to provide maximum access to education (Saraswathi, 2008: 67).

The NYP 1988 also aimed to implement programmes for the removal of unemployment, rural and urban, educated and non-educated. It also planned for a Committee on National Youth Programmes (CONYP) ‘to bring together the various representatives of concerned ministries, departments and national youth organisations, to advise the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports in discharging its duties in the effective implementation of the National Youth Policy’. However it failed to execute its objectives, primarily because of the weak implementation strategy (Sivakumar, 2012: 38).

In 1993, the Government of India established the Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD) as an apex information and research centre on
youth development issues (Sivakumar, 2012: 38). In response to the changing nature of society in the technological era, the NYP 2003 was intended ‘to galvanise the youth to rise to the new challenges and aimed at motivating them to be active and committed participants in the exciting task of national development’ (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2003). NYP 2003 is a refined version of NYP 1988 and the thrust of the Policy centres on ‘youth empowerment’ in different spheres of national life. To achieve this end, the policy elaborates on the thrust areas and identifies key sectors of youth concern as well as priority target groups. Though NYP 2003 spelled out an implementation mechanism more clearly than the 1988 policy, there were still problems in following through on the actions (Sivakumar, 2012: 38).

The National Youth Policy 2003 focused on the needs of those aged 13–35, but recognised adolescents (aged 13–19) as a special group requiring a different approach from that of young adults (aged 20–35). It recognised, moreover, the need for a multi-dimensional and integrated approach to serving youth needs and contained wide-ranging objectives. For example, it aimed to promote qualities of citizenship and adherence to secular principles and values; ensure educational and training opportunities for youth; facilitate their access to health information and services, and develop their leadership in socio-economic and cultural spheres. Further, it called for gender justice and a focus on ensuring that the gender gap in education is narrowed, that young women have access to health services, are free from domestic violence and have access to decision-making processes, and that young men are oriented to respect the status and rights of women (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2003).

The exposure draft of the draft NYP 2012 was unveiled by Minister for Youth Affairs and Sports on 31st May 2012. The draft NYP 2012 is intended to build on the earlier policies. It reaffirms the commitment of the nation to the holistic development of the young people of the country. The draft NYP 2012 aims to respond effectively to the changing conditions of the young people in the 21st century and to put young people at the centre of country’s growth and development (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012b: 2).

The government of India, following a review of the draft NYP 2012, launched the new National Youth Policy 2014. This defines youth age-group as 15-29 years ‘with a view to have a more focused approach, as far as various policy interventions are
concerned’ (Government of India, 2014: 9). The NYP 2014 (2014: 19) provides a holistic vision for the youth of India which is: ‘to empower youth of the country to achieve their full potential, and through them enable India to find its rightful place in the community of nations’. It also provides following five objectives and eleven key priority areas as given in the table below (ibid: 23):

Table 4.1: Objectives and Priority Areas of NYP2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Priority Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create a productive workforce that can make a sustainable contribution to India’s economic development</td>
<td>1. Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop a strong and healthy generation equipped to take on future challenges</td>
<td>2. Employment and Skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instil social values and promote community service to build national ownership</td>
<td>3. Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Facilitate participation and civic engagement at levels of governance</td>
<td>4. Health and healthy lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Support youth at risk and create equitable opportunity for all disadvantaged and marginalised youth</td>
<td>5. Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion of social values</td>
<td>6. Community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participation in politics and governance</td>
<td>7. Community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Youth engagement</td>
<td>8. Youth engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social justice</td>
<td>10. Social justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NYP 2014 includes the introduction of a Youth Development Index (YDI) with sub-indices such as Youth Health Index, Youth Education Index, Youth Work Index, Youth Amenities Index, and Youth Participation Index. YDI helps to recognize youth as a population category that needs separate consideration and the development of a summary index would help to make comparisons across regions. The NYP 2014 targets the following groups:

- Socially and economically disadvantaged youth, including but not limited to youth belonging to SC/ ST/ OBC groups, migrant youth and women; Out-of-school or drop-outs from the formal educational mainstream; Youth living in conflict affected districts, especially those affected by Left Wing Extremism (LWE) and youth from Jammu & Kashmir and the North East; Youth living with disability or suffering from chronic diseases; Youth at risk, including but not limited to youth suffering from substance abuse, youth at risk of human trafficking and youth working in hazardous occupations, sex workers; Youth that suffer from social or moral stigma including but not limited to
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) youth, youth infected or affected by HIV/AIDS; Youth in institutional care, orphanages, correctional homes and prisons (Government of India, 2014: 66-67).

Youth programmes in India have been formulated and are being implemented keeping the aim and objectives of NYP 2014 in view. The youth services and programmes are being planned, implemented and evaluated by the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports through the Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD), the Nehru Yuvakandra Sangathan (NYKS), the National Service Scheme (NSS) and other national youth related schemes and also Bharat Scout & Guides, the National Cadet Corps (NCC), National Youth Red Cross and NGOs (Sarumathy and Kalesh, 2007: 231). The Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports is the nodal ministry of youth development in India (Kingra, 2005: 135). Brief further information follows on some of the initiatives and programmes it supports.

1. The Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD) is an autonomous organization of the Ministry of Youth Affairs & Sports, registered as a Society under the Societies Registration Act, 1860, fully funded by the Government of India. RGNIYD functions as a resource centre that coordinates training, orientation, research, extension and outreach initiatives for state, central governments and national level youth organizations (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012a: 20; 2012b: 22).

2. Nehru Yuva Kendra Scheme was started in 1972 by the then Ministry of Education with the objective of providing development opportunities for non-student rural youth and enabling them to become involved in the nation-building-activities. In 1987, all the existing Kendras under the NYK scheme were re-organized into an autonomous body that was formed by a resolution of the Department of Youth Affairs. As a result of this endeavour, Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS) was formed. It has become one of the largest youth organizations in the world, having its presence in 501 districts of India. It is extending its service to more than 4.2 million non-student rural youth enrolled through over 125,000 village based active youth clubs (Ministry of Youth affairs and Sports, 2012a: 3; 2012b).
3. In India, the idea of involving students in the task of national service dates back to the times of Mahatma Gandhi, the ‘father of the nation’. It was started in 1969 to channel the ‘reservoir of youth resources’ for constructive social action. Its main objectives are, broadly, education and service (Chowdhry, 1988: 154). The main aim of National Service Scheme is personal development of young people through social service or community service. The NSS was formed in 1969 and started initially in 37 universities involving 40,000 volunteers. The scheme has grown over the years and it is implemented today with an involvement of more than 3.2 million student volunteers spread over 298 Universities, Polytechnics and 42 (+2) Senior Secondary Councils and Directorate of Vocational Education all over the country. The Motto of NSS – ‘Not Me But You’ – is intended to reflect the ‘essence of democratic living’ and to uphold the need for ‘selfless service’ (Ministry of Youth affairs and Sports, 2012a: 13). Through the NCC, the students also undertake social projects to learn the value of labour and teamwork (Ministry of Youth affairs and Sports, 2012a; 2012b).

4.4 The Factors and Actors that Influence Youth Policy

Following Gough's framework of the Five I's the remainder of this chapter explores the factors and the actors that have influenced the emergence and development of Indian youth policy as described above.

4.4.1. Industrialisation

Before the British rule, Indian traditional systems were well organised with welfare as well as economic functions. The villages of India were described as self-sufficient and self-manageable economies. The Jajmani (Jamindari or Landlord) system speaks of landholdings and cultivating communities which satisfied the primary needs of the people. Hence, occupations were ‘family occupations’ and the youth were trained and were employed in the family environment, based on the passing on of indigenous knowledge (Karur, 2010).

As mentioned in the previous section, the arrival of the British to India made the interdependent and self-sufficient villages became more dependent on goods from outside. Under their rule, India's economy witnessed deindustrialization and decline of
Indian handicrafts and the centres of manufacturing and towns turned more towards agriculture due to joblessness.

Indian Industrial development can be divided into three sub-periods within the pre-independence state. The first phase was from 1850 to 1914 - a period that brought modern industries into India. In 1853, Lord Dalhousie started the process of introducing machinery and locomotion and thus established the railways; and coal industry, cotton mills, jute mills and tea industries boomed and employed large number of labourers. This period is also marked by a decline in traditional handicrafts. The industrial development was lopsided as India was favoured with consumer goods industries while heavy manufacturing, engineering and chemical industries were not established. Thus, most modern machinery was imported and operated by their engineers. The educated youth began to aspire towards technical education as the modern machinery and technology fascinated them and aroused their curiosity (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 283).

The second phase was from 1915 to 1939 - another era of industrial development which was influenced by the First World War that featured rising prices and low wages for the workers. At the same time India was flooded with paper, steel, sugar, cement, and other industries like matches, glass, vanaspathi, soap and other goods and thus labour intensity was experienced in the cities. This necessitated the trade unions to safeguard the rights of labourers such as the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) in 1920 and commissions such as the Indian Industrial Commission (1916), the Fiscal Commission, and the Royal Commission on Labour (1929). They were influential in bringing the following acts: the Bombay Industrial Dispute Act (1938), the Bombay Shop Assistants Act (1939), the C.P. Maternity Act (1939) and the Bengal Maternity Act (1939) (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 283).

The third phase was from 1940 to 1950 - the most important pre-independence period which was a threat to the British-based industries. In addition, the Second World War forced the Indian industries to experiment with mass production and at the same time caused a cessation in exports due to the war. Moreover, this resulted in rising prices and a consequent lagging behind in wages for the year 1940 (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 284). In 1947, India followed the soviet model of planned economic development with an emphasis on heavy industries and self-sufficiency which led to
the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 that marked the beginning of the evolution of Indian industrial policy. In 1954, the country adopted the goal of a socialist pattern of society that necessitated curbing the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few (Tripathi, 2003: 205).

The post-independence scenario was focused on increasing employment opportunities and increasing gross product. As Jawaharlal Nehru declared on the eve of Independence the goal was ‘the ending of poverty and ignorance and disease and inequality of opportunity’ (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 3). The Government of Jawaharlal Nehru utilized industrialization as a means to alleviate poverty and speed up growth (ibid). His Government also initiated the development-oriented Five Year Plans to address systemically the developmental needs of the country with the belief that the state needs to have a centralized planned economy for development (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 57). During this time, the government opted for state control over key industries (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 3).

The developmental model chosen for India was essentially based on a techno-economic approach to modernization (Kulkarni, 1979). With the introduction of the Industries Development and Regulation Act (IDRA) in 1951, the second plan period faced a rapid industrial development. The Second Five Year Plan was termed as the instrument of industrial revolution in India wherein priority was placed on for establishing modern heavy industries. The Third Five Year Plan continued the momentum in industrial development which saw the growth rate of 9.0 against the growth rate of 5.7 achieved in the First 5 Year Plan Period (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 57). Industrial Development was simultaneously supported with such initiatives as the establishment of the Higher Education Statutory Body of University Grants Commission (UGC) in 1956 (Grover and Grover, 2002).

Considering the importance of technical education, the Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore and several others in various other cities were established in 1913. In 1945, the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) was established. In the year 1947, there were 44 Engineering Colleges and 43 Polytechnic Colleges with the intake capacity of 3200 and 3400 respectively. However, at present the total intake exceeds 50 million (AICTE, 2012) and the problem cannot be addressed as the population ratio exceeded available opportunities. The lack of
employability skills and technical education contributed to the accumulated problems of underemployment and unemployment. Thus, we see the government’s current focus on raising employability skills through formal and informal vocational education, with important implications for young people and youth policy.

The Kothari Education Committee (1964) developed a number of development-oriented proposals including vocationalisation of secondary education and the introduction of education for agriculture and industry (Ministry of Education, 1966). These mooted the need for technical education to cater to the needs of modern industries as most youth did not have formal education and had no skills for processing technology.

The increase in industries propelled growth but it also posed the threat of inhuman working conditions, wage, housing, and sanitation problems. Various committees constituted from time to time tried to address the above problems with possible solutions to reduce the vulnerabilities. The Committee on Distribution of Income and levels of living which was constituted in 1960 suggested the licensing of industries (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 59). This triggered statutory requirements which impeded the industrial development due to the cost of industrial infrastructure and this was one of the reasons for the slowdown in the Third Five Year Plan period (Dhingra and Garg, 2007: 57). The other reasons for the slowdown during 1977-78 were power shortages and industrial unrest. In the same period 1966-77 under Indira Gandhi, agriculture and allied activities were encouraged through subsidised seeds and fertilisers and tightening of state control over every aspect of the economy. The Government also made strict policies to shut the inflow of modern and new technology which directly hampered employment. At the same time, the nationalisation of banks, rural electrification and agricultural credit ensured the beginning of the ‘Green Revolution’ in the mid-1970s (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 3).

However, the 1980s marked a revitalisation of the Indian industrial development through liberalisation policies including foreign direct investment, subsidies, tax concessions and improved export opportunities. That indeed resulted in a reduction of poverty and an increase in employment. The latter part of 1980s saw political manifestos concentrating on subsidies and rural employment schemes at every election (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 3).
Before the 1991 economic reforms, India was possibly the least open and most heavily regulated market economy in the world. The 1990s witnessed the revised and second major economic policy which opened the gates for globalisation and free trade with promises of higher employment opportunities, a reduced poverty ratio and higher national growth. Thereafter the Indian economy was dependent on the global economy with the inflow of Business Processing Outsources (BPOs), IT Industries, Automobile Industries, Telecommunications, Apparel Industries and export-based food processing units (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 4).

Though poverty reduction and economic self-sufficiency were the primary objectives of industrial development, the allied factors had great importance and require our attention. They are human resource development, education and health and hygiene. Educational development has been hindered in India by class bias and caste inequalities. As Amartya Sen puts it, only the deep-rooted economic and social powers in India have enjoyed the benefits of education (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 5).

The changing socio-economic situation and its impact on the needs and issues of youth were among the main reasons for the development of the first National Youth Policy in 1988. The NYP 2003 also focused on the importance of preparing the youth to cope with the rapid pace of urbanisation, migration, industrialisation, consumerism, and changes in the structure and the role of the family. The most recent NYP has similarly addressed the impact of economic changes on young people (Kingra, 2005: 129).

4.4.1.1 Impact of Industrialisation

Misra (2003: 146) states that the impact of industrialization, democratisation, urbanisation and westernisation has presented Indian youth with a struggle between tradition and modernity, a dilemma as to whether they should adhere to the way of living and thought in which they have been brought up or adapt to emerging patterns of values and behaviour.

The introduction of the new economic policy not only helped to deregulate the internal economy; it also increasingly integrated the Indian economy with the world
economy; that is, it globalised the Indian economy (Tripathi, 2003: 220). According to Datt, (1997 cited in Tripathi, 2003: 221) there are at least four parameters of the process of globalisation which can be easily identified with Indian situation:

- Reduction of trade barriers so as to permit free flow of goods and services across national frontiers;
- Creation of an environment in which free flow of capital can take place;
- Creation of an environment permitting free flow of technology among nation-states; and
- Creation of an environment in which free movement of labour can take place in different countries of the world.

The process of economic development has not been without difficulties. Unemployment has been a recurring problem. It was partly in order to address the serious issues of unemployment among the educated that the government introduced the national youth policy in 1988. The review of the policy in 1998 confirmed a much higher unemployment rate among the youth. Moreover, the rate of rise in unemployment among the educated did not match the jobs being created. The problem was compounded by the rising population growth since the 1950s and the fall in mortality rates (Prakash, 2013: 3). As one commentator observed: ‘The high rates of youth unemployment need serious attention by the policy makers not only to mitigate the frustrations faced by the new entrants into the workforce but also to minimise the likely alienation and widespread evidence of deviant behaviour of the youth throughout the country’ (ibid).

The Indian government's recognition of the growing needs and issues of youth resulted in several policies in order to invest in youth since 2000. In addition to the national youth policies already mentioned, the situation of adolescents and youth are among the concerns of the National Population Policy (Government of India, 2000) and of the Tenth (2002–07), Eleventh (2007–12) and Twelfth (2012-2017) Five-Year Plans (Planning Commission, 2002; 2007; 2013; International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 1).

The global trend of insecurity in private companies and in the service sector has prompted the government to introduce policies to support young people become
entrepreneurs. Government policy also encourages the national and private banks to become more entrepreneur-friendly and to enable young educated professionals to start their own business or industry. As we will see the recent emphasis on youth entrepreneurship is an aspect of youth policy that India and Ireland share.

### 4.4.1.2 Demographic Change

Jayaraman (2012: 7) states that India is undergoing demographic transition and is gaining economically from the changing age structure. India is in a typical phase of demographic dividend. While many countries do not have enough youth to carry forward the economic and social progress, India has it in abundance but it remains a challenge until the country manages to use this resource constructively for its progress (Parasuraman et al., 2009: 1). The demographers and economists have predicted that as an effect of the fertility decline, the bulge of population age cohort in the working age group will sharpen in India in the coming decades (DeSouza et al., 2009: xiv-xv). Certainly the huge size of the youth population has been among the principal drivers of policy development in recent years.

### 4.4.1.3 Social-Structural Changes

People of all ages are being affected by the changes associated with the postmodern era. It has been suggested that among the most significant changes for young people is a greater tendency to live in the present, to live without cultural and social barriers, and to live more individualistic lives (Stanislaus, 2006: 10). Young people wish to ascertain their unique place in society and when there are blocks to such aspirations it can result in conflict (ibid: 11).

Kingra (2005: 134) states that in the past the Indian joint family system took care of the issues and needs of the young people and advice and companionship of the elders were available at no cost within the family. However, he argues that in the contemporary era, the extended family system has increasingly given way to the nuclear family and young people deprived of familial support are at risk of stress and difficult behaviour. Misra (2003: 146) also agrees that the joint family is in the process of gradual disintegration with the growth of individualistic ideas based on modernisation, urbanisation and industrialisation leading to changes in joint family
structure and functioning. One of the impact of the New Economic Policy (NEP) and the reservation policy of the government has been in the employment of women which helped more women to enter into the world of work. It enabled women to become entrepreneurs and family breadwinners. This also helped young women to be liberated from the traditional joint family control of the elders and become independent (Tripathi, 2003b: 215).

Traditionally in India, the family was the primary institution that provides the first social group, the first medium in which attitudes, habits, ideals, values and sentiments of social significance are acquired. The parents generally shape the personality of their children (teen-agers and youth included), in accordance with their own beliefs and traditions (Misra, 2003: 147). But the today non-family groups such as pubs, dancing and singing clubs for teenagers and young people are becoming increasingly important, since it is within them that they have the opportunity to talk freely about their aspirations and anxieties, besides finding freedom of thought, expression and action in a relaxed atmosphere (Srivastava, 2003: 180-181). Changes in attitudes towards sexuality and sexual orientation have also been a feature of recent socio-economic change. Recent protests for equal rights for LGBT people provide an example of the changing attitudes in India (The Hindu, 2013b). In 2009, the Delhi High Court decriminalised adult consensual homosexual relations and this was seen as a landmark judgement for the Indian gay rights movements. With this, India became the 127th country to decriminalise homosexuality (Mitta and Singh, 2009; but see page 253 below). The draft National Youth Policy (NYP) 2012 also proposed, for the first time, various programs for the LGBT community.

4.4.1.4 Education, Employment and Health

Swami Vivekananda once said, ‘Travelling through the cities of Europe and observing in them the comforts and education of even the poor people, there was brought to my mind the state of our people, and I used to shed tears… what made the difference? Education was the answer I got…’ (Kaushal, 2012: 42). Recognising that education is the best investment in human resources for the all-round development of the population, in the 1990s both central and state governments initiated varied schemes and programmes to increase access to primary education. Most of these initiatives were foreign aid driven (Ghosh, 2002: 20). Provision pertaining to education
in Article 45 of the Directive Principles of State Policy of the Indian Constitution, formulated in 1949, states that ‘the State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until the age of fourteen years’ (Ministry of Law and Justice, 2007: 23).

Realising the value of education as a powerful tool for social change and progress (Kaushal, 2012: 43), and under pressure from national and international forces, the Indian government introduced the Right of Children to Free and Compulsonry Education Act 2009 (Government of India, 2009). This intervention provides free and compulsory schooling to children in the 6-14 year age bracket. By this India joined a list of 135 nations that had made education a right (The Hindu, 2010).

In spite of such efforts made by the government, social scientists are critical that education is not given sufficient importance. For example, Drèze and Sen (2002: 38) state that the educational aspects of economic development have continued to lack adequate focus, and this relative neglect has persisted despite the recent radical change in economic policy.

The new economic policy (NEP) offered a world of opportunities to Indian youth through liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation reforms in the field of self-employment, software and information technology, as well as service and management. Following the new economic reforms in 1991, the state as an employer started shrinking but private enterprise became provided increased employment opportunities for youth (Tripathi, 2003: 215). Multinational companies introduced the need for new skills-oriented requirements to handle the state-of-the-art technology they brought in, both in manufacturing and in the services sectors. This situation created a big demand for trained professionals and skilled executives. This led to efforts on the part of both government and private institutions to equip the youth with the new skills and training (ibid: 224).

In the globalised economy, ‘specialisation’ is the watchword which has created many fields of study, research, and employment opportunities (Sahayadas, 2006: 21). During this time, the government, in close association with NGOs and some
intergovernmental organisations, developed many schemes and programs for skill training among the young generation. A large number of Industrial Training Institutes (ITIs) and upper secondary schools provided vocational training courses both for young people still in schools and also for dropouts from the formal education system (Kingra, 2005: 131-132).

In order to eradicate poverty and unemployment in rural areas, the government introduced the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on 7 September 2005 to provide for an enhanced and more secure livelihood among households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household (Ministry of Law and Justice, 2005). The national youth policy also recommends states and union territories to provide this scheme (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012: 75).

Providing targeted skills for employability to different segments of the youth population under the Prime Ministers’ Skill Development Mission is one of the guiding principles of the new policy (Veliath, 2012: 32). For example, The National Policy on Skill Development took initiatives to empower individuals through improved skills, knowledge and qualifications to gain access to employment in an increasingly competitive global market (Planning Commission, 2009). This policy aims to have achieved skills development by 2022 of 500 million individuals with special attention to youth, women, and school dropouts (International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 7).

A concern with the health of the population is a further important factor influencing government policy. Health is not only the absence of any disease but the state of physical, mental and spiritual wellbeing. Youth can be a time of energy, idealism and enthusiasm but it is also associated with a variety of physical and emotional challenges. Among those who commit suicide a considerable proportion are young people. It is estimated that 1.5 to 2 million young people commit suicide annually in India (Sule, 2010). Young people are also victims of HIV/AIDS and other sexually-transmitted diseases (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012). One of the prime concerns of the Youth Policy of India 2012 is to work towards ensuring a healthy atmosphere for its young people, be it in the home, the work place or in public
The growing issues related to the health of the young people required the government to initiate programmes that relate to youth nutrition and health (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012). The National Health Policy (NHP) was first adopted in 1983 which gave the call for ‘Health for All’ (Saraswathi, 2008: 79). Other follow-on policies - the National Population Policy 2000, the National Health Policy 2002, the National AIDS Prevention and Control Policy 2002 and the National Youth Policy 2003 - have all articulated India's commitment to promoting and protecting the health and rights of adolescents and youth, including those relating to mental, and sexual and reproductive health (International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 8). For example, the growth of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in India and the recognition of its spread among young people have resulted in a greater openness in addressing issues relating to sex among young people. Recognising the special vulnerability of youth, the National AIDS Prevention and Control Policy 2002 took initiatives to promote a better understanding of HIV infection and safer sexual practices among youths (National AIDS Control Organisation, 2002; International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 8).

The National Health Policy also recognises the need to address nutritional deficiencies in women and girls, and to raise awareness among school and college students about health-promoting behaviour (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, 2002). Also notable is the commitment to addressing the needs of adolescents and young people articulated in the National Rural Health Mission's Reproductive and Child Health Programme II and the Five Year Plans, particularly the Tenth and Eleventh Plans (International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 8).

There are many other policies and programmes designed to address the health needs of adolescents, with many focusing on girls in particular. For example, the National Population Policy 2000 introduced counselling and services, including reproductive health services for adolescents (Ministry of Health and Family Welfare,
Likewise, the National Youth Policy 2003 also recommended the establishment of ‘adolescent clinics’ to provide counselling and treatment and ‘youth health associations’ at the grassroots level to provide family welfare and counselling services to young people (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2003).

4.4.1.5 Technological Revolution

The micro-electronic revolution of the 1970s which was accompanied by globalisation and the information ‘explosion’ had a great impact on the lives of Indian youth (Tripathi, 2003: 207). Today Indian young people not only face problems of their age pertaining to education, employment, and family responsibility, but also have to cope with new situations created by social, political, and technological changes (Saraswathi, 1992: 163). Srivastava (2003: 183) calls the urban post-1990 young consumers ‘a lucky generation- a generation that has not seen any real hardship except on television and they have all the advantages of a lavish life with global mind-set, attitudes and life styles’. This is of course a rather simplistic view given that poverty and hardship persist among young people.

When India liberalised the economy and opened its doors to globalisation, it created both opportunities and challenges for young people. Prakash, (2013: 3) states that ‘youth were raised in a techno-world and not only did they represent the potential for realising the outcomes of liberalisation, they were also the purveyors of the products of liberalisation, without whom the burgeoning new economy would cease to grow.’

Today youth have access to a much better infrastructure, quicker and more efficient means of transportation, and vastly improved communication technologies in comparison to their parents’ generation (Sahayadas, 2006: 21). Information and communication technologies are among the key sectors of the modern Indian economy. Electronic communication has significantly modified the lifestyle of youth (ibid: 22). It has been suggested that young people today find themselves at a crossroads between openness to western cultures and values and an unwillingness to give up one’s own time-tested values and traditions (ibid: 28). The government’s introduction of the telephone scheme ‘One Rupee, One India’ was another notable development that has changed the face of India. It has created a ‘continental village’
with a great impact on the communication behaviour of the entire population, especially the youth (ibid: 22).

Internet use is growing day by day and it has also had a great impact on the lives of young people. *The Times of India* (2009 cited in Swamy, 2012: 563) states that ‘India will be the third largest Internet user base by 2013 - with China and the US taking the first two spots respectively’. Swamy (2012: 561) states that information and communication technology (ICT) has become a fundamental constituent of contemporary life and has opened the gateway to increased efficiency. At the same time, it has also opened the door to cyber threats.

The growing needs and issues that have emerged out of the massive growth of technology have prompted the government of India to initiate policies and programmes for safety and wellbeing. Although the Indian constitution guarantees the fundamental right of freedom of speech and expression, it has been held that a law against obscenity is constitutional (Swamy, 2012: 566). The government, through the introduction of Information Technology Act 2000, and later the Information Technology Amendment Act, 2008 has made efforts to safeguard people from crime that arise from the electronic environment. For instance, in 2013, the government of India introduced a Central Monitoring System to privy to phone calls, text messages and social media conversations (Nandakumar and Srikant, 2013).

4.4.1.6 Youth Culture

The present generation of young people in India is more at home with different perspectives than in the past. Contemporary youth culture has room for different worldviews and ideologies and can accommodate often contradictory views. While it may be a good thing that young people are not narrow minded or limited to any one view, it has also been suggested that youth culture can tend to ‘ape’ all that it considers modern rather than Western (Stanislaus, 2006: 16). India’s economic boom has led to a radical individualism, which is a cause for concern, as much as it is a strength that young people have developed increased global contacts and awareness (Kulanjiyil, 2008). One of the objectives of draft National Youth Policy (NYP) 2012 is to promote and instil in the young a respect for their culture (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012). The Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports has made efforts through its exchange
of youth delegations and international training programmes to promote exchange of ideas, values and culture amongst the youth of different countries and also to develop international understanding (Government of India, 2012: 33).

Saraswathi, (1992: 164) states that as India is huge and has variety of cultures it is difficult to identify any special youth culture pervading the whole country but at the same time one can trace certain youth culture among school/college students, factory workers, political workers, and so on. Tripathi (2011: 4) suggests that young people in India today are different from the past in the following ways:

They are filled with hope; exhibit the confident open-mindedness; they are proud of their past, but are willing to question things they don’t agree with; they are proud of their own heritage, but willing to explore other cultures as well; today’s youth are eager to learn from the west, but are not in any way embarrassed about being Indian….are far more eclectic in their reading habits than their parents ever were.

4.4.2. Interests

4.4.2.1 Youth movements

Social policy in India has been influenced greatly by a variety of groups and movements that have attempted to promote and defend their interests. Shah (2004) in his review of social movements in India argues that collective actions were not aimed only at ‘political change rather they were against dominant culture, caste, class and ideology’. Various revolts and agitations have brought changes in the civil and political society. The movements can be classified broadly into two types, social and political, although they are not mutually exclusive. In the Indian context, the social movements would include peasant movements, tribal movements, dalit movements, youth movements, student movements, class movements, human rights and environmental movements. Political movements include freedom fighters, religious, regional and labour movements.

The youth in India, both in the past and the present, have been actively involved in several protests asking for changes in many areas of the economy and polity. They have been in the forefront in several protests against land acquisition, against
corruption, nuclear installations and the imposition of a model of development against
the people (Pinto, 2012: 28). Students’ movements and student unrest were among the
primary reasons for the development of a youth policy framework in India. A well-
recognised student movement was the All India Student Federation which had its
beginning in 1936 (Kumar, 2006). Student protests were organised for various
purposes such as political, educational and economic. The following timeline provides
information about the most important post-independence student struggles.

- 1949 - Samajwadi Yuvak Sangh (Youth Socialist League) was formed;
- 1949 - Akil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad (ABVP) was founded as the students' wing of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS);
- 1957 - The role of youth in affiliation with Communist party had an active role in Kerala Elections which lead to the first elected Communist Government;
- 1959 - The All India Youth Federation (AIYF) was formed by the Communist Party of India (CPI);
- 1963 (1963-65) - The students of North Indian Campuses agitated on issues like reformation of Law Courses, enhanced tuition rates, lack of basic amenities like hostels, food subsidy, entertainment etc;
- 1965 - Students of South were on the streets against the Official Language Bill, ‘Hindi language’ as medium of instruction. The anti-Hindi agitation was an effective protest movement;
- 1967 - Students played an important role in defeating Kamaraj in Tamil Nadu and placing DMK on rule;
- 1970 - Students Federation of India (SFI) was founded as the Student wing of the Communist Party of India-Marxist CPI (M);
- 1975 - Emergency declared by Indira Gandhi led to lot of repression of student leaders and organisations;
- 1979 - The Assam Student Movement was founded;
- 1986 - All India Jharkhand Students Union (AJSU) was founded with the demand for separate statehood of Jharkhand;
- 1990 - All India Students Association (AISA) was founded as a student wing of the Communist Party of India-Marxist-Leninist CPI (ML) – Liberation.

The linguistic division of Indian States in 1956 resulted in a revolt among the students of various states opposing Hindi and arguing for English as the medium of
instruction. From then on, the study of English has served as a passport not only for employment under government and other organisations, but also for studies in foreign universities. The importance and value of regional languages was rejected (Tukol, 1971: 8). Students wanted to do something about their miserable condition and they were mostly alienated from the decision-making process of the institutions (Ahluwalia, 1972).

Student agitations were political in the sense that they raised political issues relating to government policy and action. Some of the agitations supported freedom movements. However, after independence the political elite of the Congress advised the students to depoliticise. However, most political organisations initiated front organisations among students that were used as special pressure groups by the political parties (Shah, 2004; Weiner, 1963). The participation of students in the Telengana Movement, the Naxalite movement in Bengal, the successful dissolution of the State Assembly in Gujarat and the shakeup of Congress in Bihar are some of the celebrated instances of their political involvement (Custers, 1987; Barik, 1977; Shah, 1977).

Thus, Indian social policy and specifically youth policy were influenced to the extent that they attempted to respond to student unrest and revolts through various schemes including NCC, NSS, and Yuva Kendras as well as by increasing their participation in national development. The above schemes were mostly given thrust by the Congress party and its leaders as they experienced negative attitudes towards the party. For example the first National Youth Policy was framed in 1988 during the period of Rajiv Gandhi. As a recent development, we could refer to the importance given to the RGNIYD at Sriperumandur which was recognised as Institute of National Importance in the year 2012.

Unequal conditions for women and widespread discrimination in India led to the development of women's movements which fought for equal rights and freedom from outmoded and oppressive customs. The emergence of the Women's India Association in 1917, the National Council of Women in 1925, and All India Women's Conference in 1927 spearheaded the demands for women’s rights in political and social spheres. Apart from the social legislative measures, to protect the rights of women the National Policy for the Empowerment of Women was formulated in 2001 under the wing of Department of Women and Child Development.
The rights of transgender, lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGBT) people are still a source of controversy in India (The Hindu, 2013a). The LGBT young people in India live in a “Don’t ask, Don’t tell” culture and there is no open family and institutional support (The Hindu, 2013b). The right to vote for transgender was formally introduced in the year 1994. However it still has not materialised in practice as the voter identity cards have not been issued because there is no column for the third group apart from the female and male (Sathasivam, 2011: 2). LGBT rights have yet to be recognised by the legislative assemblies in a Bill. The agitations in 2009 through the High Court and continued agitations by and through the non-governmental organisations may be having an effect. (Bhowmick, 20012). In the new NYP 2014, there is a specific mention of LGBT and the government has shown interest in this group's wellbeing (Government of India, 2014: 67).

### 4.4.2.2 The Voluntary Sector

Paranjpe (1990: 12) states voluntary organisations have played a key role in the formulation and implementation of welfare programmes in India. India has a long history of civil concepts like daana (giving) and seva (service). Voluntary organisations were active in cultural promotion, education, health, and natural disaster relief as early as the medieval era. During the second half of the 19th century, national consciousness spread across India and self-help emerged as the primary focus of socio-political movements (Asian Development Bank, 2009: 1).

There are non-governmental organisations (NGOs) throughout the country that work for the empowerment of young people. According to the Indian committee of Youth Organisations (ICYO) there are over 393 youth organisations registered under their umbrella committed to the welfare and wellbeing of young people, spread across 122 districts of 26 states representing all corners of India (Motcham, 2011). In order to face the enormity of the youth challenge in India, the government has built an alliance with the NGOs in the youth work field to implement its various initiatives. Government also supports them by way of funding, building NGO capacity, recognising the efforts made by various NGOs making awards for excellent work in the field of youth development (Kingra, 2005: 138).
The National Policy on the Voluntary Sector (NPVS) is an initiative of the government adopted in 2007 and is still in its infancy as it evolves into a new working relationship between the government and the voluntary sector without affecting the autonomy and identity of the voluntary organisations. The policy is a ‘commitment to encourage, enable and empower an independent, creative and effective voluntary sector, with diversity in form and function so that it can contribute to the social, cultural and economic advancement of the people of India’ (Government of India, 2007: 1).

In this Policy, the term ‘voluntary organisations’ (VOs) includes organisations engaged in public service, based on ethical, cultural, social, economic, political, religious, spiritual, philanthropic or scientific & technological considerations. The policy also specifies that the VOs should be private, non-profit oriented and registered organisations with defined aims and objectives (Government of India, 2007: 2). The objectives of the policy are

(i) To create an enabling environment for VOs that can stimulate their enterprise and effectiveness, and safeguard their autonomy;
(ii) To enable VOs to legitimately mobilise necessary financial resources from India and abroad;
(iii) To identify systems by which the government may work together with VOs on the basis of the principles of mutual trust and respect and with shared responsibility;
(iv) To encourage VOs to adopt transparent and accountable systems of governance and management (ibid).

4.4.3 Institutions

In 1969, following the conference of representatives of youth organisations, youth services agencies and youth leaders, the establishment of the National Youth Board with the Union Minister for Education and Youth Services as Chairperson was taken as a positive sign that showed the interest of the government in the wellbeing of the youth. The integrated membership of the National Youth Board included

...the ministers/ deputy ministers in the ministries concerned with youth services, all ministers in charge of youth welfare/youth service activities in the states and union territories having legislatures, the Chairman of the University Grants Commission, the
Chairman of the Central Social Welfare Board and the All India Council of Sports, ten representatives of national youth organisations/youth services agencies by rotation and five representatives of other concerned voluntary organisations (Saraswathi, 2008: 57).

The Constitution of India recognises the importance of investing in youth and through its broad Directive Principles of State Policy for the youth guarantees certain fundamental rights to them, whereby the youth are protected against all social, economic and political hazards (Chowdhry, 1988: 155). For example, Article 39f of the Directive Principles of State Policy states that it is imperative that ‘children are given opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity and that childhood and youth are protected against exploitation and against moral and material abandonment’ (International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 6).

The democratic nature of Indian political system has ensured representation from every part of the country. The Central Administration was often criticised for its favouritism with its majority based on linguistic and regional disparity. And every State's social policy is effectively governed by the Directive Principles of State Social Policy in the Constitution which as explained earlier was borrowed from Ireland. It has been suggested that Ireland in turn had borrowed it from the old Spanish constitution (National Institute of Open Schooling, 2013b: 48). By choice, state governments also have right not to adhere to the above directive principles. States however, have to ensure fundamental rights by the provision of means to secure livelihood, protection of child rights and compulsory education for all children. Moreover, the reason for the addition of Directive Principles of State Policy was to provide opportunities for economic and social development of Indian citizens (National Institute of Open Schooling, 2013b: 48-50). The National Youth Policy of India was directly influenced by the following constitutional and legal provisions:

- Article 15 of the Constitution, which gives power to the State to make special provision for the betterment of young people;
- Article 24 which prohibits employment of persons below the age of fourteen in any hazardous activity;
- Article 39(e) which provides for the State to ensure against the abuse of the persons of tender age for any kind of economic benefits;
• Article 39(f) which requires young people to be given opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity;
• In 2000, India also passed the Juvenile Justice (Care and Prevention of Children) Act;

Constitutionally as India became a Republic, it has provided citizens with the right to vote. Until 1989, the voting age was 21 years. Of late, the Government of India has attempted to encourage the political participation of young people through the reduction of the right to vote to 18. This was marked as having great political significance since it recognised the contribution of youth and gave young people a role in selecting their political leaders. The decision was also based on the principle of universal adult suffrage; that any citizen over 18 years of age can vote.

The government of India created a separate Ministry to look after youth affairs in the year 2000. The ministry is headed by a cabinet minister, which might be taken as an indication of Government commitment to this segment of the population. As already stated, the government supports the wellbeing of the youth of the nation through two major institutions: National Service Scheme (NSS) for student youth and the Nehru Yuva Kendra Sangathan (NYKS) for the non-student youth (Kingra, 2005: 127).

Constitutional provisions, Directive Principles of State Social Policy, and social security in India target the marginalised and underprivileged. The population which lives below the poverty level and the groups at risk are targeted with special schemes. There are more than twenty Ministries in India which undertake skill development of youth, women, disabled and disadvantaged sections of the population, of which ten Ministries fund skills development initiatives by private or voluntary agencies. Saraswathi (2008: 72) states that youth policy in any nation cannot achieve its goals unless it is supported by other policies. She suggests that as youth is an intermediate age group there is a greater need for coordination between different policies: policies related to children, women, the population policy, national policies governing education, health, child labour, and employment and so on.
4.4.4. Ideas

As Nehru asked the students during the struggle for freedom ‘Is the examination hall or the counting house dearer to you than India's freedom…what it shall profit you to get your empty degrees if the millions starve and your motherland continues in bondage! Who lives if India dies? Who dies if India lives?’ Kumar (2006) states that because of the ideas in today’s neo-liberal era there is an attack on students’ involvement in politics and even the courts these days sermonise against student politics.

As mentioned earlier, in 1988 national youth policy emerged in order to divert the youth from actively involving in student movements and protests. Different ideologies played a great role in shaping the policy on how poverty and exclusion were to be overcome and which role the state should play. For example, there were the three important intellectual leaders (Mahatma) Mohandas Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Bhimrao Ambedkar who proposed different agendas for reform (Ehmke, 2011: 7). Mohandas Gandhi’s social reform agenda was centred around three issues: the need to stop the practice of untouchability, the realisation of equality of women and the education of the masses (ibid). Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Indian prime minister, identified the structural causes of social evils in past history. For him, they had an intimate connection with the economic structure (Nehru in 1920; Corbridge et al. 2005: 53 cited in Ehmke, 2011: 7). According to Bhimrao Ambedkar, special provisions would be necessary to ensure equality to those who had been historically excluded from economic and social domains, and who continued to face discrimination (ibid: 8). The following Directive Principles in particular reflect Gandhian thought:

- The state shall promote the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the society and in particular the interests of the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes
- The state shall take steps to organise the village panchayats. These panchayats should be given such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government;
- The state shall make efforts to prevent the consumption of alcoholic drinks and other harmful drugs;
- The state shall try to promote cottage industries in rural areas;
The state shall take steps to improve the quality of livestock and ban the slaughter of cows and calves and other milch and draught cattle (National Institute of Open Schooling, 2013: 51).

The Indian government, realising the importance of village contributions to the national development, made Panchayats the third tier of the political system in the 73rd Amendment to the Indian Constitution (1992) in addition to the two-tier system of India: the union government and the state governments (Singh and Goswami, 2010: 3). Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, in his Address at the Chief Ministers’ Conference on Panchayati Raj on 29 June, 2007, stated that ‘the transfer of responsibilities should be on the basis of subsidiarity theory’. The ideology of Panchayat Raj is greatly influenced by the similar concept of Mahatma Gandhi’s ‘Village Swaraj’ and Pope Pius XI’s Encyclical ‘Quadragesimo Anno’ which advocated the principle of subsidiarity (Tharakan, 2007). This is also reflected in the National Youth Policy draft 2012 which encourages and supports youth clubs at the village level to take active part in ‘Panchayati Raj’.

Idealogies have influenced youth policies to a great extent. Each and every political party has its own agenda and ideology based on which the programmes and policies are drafted (Van Gyampo, 2012: 138). The long reigning Congress has obviously had a particularly powerful influence on youth policies and youth development initiatives in India. Though the Communist parties were important agents in raising awareness and movements among youth, yet they could not gain power in the assemblies which diminished their impact. The ideology of the Indian National Congress is evident in its election manifesto which is unique in that it combines ‘experience and youth’ (Indian National Congress, 2009: 1). The Congress party has also boasted that it has ensured the participation of youth through voting rights at 18 years of age and declaring ‘National Youth Day’ on 12th January which is the birthday of Swami Vivekananda, as well as contributing towards IT development in the country (Indian National Congress, 2009: 17).

Hindu nationalism has its ideological origins in the British Colonial period and advocated for the creation of a Hindu rashtra (Hindu nation) based on Hindu traditions and values. The religious ideologies mobilised youth for various initiatives as well towards the efficiently managed youth movements. The Sarvakar's Hindutva concept
and its influence on youth and on the broader population through the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) and its offshoot Akil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad has resulted in various agitations and mob reactions and been associated with religious conflict in India (Aoun et al., 2012: 6).

‘Epistemic communities’ are networks of professionals with recognised expertise and competence in a particular domain or issue area (Haas, 1992: 3). The National Youth Policy of India was also influenced by the epistemic communities such as expertise from UN organisation and Commonwealth Youth Programme. They were fundamental in providing information that shaped the formulation of national policy on youth in India (Angel, 2005: 52). The government of India also started a centre called Research, Evaluation and Documentation / Dissemination (READ) under the supervision of Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD). This centre takes on action research and evaluation studies, which help in formulating policies and programmes to cater to the current needs and aspirations of the youth.

On May 3rd and 4th 2013, the RGNIYD and Friedrich-Ebert- Stiftung (FES) organised a national workshop on ‘Building Perspectives on Youth Policy’. This workshop planned to discuss the findings of the study on ‘Youth Agenda’ done by Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES), an international organisation from Germany. In this workshop, the following different key-informants on youth policy participated and contributed on youth policy: policy makers, academicians, researchers and practitioners working on youth development, and Young Leaders Think Tank (YLTT) members (RGNIYD, 2013). These are examples of how ideas and research findings from diverse sources have influenced the formulation of Indian youth policy.

4.4.5. The International Environment

From the 1960s onwards different agencies of the United Nations such as the United Nations Economic and Social Council (UNESCO), the Economic Social Common Union for Asia And Pacific (ESCAP), and the International Labour Organisation (ILO) have, from time to time, adopted resolutions and offered positive guidance to the governments for making the best use of the resources and energies of the youth. The idea of youth participation in the formulation and implementation of development policies was stressed repeatedly (Saraswathi, 2008: 58).
The role of United Nations in the formulation of youth policies was initiated with its declaration along with its member’s states in 1965 (United Nations, 1984) to develop youth through their social and political participation. The announcement of International Youth Year in 1985 required a compelling effort from its member states. Thus, India established a Department of Youth Affairs in the Ministry of Human Resource Development which paved a clear way for the Indian National Youth Policy. And also when the United Nations in 1985 announced International Year of Youth, the government of India shifted its major focus on the welfare of young people. During this time, as a step forward, the Indian government changed what once was the National Ministry of Education with youth services attached to the Department of Youth Affairs and Sports, and later served under the Ministry of Human Resource Development to initiate national youth programmes (Kashyap, 2000: 129).

The Commonwealth Secretariat was another forum which emphasised youth development through the Commonwealth Youth Programme. Since 1974 it has helped the Commonwealth Governments in partnership with youth and civil society organisations (Commonwealth, 2008: iii). The Commonwealth Youth Programme provided consultation and support to India in revising the First National Youth Policy in 2003-04 (Angel, 2005: 52). It also took new micro-credit initiatives for the economic development like the implementation of the Commonwealth Micro-credit Initiative in Gujarat State. Following this experience, the Indian government also took the initiative where small self-help groups are formed to provide credit for starting small businesses (Kingra, 2005: 131).

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was also fundamental in influencing the youth development initiatives in India. From its inception in 1985, SAARC has governed the regional cooperation in social, political, economic facets of development in South Asian Countries including in India. The SAARC year of youth was commemorated in 1994. As a result, SAARC youth resolution was adopted with the aim to advance the overall development of youth in the region through the SAARC Ministerial conference on youth, youth camps and SAARC youth awards. A “youth volunteers’ programme” was initiated to enable volunteers from one country to engage in social work in other countries within the SAARC region (Saraswathi, 2008: 65; SAARC, 2013).
The BRICS Forum is an independent international organisation consisting of newly industrialised countries Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa, aimed at promoting cooperation between the member countries in commercial, political and cultural spheres. Of course, economic and trade cooperation tops the agenda between the member countries but a number of other initiatives also have relevance for youth. Enhancing youth employability and increasing opportunities for youth employment are among the emerging outcomes of the latest BRICS Summit in 2012 (BRICS, 2013).

The International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO), founded in 1947, has ventured into standardising organisations with quality of work environment and production and with an emphasis on safety of labourer in almost all sectors of human life (ISO, 2013). This has also influenced industries in developing countries with standardisation and in turn has empowered the youth of the developing countries to realise the need for skill development through technical and professional education. This has positively influenced the academic and industrial interface (ISO, 2013).

According to Rajan and Kumar (2011: 1), there is ‘hardly any part of the earth where Indians are not found’. Kumar, (2011: 243) states that India has a long history of international migration and notes the following three distinctive phases in the twentieth century: ‘The first immediately after independence was mostly to the UK. The second, since the mid-1970s to the Gulf, was triggered by the oil boom and has continued with ebbs and flows. The third to the USA in the 1990s was led by Information Technology (IT)’.

According to the census of 1991, there were 4.7 million migrants in the age group 15-34 years migrated because of ‘employment’ or ‘seeking employment’ (Saraswathi, 2008: 28). A study on the dynamics of migration in Kerala concludes that migration is ‘highly selective of the young adult age-group’, and that the ‘propensity to emigrate or out-migrate is, in general, the highest in 20-34 year age-group’ (ibid).

Contemporary flows of people from India to other countries are of two kinds: ‘the first is the emigration of the highly skilled professionals, workers and students to the most advanced OECD countries, particularly to the USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The second was the flow of unskilled and semi-skilled workers
going mostly to the Gulf countries and Malaysia—following the oil boom in the Gulf countries’ (Government of India, 2012: 8-9).

Though there is the emigration Act of 1922 and then the Act of 1983, no attempt was made to articulate a policy governing international migration. In response to the increasing issues of international migration, in 2004 the government formed the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs (MOIA) as an independent ministry. The Indian government, recognising the importance of its overseas population, established an institutional framework for a sustainable and mutually-beneficial engagement with its diaspora (Government of India, 2012: 8). The MOIA focussed on the international migration policy and in collaboration with the Centre for Development Studies (CDS) draft policy on international migration is in process (Kumar, 2011: 243).

Tripathi (2003: 222-223) states that the impact of globalisation and its free movement of labour has a direct bearing on youth because a large proportion of skilled/unskilled labour providers are young. The government's reservation policy has now made access to government jobs limited in scope, middle classes and the upper castes wish either to seek employment in lucrative private-sector jobs or migrate outside the country and the rural youth to the cities.

The changing labour market and growth in economy context in India continues to see growth in internal and outward migration, forcing the policy makers to propose necessary changes in Indian migration policy. For example, the Indian growth rate went up significantly to 8.7 per cent per annum during 2004-2008, with an annual target of 9 per cent for the Eleventh Plan period of 2007-2012. This fast growth created a great demand for labour both for skilled and semi-skilled with high wages. This labour environment increased the internal migration especially to large metropolitan centres like Mumbai and Delhi or even regional growth poles like Bangalore or Hyderabad (Kumar, 2011: 244). The recent global economic downturns have created anti-immigrant sentiments among the host country which also challenged the overseas communities (Government of India, 2012: 10). This situation also changed the attitude of people towards internal migration.

The government also made efforts to create an opportunity for youth mobility to neighbouring countries through different international exchange programmes for
promotion of durable world peace, brotherhood and general prosperity of mankind. One of the objectives of the new draft NYP 2012 is also to ‘help youth to develop an international perspective on issues of global significance and work for promoting international understanding and a just and non-discriminatory global order’ (Government of India, 2012: 6). In order to promote youth travel and to enable youth to experience the rich cultural heritage, the government built youth hostels throughout India. The scheme of youth hostels has been conceived of as a joint venture of the central and state governments and at present, there are 80 Youth Hostels spread throughout India and four more are still under construction (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012: 23).

Colonisation, industrialisation, liberalisation, globalisation and economic development have changed India from a self-sufficient interdependent community-based welfare system into a more dependent and individualistic one. From the beginning, the government of India has given special attention to the welfare of youth based on the needs and issues of the times. Youth policy in India is part of social policy which is dynamic and changes according to the socio-economic situation of the country. Before and after independence, voluntary organisations have given life to the youth welfare activities in the country.

After independence, the following organisations were involved in various youth welfare activities: the Scouts’ and Guides’ Organisation, the National Cadet Corps, the Students’ Unions, sports and athletic associations inside and outside the colleges, dramatic clubs, etc. At present, the government implements the youth policy through RGNIYD, NYKS, NSSS and NGOs. It is evident that industrialisation, interest groups, institutions, different ideologies and different international agencies have greatly influenced and shaped Indian youth policy. Though the government takes an integrated approach to address the needs of the young people, a lot more needs to be done. Illiteracy among youth, unemployment, and health issues are yet to be addressed fully and comprehensively.

Though the Indian Constitution recognises youth and directs the states through Directive principles of the constitution, out of 28 states and 7 union territories only 5 states and 1 union territory in the country have an explicit youth policy in place (Motcham, 2011: 50). The institutionalisations of the neoliberal agenda in the 1980s
and 1990s have had a great impact in GDP growth (Government of India, 2006). At the same time, Palriwala and Neetha (2011: 1051) state that this growth improved quantity and quality of employment, led to a decline in poverty levels, and enhanced standards of living though not all have benefited equally, especially women. Prakash (2013: 3) states that though India's policies have always acknowledged youth, they have always been for the youth and not about them. He argues that without a youth agency or a youth constituency, policy makers have largely confined themselves to pronouncements and tokenism.
Chapter Five
Irish Youth Policy

Ireland is the third largest island in Europe and the twentieth largest in the world. All of the island of Ireland was part of the United Kingdom until 1921 when under the Government of Ireland Act 1920, ‘Home Rule’ institutions were created in the two parts of the island with twenty-six counties forming Southern Ireland (although this entity was very short-lived) and six counties forming Northern Ireland which remained part of the United Kingdom. The Irish Constitution Bunreacht na hÉireann (Basic Law of Ireland) was adopted in 1937. It is the fundamental legal document that contains a series of 50 Articles that set out how Ireland should be governed. The principles of social policy mentioned in Article 45 (Directive Principles) are only the general guidance of the Oireachtas, composed of Dáil Éireann (the House of Deputies) and Seanad Éireann (the Senate), and this cannot be enforced by court (Department of the Taoiseach, 2012).

According to O'Malley (2011: 4), ‘the Irish state itself is contested because many regard the Irish nation as encompassing the whole island of Ireland’. According to the 2011 census data, there are 4,588,252 people living in Ireland (Central Statistics Office, 2013). It is obvious from the history of Ireland that the country has been subject of migration, invasion and assimilation by various groups (O'Malley, 2011: 1).

The 19th century began with the Act of Union in 1800, under which Ireland and Britain became a single political entity. Ireland lost the political autonomy it had through a developed parliament, and any further developments depended on decisions taken in London (Pašeta, 2003: 4). O'Malley (2011: 6) opines that “throughout this period the British, or the English, attempted to impose ‘English civility’ on an often resistant Ireland”. During this period, state intervention in matters of welfare grew, as noted by McPherson and Midgley (1987: 9 cited in Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 6):

…the nature of colonial administration gave emerging welfare institutions distinctive features which heavily influenced policy making. Administrations were highly bureaucratic and extremely centralised designed for control, maintenance of order and downward transmission of policies formulated elsewhere.
Class and class distinction in Ireland was a part of the colonial package which was evident from the colonial plantation of the 16th and 17th century landlord system (Gray, 2012). S.J. Connolly (1992: 55 cited in Gray, 2012) points out that the rural lower classes became subject to the same broad body of property law as in England. Traditionally, in the class basis of Irish society, ‘property was the main determinant of social wealth and position but now this has been at least partly replaced by the ability to secure wages or salary in a competitive and dynamic labour market’ (Share et al., 2012: 151).

5.1 Emergence of Irish Social Policy

According to Curry (2005: 1), social services are considered as the main instrument of social policy and they are provided by the State or other agencies to improve individual and community welfare. Ireland’s social welfare system has its origin in the Poor Relief Act of 1847, at the time of the Great Famine (Rehill and Mills, 2005: 8; Kiely, 1999: 1). Burke (1999) argues that this Act was a meagre form of outdoor relief which the British government was compelled to introduce because of the inability of the Poor Relief (Ireland) Act 1938 to respond to the growing humanitarian crisis in Ireland. This Act emphasised control and the maintenance of order, and hardened the distinction between the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving poor’ (Kiely, 1999: 1).

The dominant view of poverty during the eighteenth and early nineteenth century was that it was the fault of individuals and their particular character traits, such as idleness, rather than being caused by structural factors outside the control of an individual person, such as lack of work (Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 9). Later, when industrial development came about the view of poverty as a personal failing was challenged by links established between poverty and problems beyond individual control, such as unemployment. As a result, the deserving poor were transformed into ‘needy fellow citizens’ (ibid: 17). One of the driving forces behind the development of Irish social policy in recent decades has been a national concern about the high number of people living in poverty, particularly families with children. Poverty is now generally accepted as being a structural problem (Kiely, 1999: 7).
From 1900 to 1921, Ireland benefited from the Liberal welfare reforms of the British government (Burke, 1999: 11). There were many social policies implemented in Ireland while it was still under British rule such as the Children's Act 1908 which remained in place until the 1990s, the Old Age Protection Act 1908 and the National Insurance Act 1911 (Kiely, 1999: 2). Nineteenth-century liberalism was also a component of the ideological, sociological and institutional process of Irish nation building (Fanning, 2004: 13). According to Bellamy (1990: 2 cited in Fanning, 2004: 6), nineteenth-century liberalism had broad cultural roots that ultimately amounted to an ideological hegemony. These incorporated a variety of heterogeneous political languages, and evolved over a long period of social change. Intellectual sources as diverse as natural rights doctrines, whiggism, classical political economy, utilitarianism, evangelical Christianity, idealism, and evolutionary biology all played a part in liberal ideology, modifying and emphasizing market mechanism and property ownership.

Before independence, the British, operating from Dublin Castle, used interventionist and paternalistic policy approaches in the field of education, public health and emergency public works (Burk, 1999: 12). The beginning of Irish independence in 1922, the conservatism of the new state, coupled with a poor economy and the influence of the Catholic Church were major factors affecting the lack of social legislation and provisions right up to the time Ireland joined the European Economic Community in 1973 (Kiely, 1999: 2). Liberalism and Catholicism have long been ideologies which were closely connected with the process of modernisation, nation building and social reproduction that moulded Irish social policy and social citizenship. The Catholic, rural, Gaelic, ‘Irish-Ireland’ with its unique national ideals which were prevalent during the decades after independence were reformulated in response to a perceived social crisis by a state-driven programme of economic expansion from the 1950s (Fanning, 2004: 6).

Catholicism played a vital role in the Irish social policy development for the past few centuries. Turner (1999 cited in Fanning, 2004: 9) states that sociological accounts of the role of religion emphasise how a religion's control of sexuality has major consequences for the distribution of wealth and authority. The influence of the Catholic Church on the development of Irish social policy was at its greatest in the first few decades of the new Irish state. It culminated with the Constitution of 1937, which
reflected Catholic moral and social principles. This influence was particularly strong in relation to sexual morality, the family and the position of women in Irish society (Kiely, 1999: 2).

The Charitable Bequests Act (1844) gave the Church a powerful position within Irish society to own and control many of the schools, hospitals and social services in the country, which it continues to exercise to the present day (Powell and Guerin, 1997: 74). After independence, the principle of subsidiarity became the dominant force in shaping social policy. This principle, drawing on Catholic Social Teaching, conveniently matched the state's inactivity in the field of social policy, thus leaving the churches, the voluntary sector and the family as the main, and in some cases, the only suppliers of social services (Kiely, 1999: 3). The state only intervened in ways that were consistent with the Churches’ perspectives on men, women and families (Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 30). The Green Paper on the Community and Voluntary Sector (Department of Social Welfare, 1997: 31) acknowledges this powerful religious role:

It is notable that the voluntary sector in Ireland not only complements and supplements State service provision, but is the dominant or sole provider in particular social services areas. In this context, Roman Catholic religious organisations and those of other denominations have played a major role in the provision of services. Many services have been initiated and run by religious organisations, for example, services for people with a mental and physical disability, youth services, the elderly, residential childcare services and services for the homeless (Powell and Guerin, 1997: 74).

Powell and Guerin (1997: 75-76) argue that though the recent allegations of breaches of trust and abuse of power by the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland have greatly decreased the Church’s role in the service sector, their contribution and influence in the voluntary sector remains still strong. Following independence, the Irish post-colonial elite in 1950s and 1960s used the paternalistic approach of the British to formulate policies. This approach to social policy began to change significantly only in 1970s when Ireland joined the European Economic Community (Kiely, 1999: 9).

Curry (2005: 9) states that though Irish political parties have influenced the shape of social service provision over the years, they do not have strong ideological
differences in relation to social policy. The change from a monocultural to a multicultural society has created both opportunities and challenges for all aspects of policy provision. The need to provide a service for consumers with differing cultural practices, traditions and religious beliefs is in marked contrast to the assumptions of sameness which have traditionally been a feature of service delivery in Ireland (Quin et al., 1999: 3).

In Ireland, as Kennedy (1972 cited in Curry, 2005: 8) points out, there were different social policy phases, both ‘expansionary and regressive’. For example when there was economic stagnation in 1950s, little development occurred in the social service area but when there was economic growth from 1960 to the early 1970s, there was significantly more social services development (Curry, 2005: 8). In the 1990s, Ireland experienced rapid economic growth, total reduction in emigration and an increase in immigration. During this period, there was major investment in the fields of social service, health and education along with the development of such policies as the National Anti-Poverty Strategy in 1997 and the establishment of the Equality Authority in 1999 (Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 72-75).

The development of ‘social partnership’ institutions has been one of the most striking and surprising aspects of the transformation of Irish society and politics (Riain, 2006: 311). In 1996, the government of Ireland included community and voluntary services as the ‘fourth pillar’ alongside employers, trade unions and farmers in the national social partnership (Murphy, 2002: 80). According to Larragy (2006: 375), the inclusion of farmer associations and of community and voluntary sector organisations in partnership makes the Irish social partnership model unique compared to other countries. This makes it a different model also to the existing traditional corporatist model which includes only representatives from trade unions, employers and government (Teague, 2006). The claim is that this institutional system has allowed the social partners as well as civic associations to have greater influence on the formation, delivery and evaluation of social and economic policies (ibid).

Partnership has been one of the main driving forces behind Ireland's developing social policy, at least up until the recent economic crisis. Traditionally, partnerships have been based on bargaining between the social partners in situations where the state intervenes in the economy. In Ireland, social solidarity and deliberation are also key
elements in the partnership process (Kiely, 1999a: 10). Murphy, (2002: 80) states that there are many challenges which show that within the Community ‘Pillar’ and ‘Platform’, different organisations identify with different types of participation and have different motivations for participation. This leads to different tactics, which may lead to confusion, ineffectiveness and frustration.

Ireland has followed a variety of economic approaches at different periods of time such as neo-liberal reconstructing, globalisation, and financialisation and each one has greatly influenced social policy development (Healy et al., 2012: 8-9). From 2008, Ireland started experiencing a sharp reversal of economic fortunes and still today the country remains in crisis. At the outset of this period the National Economic and Social Council (National Economic and Social Council, 2009: ix) summarised this crisis as having five closely related dimensions: A banking crisis; a public finance crisis; an economic crisis; a social crisis, and a reputational crisis (Healy et al., 2012: 18). In this context of economic recession government followed austere measures in spending and social policy development. For example, the government abolished or reduced the budget of some of important agencies established during 1980s and 1990s to combat poverty, racism and discrimination (Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 78).

5.2 ‘Children’ and ‘Young People’ in Law and Policy

According to recent statistics, Ireland has the highest number of young people between 15 and 24 years among the (until 2013) 27 EU countries. It has 15.1% of its population in this age group compared to the overall EU figure of 12.7% (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 26). There is no single legal definition in Ireland of a ‘child’ or ‘young person’. They are defined differently for different legal purposes, although the Child Care Act and Children Act have similar thresholds, as indicated below:

- The Child Care Act 1991 (s.2 (1)) defines a ‘child’ as ‘a person under the age of 18 years other than a person who is or has been married’;
- According to the Children Act 2001, ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18 years;
- The Protection of Young Persons (Employment) Act 1996 applies generally to young employees under 18 years of age. Under the Act (as amended by Section 31 of the Education Welfare Act 2000) – a ‘child’ means a person who has not reached the age
of 16 years – a ‘young person’ means a person who has reached 16 years but has not reached the age of 18 years (Government of Ireland, 1996);

- According to the Education (Welfare) Act 2000 'child' means a person resident in the State who has reached the age of 6 years and who has not reached the age of 16 years, or has not completed 3 years of post-primary education, whichever occurs later, but shall not include a person who has reached the age of 18;

- According to the Youth Work Act 2001 a ‘young person’ means a person who has not attained the age of 25 years but the same act (Section 8) states that youth work has particular regard for persons who have attained the age of 10 years but not 21 years' (Government of Ireland, 2001);

- The National Youth Work Development Plan 2003-2007 also defines a young person as ‘a person who has not attained the age of 25’ (Department of education and Science, 2003: 3).

The complexity of these legal definitions indicate that it is not straightforward to identify the parameters of policy for children or youth. As may be seen below, there has been an increasing tendency to adopt an integrated approach to such policy in Ireland.

### 5.3 Emergence of Irish Youth Policy

Youth policy in Ireland is ‘dynamic’ and continually evolving (Powell et al., 2012: 3). The origin of youth work in Ireland was closely linked to the early development of youth work in Britain, especially prior to the establishment of Saorstat Eireann (the Irish Free State) in 1922 (O'hAodain, 2010: 47). Many of the early youth work organisations in Ireland originated in Britain (Kennedy, 1987: 7).

In the history of Ireland, the welfare of children was considered as a ‘matter of private responsibility, with parents considered as the sole and duty-bound providers of care and protection of their children’ (Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 373). The Cruelty to Children Act 1889 was the first attempt to deal with the protection of children in Ireland. The introduction of the Children Act 1908 allowed the inspectors to remove children from parental custody where neglect or abuse was confirmed (ibid: 374). This became the legislative framework for child protection in Ireland for a further 83 years (Richardson, 1999: 173).
During this period, the colonial State and the Catholic Church joined together in shaping the minds of the young people through welfare and education (Powell et al., 2012: 14). The introduction of the Children Act in 1908 confirmed the position of the reformatory and industrial schools as the major provision for orphaned, homeless and delinquent children (Richardson, 1999: 178). This Act and its later amendments, as Raftery and O'Sullivan (1999: 12 cited in Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 18) point out, ‘was to form the legislative basis for child welfare services in Ireland for much of the twentieth century’.

The National Children's Strategy 2000 was an important step towards improving the quality of life of Ireland's children. The Strategy was designed to advance the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in Ireland. In fact it was prompted partly by a very negative report by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. The overall vision of the strategy seeks:

An Ireland where children are respected as young citizens with a valued contribution to make and have a voice of their own; where all children are cherished and supported by family and the wider society; where they enjoy a fulfilling childhood and realise their potential (Government of Ireland (Department of Health and Children, 2000: 4).

The National Children's Office (NCO) was established in 2001 to oversee the implementation of the strategy, under the direction of a Minister of State for Children. In 2005 it was subsumed into the Office of the Minister for Children (OMC) which in 2008 became the Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs (OMCYA). This paved the way for the establishment of a full Department of Children and Youth Affairs in 2011. Also arising from the National Children's Strategy, the first Ombudsman for Children was appointed in March 2004 (Richardson, 1999; 179). Furthermore, the establishment of Dáil na nÓg (the National Children's Parliament) and Comhairle na nÓg (Youth Council) provided new platforms for children to participate and voice issues that concern them (Richardson, 1999; 201). Youth organisations have been closely involved in these initiatives. We will return below to other recent developments bringing together the child and youth sectors.

Turning now to youth work, Davies and Gibson (1967 cited in Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 188) state that the earliest youth work initiatives in Britain were
mainly voluntary in nature and were prompted by a combination of fear, compassion, social conscience and religious convictions. This could also be said to be true in Ireland, given the links between the two countries. Here, the earliest main providers were closely linked with either the ‘Catholic/nationalist’ or ‘Protestant/unionist’ traditions, and the state had little direct involvement in the delivery of services in keeping with the principle of ‘subsidiarity’, already referred to above (Devlin, 2010: 96).

In 1844, the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) was established in Britain, and very soon afterwards in Ireland (Smith, 1999; 2002). This intervention was specifically for young people aged 13-19 years (Jeffs and Smith, 2002: 43). The YMCA was started with a purpose of ‘uniting and directing the efforts of Christian young men for the spiritual welfare of their fellows in the various departments of commercial life’ (Davies, 2009: 65). In 1849, the Catholic Young Men's Society (CYMS) was established in Ireland, partly as a response to the presence of the YMCA. Though YMCA and CYMS had similar objectives for the spiritual well-being and development of young men, they had different political outlooks (Devlin, 2010: 96). For example, at a YMCA meeting in Bray, County Wicklow in 1860 the speaker mentioned that YMCA was encouraging ‘the right kind of volunteering’, whereas:

The so-called Catholic Young Men's Associations … [aim] to make the members of them disloyal to the Government, and to send them out as volunteers to Italy; to support the temporal authority of the Pope (Irish Times and Daily Advertiser, 28 September, 1860 cited in Devlin, 2010: 96).

From 1870 to 1910, many youth-work organisations were started mainly by voluntary groups: the YWCA (Young Women's Christian Association) founded in 1877, the Boy's Brigade in 1883, the Boy Scouts in 1907 and the Girl Guides Association in 1909. There were also non-uniformed organisations. Smith (Smith, 1999; 2002: 3) notes that in the 1880s and 1890s there was also ‘a marked growth in club provision for young people’, both male and female (O'hAodain, 2010: 48).

Shortly after their inception by Robert Baden Powell in Britain, the Boy Scouts and the Girl Guides were also introduced in Ireland. They developed mainly in urban areas due to monetary and geographical constraints (Kennedy, 1987: 7). As had
happened in the case of the YMCA and CYMS, Catholic versions of the Scouts (1927) and Guides (1928) were established in Ireland. Only in 2004 did the two scouting organisations merge as Scouting Ireland (Devlin, 2010: 97).

Jeffs and Smith (2008) state that in Britain, youth work thrived for over a century without major state involvement up to the Second World War in 1939. Then the state became the direct provider of youth services in Britain but Irish youth services continued to be dominated by the voluntary sector (O’hAodain, 2010: 48). An exception to this pattern occurred in 1942 when the City of Dublin Vocational Education Committee was instructed by the Minister for Education to establish Comhairle le Leas Óige (Council for the Welfare of Youth). This was a VEC sub-committee whose role was to oversee the provision of training centres for unemployed young people (at first mainly young men) in the city. It went on to become the City of Dublin Youth Services Board and has played a key role in the development of youth work services in Dublin and further afield. From the 1970s it expanded beyond supporting club-based voluntary youth work and became increasingly involved in the funding of community-based projects with paid youth work staff.

The 1970s were also the time when a more coherent approach was adopted to youth policy at national level. The first White Paper, A Policy for Youth and Sport, was published in 1977 while John Bruton was Parliamentary Secretary (the equivalent of Minister of State today). It presented a model of youth work that focused on the development of a young person while at the same time accepting and promoting the norms of society. ‘The aim of youth work should be...to enable young people to develop personally, to appreciate society and to contribute to it’ (Department of Education, 1977). A few years later, the O’Sullivan Report recognised youth work as an integral part of the educational system, although provided in an informal and leisurely environment. Youth work provides opportunities and support to young people, for friendship, personal autonomy and the development of essential values and competencies to participate effectively in a changing society (O’Sullivan Committee, 1980).

The National Youth Policy Committee (NYPC) was appointed in 1983 by the Taoiseach Garret Fitzgerald and was chaired by the High Court Judge and former TD, Declan Costello (its report is known as the ‘Costello Report’). Its proposal for a
comprehensive national youth service with a legislative basis was broadly accepted by the government of the day in a white paper entitled ‘In Partnership with Youth: The National Youth Policy’ (Government of Ireland, 1985). The report envisaged that the purpose of a National Youth Service would be ‘the social and political development of young people’. This service would also ‘offer young people opportunities for development and educational experiences to equip them to play an active part in society’ (Lalor et al., 2007: 275). There was a general election and change of government before the white paper was implemented and its proposals were not pursued by the incoming administration. The framework presented in the Costello Report remained influential however, and its proposals can clearly be seen to have contributed to the shaping of the Youth Work Act in 2001 (Devlin, 2009: 375).

The Costello Report (1984) conveyed a further shift in thinking regarding the purpose of youth work as it emphasises the importance of empowering young people. Costello advocated the social and political education of young people by encouraging them to be critical participants in society. According to this report (Department of Labour, 1984: 116):

If youth work is to have any impact on the problems facing young people today then it must concern itself with social change. This implies that youth work must have a key role in enabling young people to analyse society and in motivating and helping them to develop the skills and capacities to become involved in effecting change.

This shift in thinking at a policy level did not necessarily mean that it was translated into practice. Too much youth work practice may have remained largely recreational and not enough thought was given to evaluation of work (Jenkinson, 2000). According to some commentators, the role of youth work in the pursuit of social change featured much less in subsequent youth policy discourses (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 186).

Stemming from a proposal in the 1995 White Paper on Education, the Youth Work Act 1997 enshrined a definition of youth work in Irish legislation for the first time Here ‘youth work’ meant ‘a programme of activity that is designed for the purpose of providing developmental and educational training so as to assist the personal and social development of young persons’ which: requires the voluntary participation of young persons; is complementary to academic or vocational training.
While defining young persons as those under 25 years of age, the Act placed particular emphasis on the ‘youth work requirements of persons who are aged between 10 and 21 years and are socially or economically disadvantaged’ (Youth Work Act, 1997). However, most of its provisions came to nothing. This was because the Youth Work Act 1997 was dependent for its full implementation on a much larger piece of legislation, the Education Bill 1997, which had not been passed when a general election led to a change of administration. However, just before leaving office, the Minister of State for Youth Affairs implemented the one important element of the Youth Work Act that could be implemented: the establishment of National Youth Work Advisory Committee (NYWAC). This was a critical step in the development of youth work and it had two immediate consequences: the incoming government could not simply ignore the Act or leave it to gather dust, instead having to commit to the preparation of its own amending legislation; and after a relatively short time, ministerial approval was secured to enable NYWAC to prepare proposals for a National Youth Work Development Plan (Lalor et al., 2007: 275).

In the meantime the voluntary youth organisations and the Vocational Education Committees (who would have ceased to exist if the Education Bill 1997 had been enacted) used the opportunity to lobby for changes in the youth work legislation. The revised legislation was passed as the Youth Work Act 2001. The Act provided that the Minister for Education would be responsible for youth work at national level. It defined youth work as:

A planned programme of education designed for the purpose of aiding and enhancing the personal and social development of young persons' through their voluntary participation, and which is (a) complementary to their formal, academic or vocational education and training; and (b) provided primarily by voluntary youth work organisations (Youth Work Act, 2001).

The Act therefore recognises three key elements of youth work: (1) the voluntary participation of young people, (2) the fundamental educational nature of the work and (3) the idea that youth work is primarily provided by the voluntary sector (Lalor et al., 2007). The first two elements of this definition echo the formulation in the 1997 legislation, and both are in keeping with the position taken in Irish youth work policy documents at least since the 1970s. The third element regarding voluntary
organisations was added to the amending legislation after much lobbying by the voluntary organisations themselves, but again it was in keeping with longstanding traditions and assumptions in Irish youth work (Devlin, 2008: 48). Under section 24 of the Youth Work Act, the National Youth Council of Ireland was specifically named as the ‘prescribed national representative youth work organisation’ for a period of three years, and it has continued to be granted that status ever since.

The Vocational Education Committees and their representative body the Irish Vocational Education Association (IVEA) were also happy with the amended legislation. Not only did it not involve abolition of the VECs as the Education Bill 1997 had proposed, but it included the provision that each VEC would have the function to ‘ensure the provision within its vocational education area of youth work programmes or youth work services, or both’ and a number of related functions, including funding and monitoring of youth work (Youth Work Act 2001, section 9.1). While this section of the Act, like most others, was not formally commenced, on the basis of it the VECs that did not already have youth work staff (the vast majority) were able to secure funding from the Department of Education and Science and the Department of Finance to enable them to employ Youth Officers from 2006.

Meanwhile, after a lengthy process of research and consultation involving young people and youth workers as well as the relevant statutory and voluntary bodies, the government published the National Youth Work Development Plan (2003-2007) (NYWDP) in the summer of 2003. The NYWDP identified the major economic, political, technological and cultural changes that had taken place in Ireland and the conditions in which youth work has had to grow and adapt. It also discussed the changing position of young people in society and the complexity of issues with which young people must cope as they grow up and become young adults. While acknowledging existing challenges, the plan set out a vision for youth work based on the definition in the Youth Work Act 2001. The NYWDP had four broad goals:

1. To facilitate young people and adults to participate more fully in, and to gain optimum benefit from, youth work programmes and services;
2. To enhance the contribution of youth work to social inclusion, social cohesion and citizenship in a rapidly changing national and global context;
3. To put in place an expanded and enhanced infrastructure for development, support and coordination at national and local level;
4. To put in place mechanisms for enhancing professionalism and ensuring quality standards in youth work.

Implementation of the NYWDP did not begin until 2005 due to difficulties in securing financial resources, and by 2009 the National Youth Work Advisory Committee calculated that less than half of its proposed actions had been implemented (Devlin, 2012: 41). The social partnership agreement, ‘Towards 2016’ stated: ‘Following a review of the Youth Work Development Plan, to be undertaken in 2008, consideration will be given to the need for a further plan’ (Lalor et al., 2007: 276). However such a formal review was not undertaken, and at the time of writing the Department of Children and Youth Affairs website states that the NYWDP will be reviewed as part of the preparation of the new Policy Framework for Children and Young People; I will return to this matter below.

In the meantime, a number of important initiatives did follow publication of the NYWDP. A national Assessor of Youth Work was appointed in what was later to become the Department of Children and Youth Affairs (an ‘Assessor of Youth Work’ had been provided for in the Youth Work Act 2001 but this statutory position has never been formally established). The Special Projects for Youth Programme was expanded and single-worker projects phased out. The Code of Good Practice on child protection in youth work was revised (Department of Education and Science, 2003) and a Child Protection Unit was established in the National Youth Council of Ireland to offer support and training for youth organisations. In 2012 a review was commenced of the Code of Good Practice to bring it in line with the revised Children First guidelines (DCYA, 2011) and to take account of the fact that legislation to place those guidelines on a statutory footing was before the Oireachtas (see Devlin, 2013: 335).

Also flowing from the NYWDP, the North South Education and Training Standards Committee (NSETS) was established in 2005 on an all-Ireland basis, representative of all the major constituencies within the youth work sector (policy makers, statutory and voluntary employers, higher education institutions, practitioners and in the case of Northern Ireland the youth workers’ trade union). The role of NSETS is to consider the quality and fitness-for-purpose of professional programmes.
of education and training for youth work and to offer professional endorsement to programmes that meet the requisite standards. It works closely with counterparts in England, Scotland and Wales and all of the education and training standards (ETS) committees in Britain and Ireland meet together regularly as the Joint ETS Forum. The revised Criteria and Procedures of NSETS were launched in Maynooth in June 2013 by the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs, Frances Fitzgerald TD (NSETS, 2013).

A major youth work policy initiative that was shaped by the proposals of the National Youth Work Development Plan was the National Quality Standards Framework for Youth Work (NQSF). On his appointment in 2008 the Assessor of Youth Work, Conor Rowley, made standards in youth work practice his first priority, and an expert steering group was convened to work with the Assessor in developing a framework. A pilot stage was conducted, involving a sample of youth organisations/groups and VECs, and after revisions to the piloted framework based on the outcomes of an independent evaluation, the NQSF was launched in 2010. It sets out the standards to be met by staff-led youth services, projects and organisations in receipt of Youth Affairs funding. The NQSF has four main purposes:

- to provide a support and development tool to organisations and projects;
- to establish standards in the practice and provision of youth work;
- to provide an enhanced evidence base for youth work;
- to ensure resources are used effectively in the youth work sector;
- to provide a basis for whole organisational assessment.

The NQSF reaffirms the definition of youth work in the Youth Work Act 2001, noting that according to this definition youth work is planned, educational, based on young people’s voluntary participation and provided primarily by voluntary youth work organisations. It then sets out five core principles that are expected to be upheld by all youth work providers. According to these, all youth work practice and provision is:

- Young person centred – recognising the rights of young people and holding as central their active and voluntary participation;
- Committed to ensuring and promoting the safety and wellbeing of young people.
- Educational and developmental;
Committed to ensuring and promoting equality and inclusiveness in all its dealings with young people and adults;

Dedicated to the provision of quality youth work and committed to continuous improvement.

The NQSF requires staff-led youth projects and organisations to complete a preliminary self-assessment of the extent to which they meet ten standards, five each under the headings of (1) Youth Work Practice and Provision and (2) Organisational Management and Development. This is subject to external assessment which is carried out by VEC Youth Officers in the case of local projects and by NQSF Standards Officers (based in the City of Dublin Youth Service Board) in the case of national organisations. A continuous improvement plan (CIP) is agreed between the project or organisation and the Officer, and progress is monitored and reported on. The NQSF process is designed to work according to a three year cycle, after which a new self-assessment is conducted and the process begins again. In 2013 the Department of Children and Youth Affairs published its National Quality Standards for Volunteer-led Youth Groups (DCYA, 2013) which are expected to be implemented from 2014.

It has already been mentioned that the Department of Children and Youth Affairs is preparing an overarching Children and Young People’s Policy Framework. This began as a review of the National Children’s Strategy as it came to the end of its ten year implementation period (2000-2010), but was extended to include youth as well as children because of the establishment of the Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs and subsequently the Department of Children and Youth Affairs. It is intended that the framework will be based on a set of national outcomes for children and young people that will apply across sectors and across government departments and agencies. Based on the overall framework and outcomes, there will be more detailed national strategies for three age groups: early years, ‘middle childhood’ and youth.

The DCYA website states that ‘youth policy developments at European level during Ireland’s Presidency of the EU Council of Ministers in 2013 will inform Ireland’s national policy for young people. The two main sets of ‘Conclusions’ of the Council of Youth Ministers during Ireland’s EU Presidency reflect recent issues, priorities and developments at national level. One is on the ‘contribution of quality
youth work to the development, wellbeing and social inclusion of young people’ and the other on ‘maximising the potential of youth policy in addressing the goals of the Europe 2020 strategy’, these goals being focused on ‘smart, sustainable and inclusive growth’ (European Commission, 2010; Department of Children and Youth Affairs, 2013). Ireland’s EU Presidency also resulted in a ‘Dublin declaration on the contribution of youth work to youth employment’ (ibid). The above themes therefore seem likely to feature prominently in future youth policy development in Ireland.

The DCYA website also states that it is intended to review the Youth Work Act 2001 in the context of the new youth strategy. This is a challenging task because most of the Act has never been implemented. However, one important legislative and administrative change has already overtaken broader youth policy development, and has to be taken into account. This is the recent passing of the Education and Training Boards Act 2013. This Act has resulted in the merging of the 33 former Vocational Education Committees into 16 Education and Training Boards (ETBs). These will continue to run the vocational schools and are also taking over the training functions of FÁS, the national training authority, which is being disbanded. Very importantly, the Education and Training Boards Act says that one of the functions of each ETB is to ‘support the provision, coordination, administration and assessment of youth work services in its functional area’ (section 10[j]). This means that for the first time ever a statutory responsibility has been imposed for the support of youth work at local level in Ireland (the statutory responsibility proposed for VECs in the Youth Work Act never came into effect). The ETB Act also restates the definition of youth work in the Act of 2001, but it says nothing more about precisely how the ETBs should fulfil their youth work functions. For this reason it is timely, in the context of the new youth policy framework, for the DCYA to review the structures proposed in the earlier legislation.

5.4 The Factors and Actors that Influence Youth Policy

The factors and actors that have influenced the youth policy developments described above will now be explored under Gough's framework of the “Five I’s”, similar to the analysis of the Indian context in the previous chapter.
5.4.1. Industrialisation

The development of youth work in Ireland was closely linked to what happened in England. There, the effect of industrialisation and urbanisation in the 19th century caused a perceived ‘increase of juvenile mental disorders, misspent leisure and raising crime rates as evidence of increasing delinquency among the young’ (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 187). This increased the concern among religious and philanthropic organisations with maintaining social order and they in turn encouraged the state to intervene.

In 19th century Ireland, the social system was also affected by industrialisation and migration to urban areas. The elite were disturbed and concerned about the dangers of unrest and decline in ‘moral standards’ among members of the lower classes. In response to the changing situation between 1880 and 1914, many clubs and organisations, mostly run by middle class adults and on a voluntary basis, were established for working-class young people (Hurley, 1992: 13). Tierney (1978 cited in Kennedy, 1987: 7) comments that in general the period from 1880 to 1910 was one of ‘cultural revolution’ in Ireland.

This was also a time of great political change. At the end of the 19th century, nationalism became the dominant force in the development of many youth movements (Kennedy, 1987: 7). For example, in 1909, Na Fianna Éireann (Sons of Ireland) was established with the objective of establishing an independent Ireland through mental and physical training of young people including military exercises and education in Irish history and Irish language (Hurley, 1992; 13). Na Fianna acted as a recruiting ground for the Irish Republic brotherhood (IRB) whose members took the vow ‘I promise to work for the independence of Ireland, never join England's armed forces, to obey my superiors’ (Kennedy, 1987: 7). A similarly nationalist organisation for young women was established in 1900 called Inghindhe na hÉireann (Daughters of Ireland). This group was also committed to complete Irish separation from the UK and opposed the Irish parliamentary party (Kennedy, 1987: 7).

The decades after independence, the 1920s to the 1950s, were characterised by widespread poverty. Many poor young people lived in home environments that were unhealthy and perhaps even dangerous. In these situations, they were removed from
homes where parents simply could not care for them out of their meagre resources and into ‘charitable’ institutes. Very often there was a moral and ideological dimension to the treatment of such children as well as the material problem of poverty (Maguire, 2009; Powell et al., 2012).

One important way in which the Irish economic experience was different from the English was the continued high level of dependence on agriculture up until the 1970s. This, and the concern to maintain and protect what was distinctive about rural Ireland, provided the motivation for the setting up of a large number of civil society organisations, including youth groups (O'hAodain, 2010: 51).

These included Muintir Na Tíre (People of the Land), founded in 1931 and Macra na Feirme (Sons of the Farms), founded in 1944 (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005). In 1952, another group called Macra na Tuaithe emerged out of Macra na Feirme which in turn became known as Foróige. Together with Youth Work Ireland it is one of the two largest national youth organisations in Ireland (Lalor et al., 2007).

Related to the desire to preserve ‘traditional’ Irish moral values was the resistance to ‘foreign’ cultural influences, such as dance halls, cinemas and ‘modern’ literature. This was a major concern for both Church and State after independence (Kennedy, 1987: 8). It is evident from a 1925 Irish Independent statement issued by the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy: ‘The surroundings of the dance hall, withdrawal from the hall for intervals and the back way home have been the destruction of virtue in every part of Ireland’ (Whyte, 1980: 26).

A further important example of the Church and state working together to meet the challenges of the industrial age was the response to the youth unemployment crisis in Dublin in 1942 (Devlin, 1989; Lalor et al., 2007: 271; Devlin, 2008: 42). During this period, the forceful intervention of John Charles McQuaid, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, resulted in the establishment of Comhairle le Leas Óige, which is now known as the CDYSB whose role in youth work was referred to earlier in this chapter. Lalor et al., (2007: 271) state that this remained the only statutory youth work provision until the advent of the Youth Work Act 2001 and the proposal for the establishment of Youth Work Committees by all the Vocational Education Committees (VECs). But in fact as described above, this section of the Act was not implemented.
and therefore it was not until the passing of the Education and Training Boards Act 2013 that statutory provision for youth work was introduced. Meanwhile the role of the voluntary organisations was vital. Most of the major national organisations have already been mentioned. In Dublin the largest voluntary youth organisation is Catholic Youth Care, originally established as the Catholic Youth Council in 1944 by Archbishop McQuaid in response to the economic, moral and cultural challenges described above. From the outset it worked closely with Comhairle le Leas Oige, an example of the ‘consensus’ dominating church-state relations in Ireland for much of the 20th century (Devlin, 1989). Another example was the approach taken by the Commission on Youth Unemployment, established by the Minister for Industry and Commerce in 1943 (Hurley, 1992: 13). The report of the Commission was published in 1951 and stated its object as the submission of recommendation ‘designed to afford the boys and girls of this country a better opportunity of becoming useful citizens of a Christian State, adequately instructed in the teaching of religion, healthy in mind and body, willing and able to work for their own benefit and that of their country’ (Commission of Youth Unemployment, 1951: 2 cited in Hurley, 1992: 15).

As Ireland was becoming modernised post-1958, the pressure from the social reformers and the reaction to the institutional child abuse influenced the Irish State to get involved in the development of youth policy and services (Powell et al., 2012: 3). During this period, the government responded both to economic challenges and to the needs of young people by its response to the OECD report Investment in Education which led to an enormous expansion of second-level education (Department of Education, 1965).

During the 1960s and 1970s, young people in Ireland, like young people in much of western Europe, were influenced by economic growth, the expansion in leisure-time opportunities and the emergence of global youth culture. Coyne and Donohoe (2013: 78) state that youth were influenced by “on the one hand an explosion of pop music, and on the other the civil rights’ movements at home and abroad including a very strong student revolutionary movement”. There was also growth in the use of psychology, social and behavioural theories and social sciences in general to understand and interpret young people’s behaviour, values and attitudes (ibid: 26). This influenced the thinking of the time about young people and youth provision in Ireland. A further important factor was the significant increase in people moving from
rural to urban areas. In 1971, for the first time, the majority of the Irish population (52 per cent) were living in urban areas (Ferriter, 2004: 703 cited in O'hAodain, 2010: 54) and this trend towards urbanisation was set to continue.

The late 1970s and early 1980s saw an increase in the problems often associated with industrialisation and urbanisation: youth unemployment, juvenile crime, drug use, and homelessness among young people. The danger of widespread unrest in society forced the Government to intervene (Government of Ireland, 1985: 12-13). The Government also was worried about the increasing popularity of Sinn Fein among urban youth (Devlin, 2008: 41). In response to this situation, and as mentioned earlier, the coalition government of the Fine Gael and Labour parties appointed a National Youth Policy Committee (NYPC) chaired by Declan Costello with the task of preparing, within a year, ‘recommendations for a National Youth Policy which would be aimed at assisting all young people to become self-reliant, responsible and active participants in society’ (Department of Labour, 1983: 33). Forde (1995: 32 cited in O'hAodain, 2010: 57) considers the Costello Report as the ‘definitive statement of the needs of young people in Irish society and on the future of the youth service in particular’. The proposals of the Costello Report were generally accepted by the Government in its white paper (Government of Ireland, 1985) but a general election took place before they could be implemented. However those proposals clearly remained influential in the Youth Work Act of 2001 and that in turn led to Education and Training Boards being given responsibility to support youth work in the legislation of 2013.

In the meantime there have been a number of other examples of how the social and economic challenges and problems associated with industrialisation, and more recently post-industrialisation, have had an impact on the situation of young people and therefore led, directly or indirectly, to developments in youth policy. These include the establishment of the Irish Youth Justice Service in 2006 and the publication of the National Youth Justice Strategy 2008-2010 (2008) which further expanded the Garda Youth Diversion Projects through close links with the youth work sector. They also include the development and publication of Teenspace, the National Recreation Policy for Young People which led to the development of youth cafés (O'hAodain, 2010: 63). Youth justice projects and youth cafés have been among the most significant developments in recent Irish youth policy, and the best funded.
A further indication of the importance of industrial and economic factors in influencing youth policy development is the priority given to these matters during Ireland’s recent EU Presidency. As stated earlier, one of the two Council Conclusions of the Presidency is specifically focused on the contribution of youth work to meeting the Europe 2020 objective of achieving ‘smart, sustainable and inclusive growth’, and another key output from the Presidency programme was the Dublin Declaration on the contribution of youth work to youth employment.

**5.4.1.1 Demographic Change**

From 1970 onwards, Ireland experienced significant population growth, and a large increase in its young population. Between 1971 and 1981 there was an unprecedented increase of 15.6 per cent in the size of the population and in 1981 people under 25 years of age accounted for 48 per cent of the population (Central Statistics Office, 1984). This simple demographic fact influenced the Government to reflect on youth policy in a way that it had not done before. As already discussed, in 1983 the Taoiseach, Garret FitzGerald, appointed the National Youth Policy Committee whose work has been highly influential in Irish youth policy development.

Two decades later in the 2002 Census, the ‘youth population’ had dropped by one-fifth, to 38 per cent, and this overall downward trend (in proportionate terms) is likely to continue in the future (Lalor et al., 2007: 332). However the absolute numbers of under 25s increased in the 2011 census, and to a greater extent than the overall population (CSO, 2012a). The number of pre-school children (0-4) increased by 17.9 per cent between 2006 and 2011 compared to 8.2 per cent for the population as a whole. The 5 to 12 age group increased by 12 per cent. The population of secondary school children (13-18) remained almost static. However, this group is projected to increase by more than 30% over the next 10-15 years. All of these developments affect social policy, including youth policy. Ireland will have a ‘demographic dividend’ much more than other European countries but there will also be challenges. The National Youth Work Development Plan (Department of Education and Science, 2003: 2) stated:

The size of the youth population, in proportional terms, is diminishing. While Ireland has (again, in proportional terms) a larger youth population than the European average,
it shares in the longer term trend towards an ageing of society as a whole. However, this does not in any respect lessen the importance of effective and adequately-resourced youth work provision. Quite the contrary: the need for social cohesion, stability and equity in the future, when the dependency ratio is substantially greater than at present (i.e. the numbers of “economically active” is proportionally much lower) makes the social, civic and political education of young people, in formal and informal settings, much more important, not less.

Migration is also an important part of demographic change. Recent emigration among young people and young adults has had a major impact on families and communities, and also on the whole society and economy because most of the people leaving are highly skilled and educated. Recent research at University College Cork (Glynn et al., 2013) confirms this:

Today's emigrants are much more likely to have a high standard of education than the population in general. While 47% of Irish people aged between 25-34 hold a tertiary qualification of three years or more, 62% of recent Irish emigrants hold the equivalent qualification, suggesting that graduates are over-represented amongst those leaving.

Inward migration in recent decades means that Irish society, including its youth population, is much more multicultural than before. In addition the composition of the inward migrants is changing because of developments in the EU and international environment (Gilmartin, 2012). In 2002 the largest group of people not born in Ireland came from the UK (101, 257) and the second largest group was from the USA (11,135). In 2011 the UK number had increased (112,259), but the number of people from Poland was even larger (122,585), and there were also large numbers from Lithuania and Latvia. The number of people from Nigeria had doubled from more than 8,650 to 17, 642. The number from the USA had remained almost the same (11, 015 in 2011) but USA is now the tenth largest group rather than second largest (ibid: 9). Also for this research it is very interesting that in the period between the 2006 and 2011 censuses the number of people in Ireland coming from India had doubled, from 8, 526 to 16,986 (CSO, 2012b). The number of these in the ‘youth’ category of 15-24 decreased by 12 per cent. However the number in the 0-14 category more than trebled from 1,162 to 3,922. This shows a significant increase in families with young children coming to Ireland from India, and these will be part of the large growth in the secondary school population in the years ahead. Youth policy in Ireland will have to
address all of these changes, including a much more diverse population. The National Youth Work Development Plan (Department of Education and Science, 2003: 2-3) referred to this:

Ireland has never been entirely monocultural: it has long been home, to one degree or another, to people of different cultures, different religious, political and ethnic backgrounds, including the Travelling community. For generations it has had the linguistic diversity of two languages, Irish and English. The multi-cultural nature of Irish society has, however, in recent years become much more pronounced, as people have increasingly come here from other parts of the world, whether because they have been actively encouraged to come here to work, or because they are seeking asylum. One way or the other, young people in Ireland are growing into adulthood in a much more culturally diverse environment... increasing the need for intercultural aptitudes and awareness among young people and those who work with them.

Overall Ireland today is in a good position in demographic terms compared to some other countries. The demographic profile of the country in the early 1980s presented a considerable challenge in terms of the massive need for employment and the availability of social services. Fahey and Gerald (1997: 98) explain the impact of the high-dependency ratio at that time as follows: ‘The mid-1980s witnessed peak levels of economic dependency ... a small workforce were supporting a very large child population, a very large number of unemployment and a reasonably large elderly population. The number of women in home duties was also large.’ As Lalor et al., (2007: 333) state, Ireland’s relatively youthful population today, when compared to other European countries, make it better placed to prepare for the challenges ahead than many other countries.

5.4.1.2 Social Structural Changes

The class system is a vital part of the social structure, and many aspects of people’s lives are related to class. Whelan (2003) says that in Ireland, ‘educational opportunities, income, health, and even mortality are strongly related to class position. Such inequalities show no signs of declining. Such advantages are also transmitted between generations’. As stated earlier, there have been many changes in Irish society related to industrialisation and urbanisation, and as a result there have been changes in
class positions within the population. However this does not mean that there is less inequality. Whelan \textit{(ibid.)} explains as follows:

While the class structure in Ireland was extremely stable from the founding of the state until 1960, subsequently a dramatic transformation was observed. This involved the contraction of farming, a reduction in unskilled manual work, and an increase in white-collar work. Substantial opportunities for upward social mobility were created. As a consequence, the professional and managerial class is drawn from diverse backgrounds. The rising tide had indeed raised all boats; however, the pattern of relative advantage remained stable, and the unskilled manual class increasingly constitutes a self-recruiting bloc. Irish society is far from being meritocratic. The operation of class processes in Ireland provides a perfect example of the principle that ‘the more things change the more they remain the same’.

Many aspects of Irish youth policy are affected by class factors. The best example is the way that youth work has always primarily targeted working class young people. Early youth work was provided mostly by middle class volunteers for working class young people. Today youth work volunteers can be found in all class groups, but state support and funding for youth work is primarily targeted at disadvantaged young people. The changing position of rural young people and the isolation they experience is also affected by the ‘contraction of farming’ and other class changes described by Whelan.

Religious institutions are also important in the social structure and particularly in Ireland. Recognition of the position of the Catholic Church and changing position regarding the influence of its social teaching is essential to understanding youth sector development in Ireland. The church continues to have a significant role in many voluntary organisations as well as in the provision of social services. In the history of Ireland before and after independence, the principle of subsidiarity, an important part of Catholic social teaching, greatly contributed in shaping the emergence and development of social services. This principle was systematically developed by Catholic intellectuals in Germany (Kennedy, 2001: 188; Geoghegan and Powell, 2006: 33-34).

The principle clearly states that ‘the state should have a secondary (‘subsidiary’) role in the provision of social services while families, communities and
associations (which historically often had religious affiliations) should take precedence’ (Devlin, 2008: 42). This has greatly influenced the NYPC’s decision to uphold the primacy of the voluntary (non-governmental) youth organisations which is clearly stated in its final report: ‘Although some statutory agencies (mainly VECs) themselves provide services that could properly be regarded as part of a Youth Service, by far the greatest providers of such services are the voluntary organisations’ (Department of Labour, 1984: 127).

Though the establishment of the CDYSB in 1942 seemed to be counter to the principle of subsidiarity, the church still had a control over the Irish youth welfare. According to Devlin (2010: 98-99) the following two factors explain why the church was willing to see statutory intervention in youth welfare:

Firstly, the initiative was taking place within the vocational education sector rather than the ‘mainstream’ secondary sector which remained firmly in the control of the churches and which (from the perspective of church figures) would be seen as much more important in shaping the values of young people. …Secondly, and much more importantly perhaps, there was by this time in Ireland an overwhelming consensus between the Roman Catholic Church and the state since the latter was no longer regarded as alien, secular and inimical to the church's interests but on the contrary was to a large degree at the church's disposal.

Devlin (2013) suggests that in recent decades this church-state consensus has been broken and that subsidiarity does not have the same dominant role in social policy and social services, including youth work. He gives the example of the Youth Work Act which expresses consensus and a commitment to working together between the state and the voluntary sector rather than the state and the church.

Overall, if ‘subsidiarity’ was a key governing principle of Irish youth work policy and provision in the past (as outlined above), then ‘partnership’ was central to the Youth Work Act, as it has been to so much recent Irish social policy…The main partnership in this case is that between the statutory and voluntary sectors (Devlin, 2013: 333-334).

Going beyond youth work, a related point is made by Moran (2009) in his study of the way the Irish state has ‘pursued its social policy orientations’. Moran says
there were ‘two major power blocs which provided legitimation from 1922 until the current economic crisis, the Catholic Church and social partnership’. Moran thinks that because of the government’s primary concern with economic competitiveness, social policy had an ‘unfulfilled secondary role in the social partnership relationship’.

Changes in family life are also an important indication of how social structures are changing. The wellbeing of children depends on the stability and effectiveness of the family to which they belong. For children who have the benefit of warm, continuous and intimate relationships with their parents throughout their childhood, there is the opportunity to develop a strong sense of identity, self-worth, trust in others and in him/herself, as well as the ability to handle stress and frustration and to develop and maintain relationships. For some children the opportunity never exists to experience family life, in which case state intervention in the form of child care services is needed to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are met (Richardson, 1999: 171). In 1983, the Department of Labour in the process of formulating national youth policy also considered family as a ‘fundamental institution within which the young learn about the past and prepare for the future’ and also discussed about the changing nature of the family’ (Department of Labour, 1983: 6). The profile of the ‘typical’ Irish family has been changing in recent years because of increased participation of women in the workforce, a falling birth rate, a fluctuating marriage rate, and an increase in separation and divorce (Lalor et al., 2007: 61).

The family, in its different forms, is in a constant state of change and is an issue for a number of areas of public policy. Marriage no longer possesses the cultural primacy as a gateway to family formation that it once had, since sex, childbearing and cohabitation outside of marriage now widely occur (Fahey and Field, 2008). Kiely (1999: 257) states that a greater need for the policy intervention of the state is required in addressing different issues arising in the ‘modern family’. These include child welfare, the integration of work and family roles, family income support, regulation of adult relationships, and care by family members (Kiely, 1999: 257).

In 1970s, the influence of the Catholic Church was declining. A clear sign was when, in May 1972, people voted to remove the ‘special position’ of the Catholic Church in the constitution of the Republic of Ireland. Moreover, from the late 1960s,
numbers of vocations to the religious life also declined which affected the teaching orders in particular (Nic Giolla Phadraig, 1995).

Effective political action by the women’s movement culminated in the establishment of the First Commission on the Status of Women in 1970 and the formation of the Council for the Status of Women in 1972 (Ferriter, 2004). Further, in 1973, the government removed the so-called ‘marriage bar’, introduced in 1932, which had prevented married women from working in the public service, and introduced what was then called the “unmarried mother's allowance” (O'hAodain, 2010: 55).

In modern Ireland, the traditional family form of husband, wife and child(ren) has significantly changed as evident in the recent census. For example, the percentage of cohabiting couples increased from 2.28% in 2002 to just under 3% in 2011 and in the same period lone parents with children increased from 11.7% to 12% (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 28). The traditional form of family pattern changed also because of women entering into the labour force. For example, ‘between 1990 and 2000 the number of females in the Irish labour force increased by almost 250,000 and the female labour force participation rate rose from 44 per cent to 56 per cent’ (OECD Labour Force Database, 2010 cited in Healy et al., 2012: 13).

In Ireland, homosexuality was decriminalised only in 1993 and LGBT people continue to experience discrimination in many ways (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 22). The recent passage of the Civil Partnership and Certain Rights and Obligations of Cohabitants Act 2010 also brought about change in the Irish law with regard to families and relationships (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 42). However, LGBT young people face challenges in finding acceptance within the family, community and society (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 28). Maycock et al., (2009 cited in Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 26) present some key findings about LGBT young people in Ireland:

- The age when most LGBT people discover their sexual orientation is 12
- The average age when young, vulnerable LGBT people first self-harm is 16
- The age when many young people begin to come out to others is 17; the average age is 21
• This means the most LGBT young people conceal their identity for five years or more through their adolescence, which as stated above is the most challenging and critical period of development for all young people.

Crimmins, (2011) states that though Irish society is now generally more accepting of homosexuality, nonetheless, teachers and students who belong to LGBT experience fear and discrimination. However there have been very positive changes in the position of LGBT youth within policy documents and in terms of official recognition and funding. One example is that Ireland’s EU Presidency programme in the first half of 2013 included a major conference on LGBT youth and social inclusion, jointly hosted by the Department of Children and Youth Affairs and BeLonG To Youth Service. Recent policy developments relating to suicide prevention and bullying also take account of LGBT young people in a way that contrasts sharply with how they were treated in the past.

A number of national organisations continue to lobby for constitutional change and equal rights such as One Family, Treoir and Marriage Equality (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 29). Recently, the government has indicated that it will consider constitutional change to allow for gay marriage (Crimmins, 2011). The Constitutional Convention has voted by a 79 per cent majority to amend the Constitution to allow for same-sex marriage (Mccaughren and Parkes, 2013).

5.4.1.3 Education and Employment

After independence, Irish nationalism was a strong motivating force among for organisations demanding a due place for Irish language and culture in the educational system. For instance, “the Dail Commission on secondary Education 1921-2 sought to allot Irish its ‘due place’ while identifying schooling as a means of reviving the ‘ancient life of Ireland, as a Gaelic state’” (Walsh, 2011: 52). The Irish educational system, apart from vocational schools, was largely under the control of the Catholic church until the introduction of free second-level education in 1967 when the state began to gain more control over education (Kiely, 1999a: 2). This was because the Department of Education realised that the type of education provided up to then was not sufficient to prepare Irish youth for the challenges of a ‘modern world’ and decided not to take a back seat with regard to education policy (Powell et al., 2012: 17).
OECD Report Investment in Education in 1966 was a significant factor in changing the approach of the state to second and third level education. One of the results has been an enormous increase in completion rates at second level and participation rates at third level (what is sometimes called ‘massification’). This in turn has an effect on other aspects of policy. For example it means that young people who do not complete second level or participate in third level are even more disadvantaged than they were before, which creates a demand for other supports.

In the 1970s, Ireland had a number of significant advantages such as membership of what is now the European Union, highly qualified youth, strategic location for European markets, an English-speaking labour force, etc. (Healy et al., 2012: 12). This helped to pave the way for economic growth. As MacSharry and White (2000: 26 cited in Lalor et al., 2007: 155) say: ‘Over the past three decades the continuing investment in education made by successive governments has laid the long-term foundation for part of the economic success we now enjoy… the educated Irish workforce has become one of the primary reasons why the country has become such a favoured industrial location for foreign investment.’

As a result of government interventions and a favourable international climate, there was a gradual growth in employment. For example, in 1989, only 31 per cent of Ireland's population was in employment but it increased to over 45 per cent by the end of the following decade. In the early 1990s, the proportion of the unemployed fell dramatically after a period of jobless growth in the early 1990s and there was also an increase in female participation in the labour market (Healy et al., 2012: 13). Changes in the education system partly responded to, and partly helped to create, new employment opportunities. In turn, changes in the employment situation had an impact on the education system. For example the recent unemployment crisis has led to more students opting to continue their studies. It has also led to an increased demand that education provide students with ‘employable skills’. Youth work is also now focusing on the issue of employability, and as mentioned earlier this was one of the themes of the youth programme during Ireland's EU Presidency.

The table below provides figures for young people under 25 on the live (unemployment) register since January 2008. It shows clearly that the numbers in this group doubled between January 2008 and January 2009 and subsequently peaked at
just over 89,000 in September 2010. There has been a decrease from 2011 onwards which may be due to emigration (Healy et al., 2012: 148).

Table 5.1: Persons under 25 years on the Live Register, Jan 2008 – Feb 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month and Year</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Month and Year</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>36,945</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>82,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>53,666</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>80,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>70,268</td>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>75,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>89,810</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>74,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>85,910</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
<td>68,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>88,663</td>
<td>February 2013</td>
<td>68,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: CSO Live Register on-line database (Central Statistical Office, 2013: 5).*

The government response to the current unemployment crisis among young people, and the related problem of emigration, has been severely criticised. There has been no specific government response to youth unemployment as opposed to overall unemployment. Schemes to date such as the ‘Job Initiative’ reforms and the ‘Pathways to Work’ programmes have had limited success (Healy et al., 2012: 149). As a result of a decision at EU level a ‘Youth Guarantee’ is being piloted at present for young people who are ‘NEET’ (not in education, training or employment), but a number of youth organisations have pointed out that there are not enough training and educational places available to meet the scale of the problem and the funding committed is not sufficient to fill the gap.

5.4.1.4 Technological Revolution

Technological change has always had an impact on all aspects of society, including life stages and age relations. The British sociologist, Frank Musgrove, commented that ‘the adolescent was invented at the same time as the steam engine’
Musgrove was referring to the fact that when the power of steam was applied to industry it meant that fewer workers were required than before, and this led to children and young people being removed from the labour force. They were then provided for through the emergence of the formal education system and non-formal services including youth work, and spent most of their time with others of exactly the same age as themselves. This helped to create a separate ‘youth culture’ and it came to be accepted that adolescence was a separate stage of life with its own psychological needs. In turn further policies and services were developed specifically for this age group.

In the contemporary world the impact of technology has further deepened. The recent information and electronic revolution has transformed perceptions and experiences of the urban-rural divide and created common online communities and consumers (Lalor et al., 2007: 327). The growth of the Internet and of social media in particular have transformed patterns of communication, and created new risks as well as new possibilities for young people. The National Youth Work Development Plan (Department of Education and Science, 2003: 2) referred to the implications for youth work: The electronic revolution has had an impact on virtually all areas of everyday life. Devices and facilities such as mobile phones and the Internet have begun to subvert traditional conceptions of space and place, and to transform patterns of social interaction. The worlds of leisure and of learning have been particularly affected, and the implications are therefore profound for youth work, where both of these come together. In addition, advances in reproductive technology are beginning to present ethical dilemmas never before confronted by humankind. As with all human inventions and innovations, modern technology has its uses and abuses, and presents both challenge and opportunity on an unprecedented scale.

It is important that policy makers address these challenges and opportunities in a way that is effective and that takes account of young people’s own views and experiences. Davies and Cranston (2008: 4) point out that “the current policy response to online social networking (and the Internet in general) tends to be based on ‘blocking first’ but they suggest that it be based first on building young people's capacity to navigate risk and take up opportunity”.
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5.4.2 Interests

In the development of youth policy in Ireland, youth movements, political parties and the voluntary sector have played a decisive role.

5.4.2.1 Youth Movements

Social movements involving young people, largely directed by young people, have been founded throughout Europe since the middle ages (Zemon Davies, 1971 cited in Devlin, 2009: 367-368). As already discussed, in Ireland, the first boys' clubs and girls' clubs were established in the 1880s and the early uniformed organisations began to emerge soon after (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 188). This can also be seen as part of a broad ‘youth movement’, mostly assisted by adults and closely linked with an aim of promoting national aspirations or religious ideals (Devlin, 2009: 367-368).

As nationalism became a more dominant force in nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Ireland, it was reflected in the development of youth movements. Movements such as Inghinidhe na hÉireann (Daughters of Ireland) established in 1900 by Maud Gonne, and Na Fianna Éireann (Sons of Ireland), which was an alternative to the Boy Scouts, formed in 1909 by Bulmer Hobson (a pioneer of the Sinn Féin Movement) and Countess Markievicz (an active Republican and follower of Sinn Féin) were revolutionary nationalist movements meant for young people (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 189-190). For instance, Na Fianna Éireann was established with an aim to stop young Irish men from joining the British army, as a recruitment leaflet made clear:


Rural youth movements emerged between 1920 - 1950 with an aim of social, cultural, personal and community development. In 1931, Muintir na Tire (People of the
Land) was started by Father John Hayes as an economic organisation and later its focus changed to include community development. In 1943, the Hospital Guild (a regional branch based in County Limerick) inaugurated a youth section which was concerned with training for agriculture, including the construction of beehives and the rearing of calves for sale. In 1944, Macra na Feirme (Sons of the Farms) was started with the same concern for social, cultural, personal and community development (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 191). These groups greatly influenced the setting up of various community and youth development organisations. For instance, Macra na Feirme was instrumental in setting up the Irish farmers Association (IFA), the Irish Creamery Milk Suppliers Association (ICMSA), the Agricultural Institute and the Farm Apprenticeship Board (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 191).

When the Irish government first took the decision to intervene in the area of youth welfare in Dublin in the 1940s, the idea of a ‘youth movement’ had developed negative connotations because of the activities of fascist movements in continental Europe. It was for this reason that the new youth service offered reassurance to the public that it was not a youth movement in the sense in which that term was used elsewhere:

An Chomhairle [the Council] does not … presume to take the place of good home life, or to waive the authority and influence of good parents in giving leisure facilities and instructions to the young, but it is honoured in being permitted to defend all youths from influences detrimental to their characters as citizens of Dublin and of Eire. Its influence, therefore, extends more over those whose home life is weakened either by internal disruption or external forces, and it does not claim to be a Youth Movement except in the sense that it urges its youths to "move on" from the street corner and the toss school into the better atmosphere of educational centres and the more natural influences of the home (Comhairle le Leas Óige, 1944: 5 cited in Devlin, 2010: 99).

Many of today’s major Irish youth organisations had their origins in social movements of one kind or another, and they have played a vital role in shaping policy. This has happened in other areas too. Powell et al., (2012: 197) state that the recent exposure of child abuse in industrial schools and reformatory schools was largely the work of social movements starting from the 1950s and the 1960s. These movements aimed at reforming the care system based on the twin principles of
deinstitutionalisation and human rights. They have had a significant impact on Irish policy development, and on how children and young people are seen in Irish society.

5.4.2.1 Political Parties

Irish political parties, particularly those that have held office in recent years such as Fianna Fáil, Fine Gael, the Labour Party, the Green Party and the Progressive Democrats (PDs), have played some role in developing and implementing policies for young people. However the nature of the party political system means that all parties are reluctant to accept ideas, even good ones, that emerge from outside themselves. In addition, the electoral system which involves general elections every few years means that all parties tend to take a very short term view of social issues and problems. These two factors combined have had a generally negative impact on policy development, especially perhaps youth policy.

In 1973, the general election brought a significant shift in politics when a Fine Gael/Labour coalition came to power after the Fianna Fáil party had been in power for 35 of the previous 41 years between 1932 and 1973. After many years, the inclusion of the Labour party also brought a somewhat different approach to youth policy (O'hAodain, 2010: 54). Hurley (1992: 21) points out the three general elections which were held in June 1981, February 1982 and November 1982 in such close proximity 'helped to reinforce the commitments of the three main political parties to recognise youth work provision and also to recognise a 'social partnership' role for the NYCI'.

Jenkinson (1996: 39) states that in Ireland many youth policy documents were 'commissioned, published and not implemented’. Devlin (2008: 45-46) also states that in the Irish context lack of or little interest on the part of policy makers has frequently delayed or prevented the process of youth policy development. For example, two separate Fine Gael-Labour governments failed to implement both the White Paper ‘A Policy for Youth and Sport’ (Government of Ireland, 1977) and the second White Paper ‘In Partnership with Youth’ (Government of Ireland, 1985).

In 1978, the newly-formed Fianna Fáil Government refused to commit itself to the proposals of the Bruton Report and instead appointed the O'Sullivan Committee to examine the improvement and development of youth services. The report of the
O'Sullivan Committee, The Development of Youth Work Services in Ireland (Department of Education, 1980) otherwise known as The O'Sullivan Report was published in 1980 (O'hAodain, 2010: 56), but led to no significant further policy development. This pattern has been repeated several times over the years. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the appointment of the National Youth Work Advisory Committee in 1997 by a government leaving office was a key factor in shaping later developments. The incoming government is unlikely to have taken any further action in relation to youth work legislation if this step had not been taken by its predecessor. The amended legislation of 2001, while never fully implemented, had an important influence on the youth work provisions of the recent Education and Training Boards Act 2013. The above examples help to show how the party political system itself can act to shape policy development as well as to hinder it.

5.4.2.3 The Voluntary Sector

In Ireland, the voluntary youth work sector emerged out of a number of diverse traditions, each with its own very distinctive value stance, as evidenced in different styles of working and different priorities governing that work (Kiely 2009: 11). Faughnan (1990 cited in Curry, 2005: 199) identifies three trends in the development of the voluntary sector in Ireland: firstly, the contribution of Catholic and philanthropic individuals in the 19th century in the field of education; secondly, in the 1930s, rural-based community self-help traditions contributed to improvement in all aspects of community welfare; thirdly, development and contribution of statutory services in the establishment of health boards in the 1970s.

In 1968, the Irish government, influenced by the trends of recognising and supporting voluntary organisations in the UK following the publication of the Albermarle Report in 1960, supported the establishment of the National Youth Council (now the National Youth Council of Ireland [NYCI]) (Hurley 1992: 15). In 1968, the then Minister for Education recognised NYCI ‘as the co-ordinating body of the principal voluntary youth organisations’ (Hurley, 1992: 16). NYCI and its role are formally recognised in legislation through the Youth Work Act 2001 and as a Social Partner in the Community and Voluntary Sector (O'hAodain, 2010: 52). The objectives of NYCI (National Youth Council of Ireland, 1988) are as follows:
• To bring together youth organisations and agencies in Ireland
• To promote the advancement of education and learning for young people
• To promote and to safeguard the common interests of young people

As Powell et al., (2011: 3) point out, the youth sector in Ireland comprises various types of voluntary organisations: ‘while some (like the YMCA, Scouting Ireland and the Irish Girl Guides) are over 100 years old and part of international movements, others are more recent in origin and based nationally (e.g. Foróige); regionally (the diocesan youth services) or locally’. The ‘primary’ role of the voluntary sector in the direct provision of youth work services is explicitly recognised in the Youth Work Act (Devlin and McCready, 2012: 37). The State also continues nonetheless ‘to exert an important, if indirect, influence through its funding of the sector and more recently through the National Quality Standards Framework’ (Powell et al., 2011: 3).

The emphasis on voluntarism took on a particular character in Ireland because of the nature of the country’s historical relationship with Britain and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church (Devlin 2009: 368). The concept of voluntary involvement was influenced by the principle of subsidiarity, discussed already, and the close links between youth work on the one hand, and religious and political movements on the other (Devlin, 2010: 95). The National Youth Policy Committee (Costello Committee) proposed that statutory support (or ‘subsidy’) for voluntary providers should no longer be discretionary (Devlin, 2008: 43). The Committee expressed its view on this strongly as follows:

We are convinced that until a clear and unambiguous statutory duty is imposed on some agency to ensure supply of the services which young people need […] , development will be spasmodic, muddled and inadequate. We feel that we must make this point. At the same time we want to make it clear that we are not suggesting a service managed and run by a statutory agency to the detriment of voluntary groups or the exclusion of agencies assisted from public funds. It should be made clear that the statutory agencies will support, not supplant, the voluntary organisations. What is required therefore is a duty imposed by statute to see to it that the services required are provided (National Youth Policy Committee, 1984: 128).

The ‘duty imposed by statute’ referred to by the Costello Committee has now been included in the Education and Training Boards Act 2013. However the Act also
restates the definition of Youth Work in the Youth Work Act of 2001, which includes the affirmation of the voluntary sector as the primary direct youth work providers. It is also under the terms of the Youth Work Act 2001 that the National Youth Work Advisory Committee (NYWAC) came into existence, and half of NYWAC’s membership (apart from the three Ministerial nominees) are nominated by the National Youth Council of Ireland. The central contribution of the voluntary sector to both practice and policy in the youth work field is likely to continue.

5.4.3 Institutions

The responsibility for youth services and for the development and implementation of a government’s youth policy can be located within different departments depending on different political, socio-economic and administrative factors (National Youth Policy Committee, 1984: 135-136). In Ireland, for example, youth affairs was from the outset attached to the Department of Education (since 1998 the Department of Education and Science) but it the early 1980s it moved for a brief time to the Department of Labour because ‘in time of economic depression and stagnation as in the 1980s, emphasis tended to be on labour, concern with unemployment and training for young people, preparing them as workers, as potential members of the labour force. At other times, there has been an emphasis on social education, and on young people as potential social citizens’ (Kiely and Kennedy, 2005: 191-192; Devlin, 2008: 43-44).

In mid-2008, the then Taoiseach, Brian Cowen announced that the Youth Affairs Section which had been attached to the Department of Education and Science for nearly forty years was to be integrated into the Office of the Minister for Children (OMC), and to be re-named as the Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs (OMCYA) (Devlin, 2010: 102; O'hAodain, 2010: 52). The Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs (OMCYA) had overall responsibility for policy development relating to children and young people while the following three departments were also involved: the Department of Justice, Equality and Law; the Department of Education and Skills; and the department of Health and Children (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 59). Policy and services were given a significant increase in status, as well as being further integrated, with the announcement of the establishment of the Department of Children and Youth Affairs (DCYA) after the
general election of 2011. As I explained earlier, the DCYA is now preparing an overarching Policy Framework for Children and Young People which will shape strategic development in the future.

Within the DCYA it is the Youth Affairs Unit that supports youth work services. Youth work in Ireland follows a two-tier approach involving 'mainstream' services aimed at young people in general (O'hAodain, 2010: 44) and 'targeted' services for certain groups of young people such as those who are disadvantaged, or involved in, or at risk of involvement with, crime or drug abuse (ibid: 68). The same point is made in the comparative study by Instituto di Ricerca (IARD, 2001: 86) which states that youth policy in Ireland has two major aims: the universalistic, conceived as personal and social development of young people and provided by traditional mainline youth work; and the provision of services targeted at specific disadvantaged or minority youths. Further, this research states that in recent years there has been a continuous increase in programmes targeting specific disadvantaged young people.

In the field of youth services, funding increased considerably during the ‘Celtic Tiger’ but has contracted considerably in recent years. Even though the Youth Affairs Unit is relatively small within the DCYA, there is a complex funding system for youth work, especially because youth work organisations often have funding relationships with other departments and agencies which support their work in specific areas such as justice, health, drugs-initiatives and other programmes focusing on disadvantaged (mostly urban) young people. There was an increase in funding especially of the Young People's Facilities and Services Fund (YPFSF) between 1998 and 2003 (Lalor et al., 2007: 273; Devlin, 2008b: 52). The following are among the major funding lines available:

- Special Projects for Youth (SPY) (primarily intended to fund community-based projects with disadvantaged young people, usually through the employment of paid youth workers);
- The Youth Service Grant Scheme (YSGS) for youth organisations;
- The Young People's Facilities and Services Fund (YPFSF) which was first introduced in 1998 and linked to the National Drugs Strategy; as well as youth-related Local Drugs Task Force (LDTF) funding which has only recently been taken over by the OMCYA/DCYA;
There is a separate line for youth information and a miscellaneous category which includes VEC youth officer costs, the Local Youth Club Grant Scheme and a number of specialist programmes;

- The National Lottery (which provides most of the SPY and YSGS funds) are funded from the exchequer under funding line ‘B.8 (1)’ (Devlin and McCready, 2012: 39).

At present, a single youth service can get funding from different departments such as the Department of Education and Science, VECs (now ETBs), the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, the Department of Tourism, Sport and Recreation (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 80). As Devlin, (2008:52 cited in O'hAodain, 2010: 62) points out, today “youth organisations have become involved in competing for funding that is available to support ‘work with young people’, which may not qualify as youth work in the strict sense, and which poses dilemmas for youth work organisations in their struggle ‘to maintain key principles’”.

5.4.4 Ideas

It has already been stated several times in this thesis that the development of youth work in Ireland was greatly influenced by the social teaching of the Catholic Church. In terms of the institutional dimension of youth work, discussed above, the principle of subsidiarity was of particular importance. It should be clear from earlier discussions that). The principle of subsidiarity espoused by the Catholic Church conveniently matched the state's inactivity in the field of social policy, thus leaving the churches, the voluntary sector and the family as the main, and in some cases, the only suppliers of social services (Kiely, 1999: 3).

The idea of subsidiarity was developed according to a self-contained community-law principle (Ritzer et al., 2006). Catholic social teaching offered the industrial age a vision of a good society that drew upon a coherent intellectual legacy stretching back to Aristotle via Thomas Aquinas, one that contested both liberalism and Marxism. In particular, it emphasised the interdependence of individuals and society and stood opposed to secular individualism and socialism (Fanning, 2004: 44). Perhaps a classic expression of the principle can be seen in a subsequent encyclical ‘Quadragesimo Anno’ by Pope Pius XI, promulgated in 1931. It proposed a reconstructed social order based on corporatist principles and subsidiarity as an
alternative to capitalism and socialism (Pius XI, 1931). The concept of subsidiarity is much used, in the Irish context, to refer to principles within Catholic social thought concerning the relationship between the ‘lower order’ institutions of family and community and the ‘higher order’ institutions of the state (Fanning, 2004: 44). Pope John Paul II reiterated this in the encyclical ‘Centessimus Annus’ in 1991: ‘A community of a higher order should not interfere in the internal life of a community of a lower order, depriving the latter of its functions, but rather should support it in case of need and help to coordinate its activity with the activities of the society, always with a view to the common good’ (John Paul II, 1991).

While in the Irish context subsidiarity was a mechanism which shaped the relationship between the state, the church and families and worked to limit state intervention (Considine and Dukelow, 2009: 30), in the secular field too, this principle gained importance. For example, the fourth of the five principles adopted by the Treaty of European Union signed in Maastricht on 7 February 1992, accepted the principle of subsidiarity as one of the basic principles by which the European Union should be governed (Mathew, 2009). In the EU context subsidiarity means that supranational institutions should not unduly interfere and that national, regional or local authorities should make their own decisions to the greatest extent possible. In this context too, therefore, there are implications for youth work. As Chisholm et al., (2011: 28) explain:

…the principle of subsidiarity, formally introduced into EU law by the Treaty of Maastricht and retained in the Treaty of Lisbon, means that the European Union cannot insist that member states implement any particular measure other than in those areas for which it has ‘exclusive competence’ (economic and monetary policy, customs union, competition rules and a few others). There are some areas in which there is ‘joint competence’ on the part of the EU and member states but they exclude most social policy, including education, training and youth. In relation to these, member states have exclusive competence and the EU’s role is ‘supporting’. This is why [European youth policy] documents…regularly use such terms as ‘youth policy cooperation’, and why the mechanism introduced in the White Paper on Youth (and reiterated in the Renewed Framework) for progressing youth policy development is the Open Method of Coordination (OMC)…
A further way in which ideas influence policy development is through the impact of scholarly research. The Report entitled Development of Youth Work Services in Ireland (1980) (the O'Sullivan Report) and the final report of the National Youth Policy Committee (1984) were among the first policy documents to recognise the importance of research in the field of youth services (NYCP, 1984: 120). This has become widely accepted. The Youth Work Act 2001 included a provision that the Minister for Education would support the carrying out of research into youth work, and when the National Youth Work Development Plan was being prepared in the early 2000s an extensive programme of research and consultations was conducted. Similarly the National Children’s Strategy included the goal that “children’s lives will be better understood”, and that has led to a wide ranging programme of research into the lives of children and young people, including the Growing Up in Ireland longitudinal study. The DCYA has recently supported the Irish Research Council to fund research into services and policy for children and young people, including youth work, and this has made possible, among other things, a study of volunteer-led youth work in Ireland by NUI Maynooth and University College Cork. Both of these, like other academic institutions, also carry out a range of other scholarly investigations of youth work with a particular focus on developing insights that can help to improve practice and influence policy.

Though all the youth work organisations continue to maintain the voluntary ethos, in recent years there has been an increase in the involvement of professionally-trained youth workers in the field of youth work ‘to support voluntary effort and to work directly with young people’ (Devlin and McCready, 2012: 37). Academic and professional education and training provide another means for knowledge and insights to be passed on and for ideas to influence policy and practice. In the 1970s, the first professional youth workers were trained and educated in Britain. In 1984 the National Youth Policy Committee recommended the establishment of a Department of Youth and Community Studies in a third-level institution, and although this did not happen at the time it was shortly afterwards that youth work was introduced on a par with community work education and training in Maynooth. In 1990, in-service youth work training was introduced in the same university, supported by the Department of Education. University College Cork also offers professional education and training in youth and community work alongside social work, and a number of other institutions either offer such programmes or plan to do so. Furthermore, there is an increased
emphasis on ensuring standards of education training for youth work, as is evident from the establishment of the North-South Education Training Standards Committee for Youth Work (NESTS) in 2006 as a result of the National Youth Work Development Plan.

5.4.5 International Environment

In addition to (sometimes overlapping with) the factors discussed above, the emergence and development of Irish youth policy is also influenced by the international environment, through Ireland’s relationship with other countries and membership of international organisations. An obvious example already discussed is the historical relationship with Britain which continues to have a very direct impact today, particularly because the island of Ireland has a border between the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom. Until the early 1920s the whole island was part of the UK and some of the earliest youth work in Ireland was part of British uniformed organisations such as the Boy Scouts, Girls Guides, Boys and Girls Brigades. More recently, the ratification of the Good Friday Agreement by the electorates of both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland also contributed towards cooperation and the development of youth work (Department of Education and Science, 2003: 1).

The pursuance of modernisation from the 1960s and accession to the European Community (now EU) in 1973 brought Ireland into the global context and led to the emergence of the so-called ‘Celtic Tiger’ (Powell, 2012: 148). Smith (2005: 2) based on the rapid economic growth of 1990s to 2000s, the famous ‘Celtic tiger' period, calls Ireland as a ‘showpiece of globalisation’. This period was associated with a boom in employment and enormous growth in the economy (Kirby, 2010: 18). But by 2008, the swift collapse of the ‘Celtic Tiger’ led to the most severe recession to have been experienced by any country of the Eurozone (Lane, 2008 cited in Kirby, 2010: 12). New debates emerged about the meaning and relevance of sustainability, Powell (2012: 148). The national and international recession, at the same time, caused substantial adverse effects on the country’s economic growth, jobs and trade (Healy et al., 2012: 12). In all of these developments, good and bad, the international context had an important influence on Ireland’s situation and on the policy choices it made. The recent imposition of ‘austerity’ policies as part of the country’s economic ‘bailout’ provides the clearest and most negative example.
Powell et al., (2012: 218) discuss the way in which Ireland’s modernisation was closely linked with its membership of international organisations. Ireland was a founder member of the Council of Europe in 1949, joined the United Nations in 1955 and the European Union (as it is now called) in 1973. The recent EU initiative, the Europe 2020 Strategy, recommends that all member states note the importance of design and delivery of youth policy, equipping young people with skills and competencies (Council of The European Union, 2013: 2).

A very important impact on policy of Ireland’s membership of the Council of Europe is through its ratification of the European Convention on Human Rights (1950), which is overseen and enforced by the European Court of Human Rights. The convention in turn was inspired by the UN’s Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948). Particularly important for children and young people is the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (1990). The UNCRC was based on three underlying principles: non-discrimination insofar as the articles apply to all children equally, whatever their race, sex, religion, disability, opinion or family background; the child's best interest must be taken into consideration in any decision concerning him or her, in accordance with age and maturity. The Convention covers four broad areas of rights: survival, development, protection and participation rights (Richardson, 1999: 190).

The UNCRC becomes law in those countries that ratify it. Ireland ratified it in 1992, thus binding Ireland to its Articles on international law (Lalor et al., 2007: 8). After signing the UNCRC, the initiatives taken include the following: the establishment of the Children's Rights Alliance in Ireland between 1993 and 1995, the National Children's Strategy in 2000, and the National Children's Office in 2001 to implement the strategy (Powell et al., 2012: 218; Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 82). The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child set out the rights of children and young people in all areas of their lives, and Ireland agreed to implement these rights when it signed the Convention (Kilkelly, 2007). In the case of the National Children’s Strategy, it has been suggested (Lalor et al., 2007: 282) that the very negative report in the late 1990s by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, which monitors adherence to the UNCRC by member states, was one of the most important factors in influencing the Irish government to take concerted action.
Ireland’s membership of the EU also has an influence on many areas of policy. Among the earliest and most significant examples is the issue of equal pay between men and women, and other aspects of gender equality have flowed from that. In the case of youth policy, like most other areas of social policy, the principle of subsidiarity means that the EU cannot force Ireland or other member states to take specific actions but can encourage and support them to do so. The ‘Open Method of Coordination’ (OMC) is an example of how this is done. Chisholm et al., (2011) describe it as follows:

This method (first used for employment policy and subsequently for education, culture, research, immigration, asylum and other areas) is primarily ‘intergovernmental’ in character, with the European Commission taking the role of facilitating, encouraging and supporting the development of common objectives, ‘benchmarks’ and ‘indicators’ and the dissemination of best practice in given areas of policy.

The European Commission’s White Paper A New Impetus for European Youth (2001) proposed the application of the OMC in the youth field. It has been extended by the Council of the European Union’s Renewed Framework for Cooperation in the Youth Field (2009). While the OMC recognises that EU member states can make their own individual decisions about youth policy, this does not mean it is not an effective way to promote policy development at European level. Chisholm et al., (2011: 29) suggest that the use of the OMC to develop common objectives, ‘indicators’, ‘benchmarks’ and so on, in areas like education and youth policy, is in fact a very ‘sophisticated’ way for the European Commission to work towards greater ‘cohesion’ among different national policies across the EU. An example is the way in which the youth programmes of the EU Presidencies involve departments and ministries in all member states working on common themes relating to young people, like ‘quality youth work’ and ‘social inclusion’ in the case of Ireland’s Presidency in the first half of 2013.

Industrialisation, urbanisation, and the technological revolution of recent times, along with the political, ideological and institutional environments nationally and internationally have created new opportunities and challenges for young people which have encouraged or at times forced the government to respond with various programmes and policies for youth. Youth culture has itself changed in line with socio-
economic developments in this country and elsewhere and that in turn demanded the attention of the government to make policy-level changes. Furthermore, voluntary organisations and other interest groups and movements have played a pivotal role in shaping and directing Irish youth policy, just as they have in India. The following two chapters present the views of key-informants on the developments that have taken place in each country and on the ‘factors and actors responsible’.
Chapter Six

Findings from Indian Key-Informants’ Interviews

Years of analysis, research, discussion and consultation precede the framing of any policy, especially those of national importance. Implementation is another difficult and prolonged process. It involves careful coordination at departmental level and in engagement with various departments, organisations and NGOs. To analyse the factors and actors that have shaped and influenced youth policy in India, eleven key-informants who were directly involved in youth welfare in both government and non-government organisations were interviewed and a very significant amount of data was collected. Based on their inputs, this chapter attempts to analyse the findings using the analytical lens of Gough’s “Five I’s”. The essential aim is to synthesise the emerging themes and ideas and to create a base for interpretation and comparison with similar findings derived from a similar study carried out in Ireland. In order to protect the anonymity of the keyinformants who were educationists, practitioners, policy makers and representatives of NGOs from India, the table below provides a guide for the reader. Some of the interviewees from India provided less detailed responses than their Irish counterparts.

Table 6.1: India: Key-informants on Youth & Youth Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Code no.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Educationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Educationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Policy Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Policy Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Policy Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.1. Industrialisation

6.1.1 Socio-Economic Changes

Industrialisation in India received fresh impetus and experienced a sudden upward surge especially after the 1991 economic reforms. It was considered to be an offshoot of India's openness to globalisation. The availability of cheap, qualified and skilled labour attracted many MNCs, BPOs and other reputable companies to begin trading in India. Indian Interviewee Four remarks on this emerging scenario: ‘The government opened the door for liberalisation and industries were forced to raise their quality and standard to reach to the international market. The government became the facilitator by introducing policies such as electronic parks, industrial parks, economic zones, and so on.’ This phenomenon demanded and absorbed, mostly, young qualified professionals. It also influenced the type of qualification that the youth chose. Indian Interviewee Two while speaking about youth policy in India remarks ‘…globalisation has definitely impacted Indian economy and it is reflected in the policy document which speaks a lot about linking employment and education, giving them skill training and life skills.’

The industrial demands and the need for professional competency have transformed the Indian youth into a ‘well-educated, well-informed and competitive’ workforce. According to Indian Interviewee Ten, in the 1990s, government policies focused on the provision of education opportunities and tried to discourage emigration to other countries. Indian Interviewee Eight holds that the reason for the ‘brain drain’ is that the youth of today does not get any employment. Even if they get employed, they do not earn as much as they do in other countries. She also speaks of a peculiar phenomenon called ‘reverse brain drain’: ‘There is also reverse brain drain wherein people go abroad for studies or work and they return to their home country to invest their money, experience and knowledge.’

Moreover, Indian Interviewee Six holds that the ‘youth of today are healthier, better educated and they have more access to media, information, and newer ideas. They have new needs too. Their health needs, problems of unemployment and the like need better and serious precautions than what was available twenty years ago.’ She also asserts, however, that though India is praised for its high demographic dividend in
terms of youth population, ‘our youth are neither educated nor healthy enough to enable us to exploit the demographic dividend.’ The socio-economic changes have also impacted upon and changed the value systems between generations. As Indian Interviewee Eleven argues: ‘Today’s youth are growing up in an environment that is corrupt. They see corrupt people, politicians, and bureaucracy. They notice rich becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer; whereas, the older generation had a cleaner environment along with political and social concerns.’ Indian Interviewee Three states that ‘youth are always youth. Here I consider this to be the purest section in society. And now because of the adult corruption, there are criminals coming from the younger section and all these criminals are generated by the adults / by the elders…’ In the changing socio-economic environment, Indian Interviewee Seven states that ‘young people have apprehensions concerning their future after the completion of their studies. There are only a very few or a small minority of young people who are clear about their future and career. Large numbers of young people, whether they live in rural areas or in urban areas, are still ambiguous on their future’.

6.1.2 Social-Structural Changes

One of the most far-reaching impacts of industrialisation on youth and subsequently on the social system is ‘the movement from a joint family system to the nuclear family system’ (Indian Interviewee Ten). This phenomenon may be attributed to many factors such as individualism and non-compatibility with elders, nonetheless, the need for migration to cities by young people in search of employment has been a dominant factor. Indian Interviewee Ten further contends that this has resulted in a decrease in respect for elders, a decrease in family support, a disconnection from family members, and a subsequent decrease in transmitting traditional values. He also holds that though young people connect through social media such as Facebook, Skype etc., still the gap between family members is widening. At the same time, Indian Interviewee eight argues that ‘in India youths still have some values in them. While I don’t want to impose the values on a young person, I at least can make the young to understand what is wrong, what is right, and the young person is willing to accept it, because the young person is growing in that environment. Even if it is a nuclear family, the parents are able to pull back. In the family there is a sister or a brother who is able to influence the other.’
According to Indian Interviewee Two, many young people today stay away from family when they move to urban areas in search of jobs. They take control of themselves because they become economically independent once they gain employment. He further adds that in today's context ‘total control of the elders over youngsters is gradually declining even in rural areas.’ For Indian Interviewee One, there is a poor relationship between elders, especially grandparents, and youth in a family. The youth do not seem to spend time with the elders. Indian Interviewee Two, on the contrary, holds that the youth in India are still emotionally attached to the family.

Indian Interviewee Three, however, states that the ‘generation gap will always exist and children keep growing whereas parents never grow. Modern changes are accepted and adapted by children, but parents do not change. Parents impose on their children whatever they failed to achieve and they fail to see the interests of their children. Most of the parents now are dominating and they are the ones who make 80 to 90 percent of decisions for their children including marriage.’ Indian Interviewee Nine agrees with this view: ‘Parents say that youth are free to make decision for their life but they do not let them be themselves and impose their ideas on them. This is a big contradiction we see today. Young people today want to be independent and want to take decisions by themselves. But they are controlled by their parents when it comes to certain most important decisions of their life.’ Indian Interviewee Five makes an important observation as follows:

The main concept is that society does not give power to the youth, centralisation of power in a house is a family that is a para-cyclic. In the political and family systems, the authority comes from the hierarchy. There is no decentralisation either at political or family level. For example, when an Indian father does distributes his assets, he does so when he is three legged or four legged …. That means he does not willingly give the powers to anyone.

According to Indian Interviewee Eleven, ‘Youth do not find the differences between religions. For example, in any college campus, youths from different religions and communities live peacefully’. Indian Interviewee Three also holds that youth do not discriminate on the basis of religion and ‘the discrimination starts only at the later age that is at the age of 18 or so following marriage.’ Indian Interviewee Four states that the youth are ‘willing to accept the differences.’ Indian Interviewee Two states
that youth policy doesn’t speak of any particular religion and at the same time, it speaks about multi-religious contexts. Indian Interviewee One agrees that there is no word mentioned in youth policy about any religion or caste. Youth programmes or camps organised by the government promote inter-faith relationships and dialogue among people.

Referring to the conflict between the old and the new, Indian Interviewee One declares: ‘Sometimes, in villages, the elders do not allow changes under the pretext of tradition. The youth who want to bring about changes need to face resistance and conflict. For example, even the youth want to introduce the latest sports and games to which the elders are opposed because they want to promote traditional sports’. Indian Interviewee Three make an important observation as follows:

In India is and was will be the same rationale there cannot be much change, it is very difficult to change. The reason is because we give more importance to our own culture, tradition, heritage that is even among the youth we cannot organise discotheque clubs. … It is because, our tradition is different, and the young people have seen the institutions of society like marriage, family they cannot be rooted out of Indian culture.

Indian Interviewee Nine states that ‘today young people grow in a pressurised environment and they are expected to become an adult overnight and as a successful adult, have a position, status, family, money. She also states that in some universities when a rural youth come into the university he /she finds it difficult to integrate with the urban youth in terms of language, a stigma is attached to them’. Indian Interviewee Eight holds that today’s young people find it difficult to share their experience with their parents the problems they experience because of peer pressure. Indian Interviewee Nine also says that if today’s youth are involved in antisocial behaviour ‘it is probably because of their family situations, the space, the values they hold in the family get reflected in the way they behave and act in the society.’

Indian Interviewee One also notes that ‘globalisation and media influence our culture and educated youth who go abroad bring different cultures and dilute the culture.’ Indian Interviewee Four assesses youth culture positively: ‘Our country has got a confluence of cultures and rigidity in the mind is absent.’
Indian Interviewee Nine opines that ‘the rural youth today are marginalised, frustrated, and without a job. Their aspirations are very high but those outcomes are not available. The middle class youth, however, have other sets of worries and values. They are constantly under pressure to perform and to fulfil the aspirations of their family.’ Indian Interviewee Eight asserts that due to peer influence young people find it difficult to share their experience with their parents.

The rich-poor divide is a cause for major concern among the youth in India. Indian Interviewee One observes that there are ‘unseen youth’ whose aspirations and struggles are never covered by the media and are not considered by policy makers and politicians. He comments: ‘Even today, there are hungry youth. In the villages, I come across youth who has never seen a silk sari in her life and families that cannot buy a single sovereign of gold for marriage…. Such is the poverty and the economic condition of the villages.’ Economic inequality together with caste and religious discrimination have been detrimental to youth in the realisation of their true potential.

Indian Interviewee Two states that ‘in Indian society the historical background has definitely had a major influence. For example, you may ask why the caste systems still exists in our educational system. The answer is because you are attached to the ancestors, the history, the culture and everything. In that sense, definitely if you read the policy also you will say that upholding Indian culture, tradition, values those types of things are the same’. As Indian Interviewee One observes, ‘Youth are caught between caste and religion and they are discriminated against by others.’ A solution that he offers to counter this issue is social empowerment wherein social sanctions are done away with and the youth are given an opportunity to mingle freely with other caste groups. However, according to Indian Interviewee Two, empowerment is not possible when ‘someone is not on an equal plane’. He suggests, therefore, that ‘the focus should be to empower them with education, employable skills and life skills.’ Indian Interviewee One observes that:

Today youth want change in society but sometimes they are not in the position to bring changes in the sense of social change, political change, economic change and cultural change. By social change I mean, they want to mix with other groups, I mean high caste and low caste but they are not able to proceed because of the traditional barriers and the caste barrier in the traditional system. By political change, I can say with certainty that even at the Panchayat level a 25 year old youth who wants to occupy a
post cannot do so because he/she is unable to climb the ladder of power and leadership because only the rich members of society are given that power.

For Indian Interviewee Five, though India believes in democracy and its principles, it does not seem to believe in equality. Indian Interviewee Two also agrees with this view: “Today’s youth are angry because the prosperity that has come into the nation is not equitable. It is not equally shared by all the young people. The informed, educated young people get a major share and as a result others become rebellious.” Moreover, he says: ‘In order to help young people, who cover nearly more than half of the population, good education and employment should be given. Otherwise, they would turn rebellious and involve in antisocial behaviour. For instance, in the North-Eastern states of Nagaland and Manipur, youth are involved in crime and antisocial activities because there are no alternatives for them to earn.’ Indian Interviewee Five too contends that these ‘sort[s] of disturbances’ are also due to ‘deprivation of opportunities’.

6.1.3 Education, Employment and Health

According to Indian Interviewee Six, young people today experience a lack of education, a lack of application of the skill to survive, a lack of vocational skills, as well as unemployment and health-related issues. Indian Interviewee Five opines that ‘only education can empower young people and the Right to Education is a fundamental right and no-one should be outside this system.’ Indian Interviewee Seven, speaking about education, mentions that ‘the Right of Children to the Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009 which the government introduced is a good and useful initiative. This RTE Act provides opportunities for children to go to school. But the overriding problem is corruption. One finds that money flows for the RTE programme and policies. This raises the question: Will the real beneficiaries gain from this? That’s a big question mark.’ Indian Interviewee Five points out that though the government gives thrust to employability skills, it should give priority to the dropouts who are outside the educational system because they are the ones who are ‘the most exploited, underpaid, unskilled, and vulnerable’. According to Indian Interviewee Six, the government of India started many institutes for skill development but very few youths benefited from them, due to a lack of awareness and neglect. Many women do
One of the important worries among the young people today is livelihood – What will I do after completing my education? There is only a small minority group of young people are clear about what they want to do in their life but large number of young people who are living in rural and urban areas are still looking for an answer to this question.

This interviewee also suggests that the government should come out with a clear policy to improve the employability of the young people.

Indian Interviewee Four makes a pertinent observation with regard to education and employment. He points to the gap between what is taught in the institute and the needs of the market. It is necessary to impart good education with employable skills. He suggests that only an industry-institute partnership and some sort of internship can address this concern. Indian Interviewee Nine, states that ‘the educational system provides an opportunity for memorising and grasping knowledge but there is no space for developing skills to understand and reflect’. Expressing a similar thought, Indian Interviewee Two suggests that ‘our education system is more focussed on marks, exams, and results’. He asserts that education should provide young people with skills and critical thinking to decide about their future and employment. Indian Interviewee Seven holds that it is not enough to provide education and make choices available, rather we need to have a broad plan in which young people have easier accessibility to information and skill training, which are not now available. However, on a positive note, Indian Interviewee Two observes that today’s young people have lot of choices and opportunities for employment. They resort to ‘job hopping’, always looking for better avenues of employment. At the same time, on its flipside, ‘job hopping’ leads to impermanency and insecurity to a certain extent.

Indian Interviewee Five states that another major problem India is facing today is youth disturbance or youth unrest in different parts of the country. He says that it is because ‘young people are deprived of opportunities’. This issue is to be addressed not through policy but through life skills, employable skills and by providing means of employment. Expressing the same view Indian Interviewee Two suggests that in order to help young people who make up almost more half of the population need to be given a good education and employment opportunities. ‘Otherwise they would become
rebellious and involve in antisocial behaviour. For example, in north east India, Nagaland and Manipur today youth involve in crime and antisocial because there is no alternative for them to earn money. Recognising the needs of the youth the government should create a separate ministry’. Indian Interviewee Three also while talking about issues of unemployment states that it is connected to economic and social concerns.

He said that in India criminals are emerging from among the youth due to unemployment, they wallow in poverty, they don’t receive an income of their own, and someone provides income along with the handgun, so they are naturally attracted to them because they have tasted poverty from which they wish to emerge. According to him the best solution is education and placement. He suggests that if everyone is in school or college in the moment they come out of schools and colleges and if the placement is waiting for them all the problems will be solved.

Indian Interviewee Seven states that in today’s context the opportunity horizon are widened for the young people and this creates the concern is on the livelihood, building their capacity so that we make them more employable. He argues that:

The government talks a lot about employment but they have not come out with a very clear-cut policy of how we can improve the employability of young people and what kind of the options we can give to them. Now the question concern 1) the employability of the young, 2) the options to choose or a kind of dissemination of the areas that are available, 3) the development of such skills. Say for instance if I wish to begin a motorbike workshop it is employability that emerges: How would I do it or how do I get the necessary economic help? And that is where we need to have a broad plan in which young people can feel that they are given information and skill training, which are not there right now.

Delving on the health issues faced by the youth, Indian Interviewee Seven contends that not only physical health but mental, psychological, social and emotional health issues are a big problem among youth. Government does not seem to be doing enough to address these issues. He argues that the failure to address their mental and psychological health needs young people are driven to ‘anti-social activities and there could be an increase in youth crimes’. Indian Interviewee Nine opines that today’s youth are ‘more and more prone to crimes and they become addicted to drugs, alcohol and substance abuse’. Indian Interviewee One too expresses a similar concern: ‘Youth,
both in urban and rural areas, have [an] alcoholic attitude and indulge in limitless drinking. For instance, in the state of Tamilnadu, the government itself has opened alcohol shops called the Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation (TASMAC).’

Indian Interviewee Nine argues that the success-driven Indian society has forced the young to commit suicides, get addicted to alcoholism because not all young people attain economic success. To address this issue, she says, the government networked with the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) to meet the psychological needs of the youth. It made a study on the need for counselling in schools. Indian Interviewee Seven contends that adequate physical, emotional, and intellectual help is not offered for the young from their families. While there are counselling centres available in many western countries, this is not the case in India. He further argues that ‘when we talk about the health policy and health, the number of primary health centres are ok. But are there sufficient doctors, medicines, nurses and the like? So where can the young people access for their health-related issues? It is not enough to have health policies, youth policies and programmes, there should be political will to implement them’. Indian Interviewee Six contends that while children and mothers are covered by various health policies, the youth are a neglected category. She strongly contends that the health needs of the youth be studied, recognised and addressed by the government.

6.1.4 Technological Revolution

Technological revolution has made the youth very knowledgeable and competent. It has, according to Indian Interviewee Eight, created a generation gap. Echoing these sentiments, Indian Interviewee Eleven writes: ‘The youth are not bothered about what the elders think. They lead their own particular lifestyle. The elders, however, have reconciled to the fact that this is a technologically advanced society and that they have to compromise and grow with it.’ Indian Interviewee Eight writes: ‘In the olden days, the youth had to live by certain values and follow what their parents said. But now, they take their own decisions, and are ready to take risk. They don’t stick to jobs and they experiment. They are far ahead of their times.’ Indian Interviewee Four states that today’s youth are able to assimilate things because of advanced technology...At the same time, the materialistic view takes prime concern. Money is all that they want…’ For Indian Interviewee Two, the technological
revolution has opened avenues for the young to stay connected through mobile phones, Internet, networking, and social media. According to Indian Interviewee Nine, India is probably the place where Internet and mobile usage is very, very high and cheapest, which has brought along newer issues and problems that have to be tackled.

6.2 Interests

6.2.1 Youth Movements and Volunteering Impact

India has a history of youth movements whose roots can be traced to the freedom-struggle era. Many of the interviewees felt that the interest of the youth in forming movements for achieving certain goals or to fight for common issues has been on the decline over the years. They feel that it is close to being nil at present. Indian Interviewee Nine contends that while university students of the 1970s and 80s came together to raise their voices against common issues, the present-day youth are not involved in any social issues. According to her, globalisation and other associated developments are reasons for such a situation. Indian Interviewee One holds that the youth do not participate even in campaigns against alcoholism, casteism, and terrorism. Indian Interviewee Two opines that involvement of young people in social issues is much less now. He thinks that they are more concerned about their own career and less involved in social issues. He also refers to a recent survey saying that

if you take student agitation for a community cause, for example, a price hike, petrol hike and all of that, students engaging in protests and taking up the issue that is a reservation issue and water issue reduced from 17.3% in the 1970s to point 1 or point 2 per cent in the 1980s. This is a drastic change where we can find the young people involved in social issues.

Indian Interviewee Eleven states that voluntarism was very prominent in the 1940s when young people were on fire with the notion of a free India. After independence, it seems to decline. Now, though there is a voluntary sector called NGOs, it cannot be called true voluntarism since many people working in NGOs are paid. Indian Interviewee Two, however, contends that the policy programmes of the Indian government encourage social services. In the 1950s and 60s, the government initiated NSS, NYK, and NCC with the view that young people have abundant energy
and unless it is constructively channelised, it is going to become destructive. The antidote to such social problems is for young people to become involved in social service and nation building. Indian Interviewee Five contends that ‘Youth volunteerism is one which is lacking in our country’. Indian Interviewee Four reiterates this idea and exhorts his students as follows: ‘When your life is uplifted with the help of others, you too should uplift others. Think of doing something to the society such as contributing your time and money for a social cause. There is a possibility that some may also be selfish. But we must have a legacy that whoever gets from the society should give back to society.’ Indian Interviewee Seven states the service orientation in India is the very important plan of any youth programme or national youth policy.

Discussing the pitfalls of not having good youth movements, Indian Interviewee Two states that in economically backward Indian states the youth are involved in naxalite movements which are destructive in nature and have a negative impact on society.

6.2.2 Political Parties

Almost all the Indian interviewees are of the opinion that politicians considered the youth as just pawns in their hands. Indian Interviewee Two, for instance, opines that youth are misguided by leaders who make use of their energy for their immediate gains. Indian Interviewee Ten suggests that the energy of youth are diverted by the vested interests of the political parties. The youth are no more than a ‘vote-bank’ for politicians, says Indian Interviewee One. He further adds that the politicians and the policy makers are not aware of youth problems and yet, the impact of politics on youth policy is huge and every government has its own way of influencing and developing youth policy to serve their own ends. He also states that when the ruling party comes with a new idea the opposition try to oppose it. This is a case also with regard to youth policy.

6.2.3 The Voluntary Sector

According to Indian Interviewee Two, NGOs are involved in the following four areas: providing livelihood opportunities; population education; health; sanitation. Indian Interviewee Ten feels that there are many organisations working with the young
people and they work with mechanisms either supplementing or complementing government initiatives. There are also single-service organisations whose concern is not youth but rather to employ youth, like the NGOs working for the national resource management. These work in villages with the youth. Indian Interviewee Two, however, feels that there are very few organisations that have a strategy, direction and vision to work for the youth. He also continues to state that:

NGOs who are working in the area of youth development are very few, they work in the community and one of their programmes can be for young people, it can be the area of career counselling and guidance. It can be the area of livelihood opportunity that the new trend is now emerging and it can be the area of population and education health and sanitation. These are the four areas were the NGOs are concentrating but if you ask me or if you study some of the agencies if there are not only working with youth actually they are working on population education or health and nutrition [or] HIV/AIDS in a community. They have also taken young people as their target group. There are very few organisations which have a strategy direction and vision for young people.

Indian Interviewee One holds that the only NGOs work at grass-roots level is with young people but he also appreciates the service done by NYK’s youth clubs. As he states:

NGOs who work with youth also don’t discriminate on the basis of religion or caste. They work with Hindu, Christian and Muslim youth groups. For example, the Dindigul multipurpose Social Service (DMSS) and Gandhigram University work with some multi-religious and caste youth groups. So here you know, for example, it is not Christian organisation working with Christian youth groups or Hindu organisations working with the Hindu youth groups.

Many of the interviewees lament the fact that there is no proper forum for NGOs to express their concerns and the issues relating to young people. Indian Interviewee Five states that ‘in this country there is no forum there is no protocol. So this is something which we have to do. Everybody wanted to do something… It is all on the inside’. Indian Interviewee Seven also states that:

There is no structure at all. I mean that the NGO should be formal of course maintaining independence and autonomy. The government should provide forums for
them to come together and agree upon the needs of the young people. So the actual question is this: Do we provide forums for NGOs to come together on issues of young people?

Indian Interviewee Four refers to the need for networking, while Indian Interviewee Eleven calls for the creation of a networking mechanism to avoid duplication of effort by various ministries and agencies. Indian Interviewee Nine, however, points out that NGOs who carry out government projects have to do what the government wants and they cannot do anything different. She also points out that there are also NGOs which do not receive government funding but do influence government policies. For instance, Aruna Roy started a Right to Information movement through a national campaign which led to the enactment of the Right to Information Act in 2005. They are community-based organisations which do not receive government funding but do significantly impact on government policies.

Indian Interviewee Six states that ‘NGOs are trying to provide the innovation and getting their innovation into practice is a difficult task. But the NGOs’ creativity doesn’t always appear in Government programmes’. NGOs are doing better than Government agencies – for example NYK is strong on paper. Indian Interviewee Eight, while appreciating the role of the NGOs, makes the following point ‘the NGOs are doing a lot of work but they are small in number. I feel they give better results than big government agencies. For example, the NYK are involved in 600 districts. Most of them are defunct, but on paper they are everywhere.’

6.3 Institutions

6.3.1 Gaps in Youth Policy: Provision and Practice

The effectiveness of a policy is realised only after its implementation. However good a policy may be, if the executive mechanism fails then that policy remains futile. This was the concern of the majority of interviewees. Referring to Indian youth policy, Indian Interviewee Nine remarks ‘if you read the policies, a lot of things are covered. But how do they translate into action; how do they reach the young. That is where the gap is in terms of overall process.’ Indian Interviewee Ten too holds that ‘the issue is
not with the policy but how to roll out the policy’. Indian Interviewee Eleven too articulates a similar contention:

…You see, the government of India drafted a policy for growth in the year 1988. That was reformulated again in 2003 and 7 years after that the government was now only planning to draft another policy in 2010. To my mind the government is trying to bring about some changes to these policies. I have gone through all of the policies and we had a lengthy discussion. I was also called in for consultation by the ministry before analysing the policy. My problem is that policy is one thing and implementation is another, if policies on paper are unimplemented then, that policy is of no use to anyone especially for a young people. So if there is a policy, the programmes that are in the policy should be given budgetary support.

Indian Interviewee Three notes: ‘Today’s youth have to be trained and shaped so that they will take care of the future. At the same time, we should prepare the future for the youth to accommodate their needs, requirements and aspirations. We find that there is a gap between the two.’ Indian Interviewee Eight states that ‘…young people have a lot of energy in them and that needs to be channelled somehow. This can happen only if you hear them. It is nice to have big policies for them, but you have to get them involved.’

Another major concern of interviewees is the lack of mechanisms for coordination. The needs of youth, according to Indian Interviewee Six, are multi-sectorial and they have to be addressed by different institutions through proper coordination mechanisms. She writes: ‘The labour ministry may have some programmes for the youth and obviously the education ministry is always preoccupied with the youth. The health ministry has some commitment to certain youth issues. I think the needs of youth are certainly multi-sectorial and they have to be addressed by different agents.’ She adds, ‘I think we need to invest more on youth and we have to look at youth as multi-sectorial and inter-sectorial. Somehow we have to do something for the youth in a cohesive way and we need to involve the NGOs and ask them what method is yet to be adopted for the betterment of Youth.’

Indian Interviewee Nine builds on the same idea and exposes how there is a big gap in policy provision and services: “There is a big challenge in making different services available to the youth because of lack of information and youth don’t get
everything in a package. The youth services are provided by different departments and youth policy doesn’t articulate where the services can be availed. There is no ‘one stop’ information available to the youth.”

One major factor that influences the implementation of the youth policy is budgetary provisions and allotted funds. Comparing the budget for youth affairs with other departments such as health, education, etc., Indian Interviewee Two calls it ‘a joke’. There is no proper budget-coordinating mechanism either as he remarks: ‘Unless you have some coordinating mechanism, you will not be able to influence other departments to take care of the needs of the youth’. Indian Interviewee Eleven also refers to budgetary constraints. He contends that the availability of funds is a challenge to policy implementation. He suggests that monitoring can be given to NGOs. Indian Interviewee One, however, warns that ‘NGOs have become very project-conscious because all projects come with huge funding. So, if there are no funds, there are no projects and no services for the youth.’

### 6.3.2 Policy Structure

In a multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, and multi-religious country like India, framing a comprehensive youth policy gives rise to innumerable challenges. The needs and issues of different sectors have to be addressed and at the same time, it is not possible to have different policies and departments for the various sectors. Defending a uniform policy, Indian Interviewee Three refers to inevitable differences between the relevant parties. As he writes: ‘What is acceptable to one group may not be acceptable to all. Yet, we need to compromise and have a common policy because our purpose is to unite all sections particularly the young.’ However, Indian Interviewee Two opines that within this policy there should be priority groups: ‘Youth policy does not mention about priority groups such as tribal youth, rural youth, urban youth, poor youth, and female youth. They need more attention because they are misguided and not so educated.’ He suggests that there should specific options and programmes for these groups.

Indian Interviewee Two raises a pertinent point with regard to institutional structure. As he writes: ‘The government is still not convinced of having a separate ministry for youth affairs. We only have a ministry for youth affairs and sports,
because of which most of the government budget allotted to this ministry is spent on building infrastructure for sports, hostels, and for salary of the personnel.’

Referring to policy making structure, Indian Interviewee Three points to a gaping hole in the whole process. He remarks that young people are not involved in the framing of policies for youth. He asks a pertinent question: ‘When are you going to bring the young people on board?’ Indian Interviewee One speaks of the need for grass-root level involvement in policy making. A statutory body like the village Panchayat should be involved in structuring and framing of youth policy. Not even district-level leaders are involved in the present structure. Indian Interviewee One further observes that the present top-down approach should be reversed for an effective youth policy.

Indian Interviewee One and Indian Interviewee Five argue for a greater role for the young at the Panchayat level. Indian Interviewee One holds that since the Panchayat leader is mostly involved in infrastructure projects, there should also be an elected youth leader at the Panchayat level to cater to the youth. This can emerge as secondary leadership. Indian Interviewee Five lauds the late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi for bringing Panchayat Raj very close to the people and also for reducing the age of voting to eighteen. However, he suggests that this is insufficient. The youth, he argues, should take part in local governments, at least in Gramasabha (local self-government at the village level), where they are involved and their suggestions are taken into consideration.

6.3.3 State Interventions

The role of the state and its agencies in planning, framing and implementing youth policy is very significant. Indian Interviewee Ten notes, ‘India is a country where the bureaucracy is very strong.’ Bureaucracy plays a prominent part in influencing policies and defining them. They have a say in budget provision too. Indian Interviewee Eleven holds that the youth in India live in an environment of corrupt politicians and bureaucracy. He contends that corruption limits state intervention to a certain extent. Referring to government measures, he writes: ‘NYK has reached out to a large segment of non-student youth and for students there are NSS, NCC, Scouts and Guides. However, all these agencies have failed to cater to the
rural youth who form the major portion of the youth population.’ In a similar vein, Indian Interviewee Three states that the ‘majority of the non-student youth whom NYK serves were once student youth. Once they finish their studies, they join the non-student group. In reality, only the NGOs work with non-students who are uneducated.’

Criticising the working of government agencies, Indian Interviewee Three states that ‘the expansion of the NSS, NCC, and NYK schemes are required. The present schemes are not sufficient. For a 1.25 billion population, there are only 3.5 million persons in NCC and NSS. At least one third of the student population should be in NCC/NSS which should be around 80 million.’ Indian Interviewee Eight holds that youth affairs and sports ministry which are mandated by the planning commission as the nodal ministry does not have concrete plans for achieving the objectives. As a result, there is a lack of cohesion among government agencies like NYK, NSS, NCC, and Scouts and Guides. Indian Interviewee Seven asserts that NYK has failed to create ‘activity-based centres wherein a youth can just walk in and be part of the whole thing’. He argues that NYK, in the name of national integration, is busy all year round organising singing and dance competitions at regional, state and national levels but without creating any real impact on the youth.

Most of the interviewees criticised the sort of inadequate training and facilities made available by the state to implement policy objectives. Indian Interviewee Two laments the fact that there is only one national institute, the Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth Development (RGNIYD), to train youth workers for the entire country. Indian Interviewee Three stresses the need for leadership training because the major challenge is leadership among youth. Indian Interviewee Seven feels that RGNIYD should become the focal point of all other training initiatives: ‘the resources and materials need to be centralised and the Rajiv Gandhi Institute be kept as a referral point.’ Indian Interviewee Eleven too feels that there should be more training centres.

6.4 Ideas

6.4.1 Impact of Research

Policy making involves and is influenced by many factors including need-analysis, input from epistemic communities and media, and the agenda of the political
parties that form the government. Indian Interviewee Seven doubts that there is a correct analysis of the needs of today’s youth in policy formation on their behalf. As he writes: ‘Before any formulation of policy, there should be a deep analysis of the requirements and needs of young people themselves. The rural youth should also be studied through some groups like Nehru Yuva Kendra that work with them.’

Indian Interviewee Eleven points to the need for a census on youth in order to have statistical information on youth and to research to know their aspirations: ‘Census is basically to know the numbers. How many literate and illiterate? How many employed and unemployed? How many rural and urban? How many aspirational, wishes, ideas, and their thinking on various aspects like religion and politics.’ He further contends that ‘unless we do research on the young, the policy we make or the programmes we want to implement will be of no use.’ Indian Interviewee One laments the lack of research funding: ‘They (policy makers) don’t have direct contact with the youth. They only have contact with district youth centres. They get some reports and they analyse them. No real research is done because no research funding is offered by the ministry.’

Indian Interviewee Five stresses the need for the sharing of information. While many individual researchers do a lot of study on youth, primarily for academic purposes, they do not seem make their findings available for the purposes of policy making. He holds that linking academia and administration would go a long way in boosting research and documentation.

Almost all the interviewees agree that the present-day youth are well-educated and competitive. Their aspirations are far ahead of those of the previous generation. They are, as Indian Interviewee Four puts it, vibrant, energetic, and love to experiment and to discover new things. However, young people also feel that certain sections like the rural youth, tribal youth, and uneducated youth miss out in the race. They feel the need to make youth policy inclusive to accommodate the needs of these weaker sections. Indian Interviewee Two reiterates this concept when calls for ‘specific option and programmes within the youth policy for the weaker sections among the youth like the female youth, tribal youth, poor youth and rural youth.’
6.4.2 Perception of Media, Politicians and Society

The media is the major opinion creator in society. They exert strong influence on the tech-savvy contemporary youth. Indian Interviewee Nine states that ‘the media try to portray the young as achievers and creates aspirations for them by presenting role models who are successful in various industries like film, sports, and technology.’ While admitting that media presents youth as achievers, Indian Interviewee Eight holds, on the contrary, that youth who are excluded from the successful society are driven to stress and despair. Some even resort to suicide as an option. Indian Interviewee Eleven holds that the media mainly portrays the youth as ‘troublemakers’ and she gives the examples of naxalites movements in Central India and the militant groups in the North-Eastern states.

Indian Interviewee Two feels that everyone including the politicians, the media and the society consider the youth as insufficiently capable, self-reliant and powerful to play a role in society. According to Indian Interviewee One, gender discriminations are instilled in the youth through media. Women are depicted as ‘sexual objects’ and these kinds of abusive presentations have a strong bearing on the youth’s, as well as society’s, psyche.

According to Indian Interviewee Ten, society highlights the destructive nature of youth. As he writes: ‘If you go to Kerala and ask any working person about his/her image of the youth, the first thing you will hear is that young people are those who are trying to break public infrastructure.’ Indian Interviewee One refers to the dependency syndrome prevalent among the youth. They depend on their parents for livelihood till they get a job. Though they may wallow in poverty, they put on an artificial façade of prosperity through their attire and speech. Society has the choicest phrases to describe youth, according to him: kali paiyan (empty guys), podipaiyan (a youth who is too small to know anything), vela illathapasanga (educated jobless guys), etc. Society, according to Indian Interviewee Five, looks at ‘youth as some sort of a problem.’

In consonance with the wider society, Indian Interviewee Two accepts that youth as an entity that has ‘to be taken care of’. He calls for a change in outlook and emphasises how ‘youth could be agents of change.’ Indian Interviewee Five too feels that ‘youth is viewed not as a big asset, not as a big resource.’ Indian Interviewee Four
refuses to consider youth as a threat and suggests that the society should try to focus on the good the youth can offer.

6.4.3 Definition and Purpose of Youth Policy

The interviewees also had their own perceptions and ideas to offer on youth and youth development. Scholars offer various definitions of Youth. Indian Interviewee Seven comments:

Youth development work can be divided into three areas: youth for society/community, society/community for the youth, and youth for youth. Youth for society/community is where service orientation comes in. Society/community for youth consists of youth programmes like career counselling, psychological counselling, etc. The third component youth for youth is to develop young people as an empowering force. This will help create equality among different youth groups and organisations in the country and make them self-reliant and self-governed.

Indian Interviewee One considers that the purpose of youth policy is to ‘enable every youth in the country to refine their personality’ and that, in his view, is youth development. Indian Interviewee Two argues as follows:

The purpose of policy should be to make the young an agent of change. If you read the policy priority areas and all the programmes, the young people are seen as being on the receiving end whereas the policy should enable young people to become an instrument of change and development.

According to Indian Interviewee Seven there is an emphasis in the west on youth who are problematic. However, in a country like India, youth are considered as a problem which in turn points to a need for a change in outlook at the policy level in India. Moreover, youth of different age groups have different issues and needs and they have to be addressed accordingly. The ministry of child development takes care of children between 7 and 12, and the youth ministry, earlier dealt with, youth from age 15 and upwards. The intermediate group was not attended to, according to him. That is the reason why the youth ministry lowered the age of youth to 13. The reason for setting the upward age limit for youth to 35 is that the youth are not settled even in their early 30s and are in search of jobs.
6.4.4 Youth Empowerment and Participation

The concept of participation and involvement of youth in policy making and implementation have been stressed by most of the interviewees. For instance, Indian Interviewee Seven argues that ‘we need to ask young people what they want for themselves, and it is sad that while framing polices for the youth, they are not part of the process.’ Indian Interviewee Eleven goes a step further and demands reservation for youth in parliament: ‘We talk about reservation. Why can’t we reserve some seats in the parliament for young people?’ He feels that by involving them in politics, they can be made into decision-makers, and to exercise an influence on policy making for the youth. Indian Interviewee Eight too calls for ‘larger platforms for youth to voice their opinions’. She further adds the following: ‘How many young people are there in the parliament? Should we not encourage that their voice is heard by ensuring that at least some seats are reserved for young politicians?’ Indian Interviewee Eleven explains how youth are denied an opportunity in politics:

They (The youth) want opportunities – job-related opportunities as well as opportunities to voice their opinion in politics. Indian politics today is full of politicians who are aged 70 and above, except a few. But today’s youth want to bring about change. They want to get into politics. But then, old politicians will not give them a chance because they think the youth are inexperienced.

Indian Interviewee Five also shares the same sentiments in relation to the lack of youth participation in politics. He states that youth are not given responsibility which is reflected in the politics. For example,

‘...you take the president or the prime minister, you take the chief ministers of the country, you could never say that it reflects or it represents youth. Coming to Loksabha, it has got 545 members elected there are only 13 members of each group below 35 which is my target. I have just been looked at the list. MLA’s also I don’t think the percentage can be 10 per cent.'
6.5 International Environment

International agencies, organisations and political systems that exert influence on governments to frame policies for youth and fund this effort have an impact on policy making and implementation. India, Indian Interviewee Four says, inherited legal, educational systems from the British and the employment systems also have a residual imprint of colonisation. Indian Interviewee Three argues that colonialism helped Indians in many ways to overcome discriminations of caste, creed and colour; it also brought railways and education, in particular, women’s education. However, Indian Interviewee Eleven feels that the influence of colonialism is long gone and only the older generation may reminisce. The young do not connect to it.

Indian Interviewee Two states that ‘before 1985, the Indian society did not speak much about the young people but the announcement of the international youth year in 1985 by UN made the government to focus on the young. At the beginning, the Department of Youth Affairs and Sports was part of the Ministry of Human Resource Development and then under Ministry of Education. Later, it became the Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports. However, the government should have a separate ministry for youth because more than half of the population is below 30.’

Indian Interviewee Five remarks that the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in which India is a signatory, plays an important role focusing on children, education, health and development. Indian Interviewee Eight states that the youth who participated in the conference organised by the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) expressed their feeling ‘you do not listen to us’ and they came out with the resolution, ‘Hear us out’.

Indian Interviewee Six contends that international agencies like UNFPA, UNICEF and World Bank have a lot of say in shaping youth policy or at least part of the policy. Indian Interviewee One asserts that Commonwealth youth programmes too contribute to the development of youth policy.
6.6 Policy Outcomes

The interviewees also talked about the policy outcomes, in other words, about benefits of the present youth policy. Banking on his experience as an employment officer, Indian Interviewee Four refers to how the employment office which was once considered just as a registration office for jobs has transferred itself to become ‘a hope-renewing and an empowering body’. This is reflected in the government starting ‘study-circle’, a system through which government with the partnership of private agencies prepares youth for competitive exams. Indian Interviewee One states that through NYK the youth have been provided livelihood skills which economically empowered the youth.

As evident from the analysis and the thematic categorisation of ideas, the key-informants were very knowledgeable about various factors that are involved in formulating and implementing the Indian youth policy. This classification of the inputs and the findings will be of help for further discussion and interpretation while comparing the youth policy of India and that of Ireland.
Chapter Seven

Findings from Irish Key-informants Interview

Ireland has a long history of youth work where the government and non-governmental organisations (the ‘voluntary sector’) are closely involved in implementing youth policy. The eleven key-informants have been involved in youth work and youth policy in one or other (or both) sectors. Just as with the Indian findings, this chapter sets out to present the views of interviewees systematically and examines the emerging themes and ideas from the interviews using the analytical lens of Gough’s “Five I’s”. This provides a framework for further discussion. The eleven key-informants were educationists, practitioners, policy makers and NGOs from Ireland. They were experienced and knowledgeable in the field of youth development and articulated their views on youth and youth policy with clarity and ease. For the sake of anonymity, the real names of the interviewees have been disguised.

Table 7.1: Ireland – Key-informants on Youth & Youth Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Code no</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Policy Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Policy Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Educationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>NGO Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Policy Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Practitioner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1 Industrialisation

7.1.1 Socio-Economic Changes

The 18th century industrial revolution in Britain had a major impact on Ireland, though Ireland was not as industrialised as Britain. It shaped and influenced the general social psyche by effecting certain socio-economic changes. Modern Ireland too is experiencing similar changes through the economic boom of the 1990s, often referred to as the ‘Celtic Tiger’, and the subsequent recessions. The ripples of liberalisation and globalisation have also been felt in the Irish contexts. Many of the interviewees talked of how recession has affected employment generation, depleted opportunities, created a slump in confidence and in a larger context ushered social changes that would have a far-reaching impact on the Irish society.

Irish Interviewee Nine thinks that due to globalisation, the whole world is getting urbanised and Ireland is no exception. As he remarks: ‘Even those parts of the world that are not urbanised accept urban values. For example, in Ireland, mobile phones became a huge part of even poor people’s lives and that of course for economic reasons.’ Furthermore, he feels that due to the overriding colossus of economic globalisation and the power in the economy, the importance given to family, traditional way of life and livelihood have been pushed somewhat to one side.

Highlighting the issue of emigration, Irish Interviewee Ten argues that ‘a large number of young people who are well educated have no future in the current economic model. Unless swift changes are implemented, there would be serious problems building up and they cannot be solved by sending them to do construction work in Australia or Canada or elsewhere.’ Irish Interviewee Eleven echoes this sentiment: ‘We are suddenly seen as one of the disaster states. We have huge economic problems. We have huge economic deficit and we have to be bailed out by the IMF and the European Bank. So that has definitely hit people’s confidence. We are at risk of going back to where we were in the 50s and 60s in terms of confidence.’ According to Irish Interviewee Two, the youth especially have to confront the fact of reduction of opportunities particularly in relation to employment.
Comparing the present generation of youth with the previous one, Irish Interviewee Eleven comments as follows; ‘The contemporary youth population are much more confident than they would have been thirty years ago and have much higher expectations around lifestyles, and definitely they are much more outward looking.’ Irish Interviewee Three notes that these attitudes are linked to economic changes that have occurred and the availability of opportunities through education and training. Irish Interviewee Five and Irish Interviewee Three declare furthermore that possibilities and aspirations of youth have been hampered by the economic recession. As Irish Interviewee Ten remarks, ‘The truth is that there aren’t training opportunities; there aren’t educational opportunities; and there aren’t job opportunities.’

7.1.2 Socio-Structural Changes

Industrialisation and the related economic demands have had a telling effect on family structures, roles of family members, impact of religions, culture and class distinction. The interviewees reiterate how these changes have occurred at various levels within the Irish society. Referring to the loss of natural connection within family members, Irish Interviewee One remarks: ‘…over the last thirty years or so because of housing people don’t live in the community where they grew up. So their extended family is not necessarily around them…whereas in the older Ireland, the family would have been around you in your locality, you would have had that natural connection. That’s not necessarily happening now.’ Irish Interviewee Six and Irish Interviewee Five observed how the role of grandparents has decreased in the context of the present nuclear family and that the current generation does not get to have enough interaction with their parents because both of them may be busy working. Nevertheless, Irish Interviewee Six argues that ‘the relationship between young people and elderly is very good....Because I think young people for some reason, find in their grandparents a care and an understanding that’s not always there in their parents.’ Analysing the changing roles within families, Irish Interviewee Nine observes that responsibility of caring for the children has fallen on the elder siblings: ‘…where the parents have to work and they need to work to survive and some of the older boys or girls have to mind the younger kinds.’

Referring to changing family pattern, Irish Interviewee Four and Irish Interviewee Ten advocate recognising the rights of LGBT and accepting them into the
mainstream society is very important in modern society. Both authors refer to ‘Belong To’, an organisation run by and for LGBT youth. Irish Interviewee Four argues, “…we would have been forerunners when it came to Belong To youth. We would have supported gay youth clubs some 20 or 30 years ago…. You had a cohort and we would have been at the roots of that and brought it along. But, it’s on its own now and it is great.” Irish Interviewee Ten notes how people had to ‘go to Europe’ (i.e. take a case to the European Court of Human Rights) to force the Irish government to decriminalise homosexuality.

Religion, and in particular the Christian Churches, have an important role to play in the Irish social structure. Irish Interviewee Two, while accepting the prominence that the Catholic Church enjoyed within the Irish society, alludes to a significant shift that has taken place in recent decades. As he writes:

obviously, in the 60s and 70s, faith and religion had a very significant part to play in most people’s lives in Ireland. For young people, it was a kind of routine. I mean you weren’t encouraged to ask questions. You know your family went to church and so the expectation was that you went to church and everything that went with that. Now there is a huge shift away from the church among the youth. On a kind of broad spiritual sense, there is concern around what is filling that gap. Where are they getting their values and the moral framework that was being provided by it? I think the perception is that they have access to much more information; they have potentially more choices and are aware of what those choices might be compared to young people of the 60s and 70s.

Irish Interviewee Six also holds that the Catholic Church’s contribution is dwindling and that the society is rapidly becoming ever more secular. Irish Interviewee Seven refers to how the Catholic Church is losing its moral authority in the moral sphere: ‘We were brought up in quite a religious Catholic upbringing. So certainly the whole idea of underage sex wasn’t tolerated. It is a different world now.’

However, according to Irish Interviewee Eleven, the Catholic Church even after many scandals is still a powerful force in Ireland as evident from its various interventions in national debates. As he writes: ‘There are feelings among some government ministers and some civil servants about whether Church based are appropriate to manage youth services. Are they safe to manage youth services because
of the scandals that are in the Church itself? …But the reality is that vast majority of provisions are made by Church-based organisations, be it Catholic or Christian. So, if they were to pull the plug vast majority of youth work would disappear down the plughole’.

An emerging trend within the religious context is the concept of faith-based funding and work within multi-religious contexts. Irish Interviewee One notes how the Girl Guides refer to themselves as a faith-based organisation, an inclusive term not restricted to Christianity alone. Irish Interviewee Three too echoes these sentiments with regard to funding. He notes how the allocation of funding to faith-based organisations for youth work extends to other religions.

Almost all the interviewees refer to the rampant inequality that exists in Ireland and the need for economic as well as cultural integration. Irish Interviewee Five holds that ‘there will always be groups of young people who would be marginalised. Even during the Celtic tiger era, there were young people who were excluded from the fruits of that boom.’ Irish Interviewee Ten also notes that ‘during the Celtic Tiger, the divide between the haves and the have-nots, that economic divide and social inequality were actually compounded. …Social disadvantage is still embedded in the system….’ Irish Interviewee Nine states that when socially disadvantaged youth are given opportunities, in most cases they respond positively. Irish Interviewee Two contends that while Ireland has a reputation as a highly-educated population, there are also high levels of educational disadvantage and very high levels of young people and adults with literacy problems. Irish Interviewee Eight stresses the need to bridge these gap and strive towards integration: ‘In mainstream youth work, centres, programmes and personnel have to be made available to all young people including the disadvantaged. However, in the present context, in terms of number of young people who have been reached out is not very significant.’

The interviewees also stressed the need for cultural integration and not simply economic integration. Irish Interviewee Eight opines: ‘One of the developments that happened in the eighties as well as in mainstream youth work was the inclusion of ethnically or sexually different young people.’ He further points to the integration of scouting organisations that were segregated on religious lines as Catholic Scouts and the Scouts Association of Ireland. He writes: ‘I suppose the youth clubs - Macra na
Tuaithe and Macra na Feirme - would have been the first to take people from different backgrounds and religions together.'

Multiculturalism is something relatively new in the Irish context that entered during the Celtic Tiger era. Irish Interviewee Six calls for ‘a greater respect for multiculturalism, a greater respect for different cultures, and a greater understanding.’ He further comments ‘I suppose, to some extent, the Celtic Tiger allowed multiculturalism to grow a bit. It grew in two ways: firstly, a lot of people from different cultures came to Ireland; and secondly, the Irish were able to experience different cultures by the fact that they could travel.’ Irish Interviewee Five argues that Ireland is becoming multi-cultural as clearly evidenced at the primary school level. She remarks: ‘There is less distinction with children accepting children from different nationalities and cultures.’ Irish Interviewee Eleven, however, holds that at the policy level importance is not given to multiculturalism. As he remarks: ‘There is a bill that has a separate youth provision for Travellers’ group and that is actually causing entrenchment especially with regard to some of the African groups. They want to be segregated because they are afraid of losing their identity and their native culture.’ However, he holds that they need to be integrated and that people should realise that ‘Travellers are citizens too.’ Moreover, he argues that the issue of racism can be tackled principally through the abolition of the segregation policy. According to Irish Interviewee Three, the National Quality Standards Framework needs to include minority groups in its policy framework: ‘There is an acknowledgement of how Ireland has changed. It never was a homogenous culture. Maybe visually it was, but less so now. It needs to respond positively to heterogeneity.’

Youth have also been affected by the influx of cultures, especially through the media. ‘Traditional’ Irish cultural values have become less dominant and have been replaced principally by American culture. As Irish Interviewee Four comments: ‘our young people share a lot of culture with the US, rather than Europe. They share more the rap culture, the dance, and the clothes of US than they would with a French, an Italian, or a Spanish kid.’ She elaborates on this point as follows: ‘They are influenced by the celebrity culture and they want to be a Cheryl Cole. They just want to be famous, regardless of how they would get there.’ Irish Interviewee Seven too contends that the youth are influenced by this ‘X factor’: ‘If you ask them ‘What do you want to be when you grow up? What do you want to be when you are older?’ The answer is ‘I
want to be famous – I want to be a celebrity.’” It is indisputable that this cultural shift is something new in Ireland.

7.2.3 Education, Employment and Health

Irish Interviewee Six’s observation is pertinent: ‘The value that young people place on education is very minimal because that does not come from their parents. …However, after the recession a lot of young people are taking more interest in education because they know that that’s the only way of moving forward.’ In his view, ‘…there is quite a number of young people who have not completed their schooling and the dropout rates are quite high. They consider education as laborious and repetitive.’ Irish Interviewee Three, however, argues that education is no guarantee that one will secure a job since “there are key issues on a functional level that probably affect young people’s possibilities.” Irish Interviewee Nine also contributes an important observation with regard to religious education:

Certainly in Ireland there isn’t the same strong religious education or schooling that every young person would have gotten years ago. Sometimes they were discussed randomly and it was out of fear and superstition than rationality. So I think young people have much more difficult time nowadays to pick their way through the choices that have to be made. There are more choices and temptations in today’s world. For example, there’s access to mass media and pornography through the Internet, unlike years ago when they were all restricted or unavailable.

Irish Interviewee Six, as an educationist, argues that it is essential to work with rather than work for the young because ‘learning is a two way process. I learn and they learn from me; they give me wisdom and I give them wisdom; and I share that with them for what it is worth.’ Irish Interviewee One contends that “what is important is that we give them their own space to develop and to grow. We don’t impose our views on to young people and that is where, for me, non-formal and informal education are very important – to give to young people that space of creativity and innovation, to allow them to be a young person and to encourage that.” Irish Interviewee Seven holds that the lives of young people are not as simple as in the past: “It’s just a bit more complicated. They are under a lot more pressure, be it the school, the points system, the educational side of things, or peer pressure, or the consumerist compulsions.” Irish
Interviewee Ten asserts that the present academic model does not suit the needs of the market and “there isn’t a future unless they go back to education and training and re-skill.”

Most of the interviewees agree that unemployment is a significant issue in Ireland today. Irish Interviewee One expresses the fear in the minds of the young people as follows: ‘…they are all fearful about where they are going to get their jobs from, their employment, which is all linked to their identity. Many young people will migrate to get a job because of the current job crisis.’ Referring to the economic boom and the recession, Irish Interviewee Five contends that growing up has changed dramatically for young people: ‘You have early school leavers who would have, in the last ten years or so, been able to get by because there was enough work out there and now they are definitely unemployed and unemployable.’ Irish Interviewee Seven refers to the need to up-skill young people. On the other hand, Irish Interviewee Nine contends that government policy, both in terms of education and jobs, should be geared towards getting people into employment, having turned them into ‘rounded people’, by giving them skills training as well as values education.

Almost all the interviewees observed that the health issues of young people are of serious concern in modern Irish society. Irish Interviewee Eleven holds that ‘at the moment, lack of faith in government and politicians because of the economic crisis, and worries and concerns about their own future have led to massive increase in teenage suicide, alcoholism and drug abuse.’ According to Irish Interviewee Four, ‘Peer pressure is huge. I think we totally underestimate it. Peer pressure drives them to alcoholism, sex, smoking, be out late, be a bit belligerent towards parents, be a racist and also to cyber-bully.’ Irish Interviewee Six lists depression and suicide as major mental health issues. For Irish Interviewee One, the availability of drugs both in urban and rural areas, peer pressure, underage sex and binge drinking are huge problems. Irish Interviewee Two charges consumerism as the reason for young people’s mental and physical health issues.

Irish Interviewee Eleven states that the major focus in the current environment should be around developing healthy lifestyles to tackle the mental-health issues of young people such as inclusion in sports, arts and drama, and seriously address
concerns about alcohol and drug abuse and also take measures to rectify young people’s disillusionment with society.

7.2.4 Technological Revolution

The surge in technological growth and its easy accessibility to the young have modified and defined the lifestyle of modern day youth in Ireland. According to Irish Interviewee Six, the sense of immediacy defines today’s young. As he remarks: “Probably today’s young people need greater access to television, social media, communication, and Internet than twenty years ago. Everything is instant now.” To some extent, Irish Interviewee Six argues that young people form ideas through and are fed by that one big machine, the Internet - Facebook, Foursquare, Myspace, Bebo, etc.

Referring to the changing nature of socialising, Irish Interviewee Four holds that “so much can happen in cyberspace now and it’s very hard for parents to become aware of what’s happening.” Unlike the earlier generation where socialising happened mainly through face-to-face interactions, Irish Interviewee Four holds that the present generation is able to connect with anyone in any part of the world instantly through the Internet. Irish Interviewee Two argues that the pastimes of young people have become very sedentary with young people spending significant periods of time on the computer, Xboxes or IPads. They seem to prefer these virtual worlds to the real world. For them, ‘you are nobody if you don’t have 1000 friends on Facebook’ and that, in his view, is a kind of dilution of friendship.

Irish Interviewee One holds that the young live in a globalised environment. They are very aware of the wider world around them. Irish Interviewee Five holds that “there seems to be limitless choices but not very many signposts about how you choose among those choices and the young people today live with constant media presence in a way that we didn’t.” Irish Interviewee Eleven, however, is wary of misinformation given the level of access the youth have to different websites. On a positive note, Irish Interviewee Three holds that technology is used to give voice to the youth: ‘…people have a forum or platform to voice their opinions.’
7.3 Interests

7.3.1 Youth Movements and Volunteering Impact

Youth movements played an important role in nation-building in Ireland. The interviewees, while acknowledging the power of youth, assert that in modern Ireland their contribution is largely lacking. According to Irish Interviewee One, youth movements helped to awaken otherwise dormant politicians to critical issues, especially in the sixties and eighties. As he writes: ‘If young people become restless, they will take on issues.’ Irish Interviewee Eight states: ‘Young people in the late sixties and late seventies were really anxious to become involved and to change the wider society. Almost every youth club had some social element in its programme. It is no longer the case. Students today march or they campaign mostly on issues of self-interest only. Generally speaking, young people live in a much smaller world, the world of their own immediate friends or associations.’ Referring to volunteerism, he contends: ‘Generally speaking, with volunteers now, it is difficult to get younger people and those who tend to do so seek great media coverage.’

Irish Interviewee Four, however, holds that ‘we still have a very good volunteer base…. There will always be volunteers because the local community wants their young people trained as volunteers or leaders. So, it is healthy. Some parts of the city are so deprived and disadvantaged that you would find it very hard to get volunteers.’ Irish Interviewee Eleven echoes this thought:

obviously, vast majority of youth work is still provided purely and completely on a voluntary basis. Now there are some professional youth workers in some organisations whose job is to train and support their volunteers. …in the vast majority of communities in the Republic of Ireland, youth work is completely offered on a voluntary basis.

7.3.2 Political Parties

Political parties and politicians exert significant influence in the area of policy making. The majority of the interviewees were sceptical about the true intentions of politicians and they also referred to their ignorance on many youth-related issues. As
Irish Interviewee Six comments: “I don’t think the politicians have an understanding of young people growing. Their understanding of a young person’s development and maturity can be very lacking. […] If we look at the age of our politicians, their age bracket is fifty to sixty years. Therefore they do not connect with and understand the issues that affect young people.” Irish Interviewee One charges that political parties are concerned to get young people involved to safeguard their own survival while Irish Interviewee Eleven laments the fact that there is no political will to implement effective youth policies.

Irish Interviewee Ten holds that policy makers, politicians and the media only look for success stories among the youth instead of addressing their real issues and urgent needs. Policy making is motivated not out of any philosophical commitment but rather for the sake of securing a political advantage. Irish Interviewee Two also agrees with this view: “There are key parts of the country that don’t have any provision for their young people and therefore they say, ‘We’ll resolve it by lobbying for our local TD who wants to make sure that he or she is elected, so that they will get us a youth centre or a youth information centre or a bit more money.’”

7.3.3 The Voluntary Sector

Voluntary organisations such as the churches and NGOs have played a prominent role in policy making and implementation. According to Irish Interviewee Eight, ‘Youth service in Ireland, for many years, was totally dependent on voluntary effort. It had a negative impact in the sense that the government did not look seriously at their responsibility to provide youth service.’ Irish Interviewee Eleven holds that the government has a fear, a concern, and a worry about the whole partnership concept because NGOs consistently raise issues of critical importance for the nation. As he remarks:

the present policy change and what we are lobbying for at the moment is a change in the constitution is to give children direct rights. They have them at the moment as a member of the family but they don’t have individual rights. So, we are looking for a change, to have a children’s referendum that will give children the right under the constitution to have access to good quality medical care, education and a safe and a loving environment.
According to Irish Interviewee Four, ‘All NGOs in the national youth council (NYCI) interact with the government and they seem to get what they want.’ Irish Interviewee Seven too feels that NYCI’s relationship with government is good. It ‘does a lot of work on the advocacy and policy side of things.’ Furthermore, he argues that NGOs ‘really have been the provider of these direct services to young people on the ground for years.’ Irish Interviewee One, however, opines that the relationship between the state and voluntary organisations is based on funding: “It’s the funding and that’s where the problem is. I think some try to look at how they can influence policy and issues facing young people. But a vast majority of youth work organisation’s relationship with government is based on funding and that has to change.” Irish Interviewee Two adds another dimension to this debate: “I do think there’s been a very strong culture of competition between various providers in Ireland and a lot of that has to do with how organisations were funded. So, it created a lot of competition for quite a small pool of resources.”

Irish Interviewee Eight refers to the changing relationships between different voluntary youth work organisations, including expansions and mergers or ‘takeovers’: ‘In the sixties, there was a takeover…The National Federation of Youth Clubs became the National Youth Federation and later Youth Work Ireland. There are obviously a lot more personnel but the whole thing has become a lot more bureaucratic. It hasn’t impacted the level of youth service.’ He argues that the whole bureaucratic tier does not necessarily promote youth work at ground level.

Referring to the training of youth-work personnel within the voluntary sector, Irish Interviewee Eight recalls how during the mid-sixties, ‘six Roman Catholic Bishops sent priests to be professionally trained as youth workers in the UK. […] When they came back, they were appointed as youth directors and they stimulated the development of youth in those regions.’ Irish Interviewee Seven stresses the need for volunteers to be trained in youth work because they may not be professional youth workers. Talking about his own experience as a voluntary youth worker, Irish Interviewee Nine agrees with Irish Interviewee Seven: ‘We realised that we were doing this voluntarily but we needed to be trained in those skills. So we enrolled into courses to be qualified.’ Irish Interviewee Six refers to his experience of the clash between voluntary youth workers and paid professionals:
My experience of working with voluntary organisations *Macra na Feirme* is that sometimes the volunteers can pull back and leave a lot of work to the paid professionals. They say, ‘Well, you can do that, you’re being paid for that’. We need to work out a system here. In some organisations, the greatest thing is learning by doing and if they don’t do it, then they are not building their skills. I don’t do it for them as a paid professional but they need to do it for themselves and if they don’t do it, then the organisation they are working for is the lesser for it.

7.4 Institutions

7.4.1 Gaps in Youth Policy, Provision and Practice

The observations of the interviewees on policy making and implementation are quite interesting. Many raised the issue of the gap that exists between these two processes. Irish Interviewee Six makes an important point regarding elected representatives: ‘They can formulate policies but who is going to implement them and then the problem arises who is going to say what needs to be implemented.’ Irish Interviewee One agrees with this observation: “Youth policy in Ireland is very good on paper but we don’t like implementing it in the same way.” Irish Interviewee Seven holds that there is insufficient link between VECs and voluntary organisations: “Organisations like ours work directly with young people and are not linked to the VECs or the Youth Officers, and so the Youth Officers don’t actually get a clear sense of what is going on at the ground level.” Irish Interviewee Eleven, however, argues that ‘most of the gaps between policy and provision are the failure to fully implement the Youth Work Act and the failure to fully implement the National Youth Work Development plan. And that has been due to two things – one, finance; and the other, the sheer, utter slowness of the government departments to act on anything.’ For Irish Interviewee One, the reason for the gaps is that “youth work organisations are so focused on getting their funding that they don’t look at the needs of all young people.”

Irish Interviewee Two holds that ‘there was no strategy or no real commitment’ with regard to the implementation of youth policy. She is highly critical of such a scenario: “Ireland suffers from implementation disorder, not just in the youth field but in so many other fields where excellent policies have been developed but we can’t, don’t, and won’t implement them. There’s a massive gap.” Irish Interviewee Ten talks
of lack of coordination in youth work. Although the Youth Work Act proposed a VEC structure for coordination between organisations, it has not been implemented (as explained in an earlier chapter). He says, “Everybody who funds youth work follows their own plan and even if they have a plan, they don’t have a coherent strategy for one region or one community. The community also struggles to provide for itself, chasing whichever fund might be able to provide money to it.” He suggests that coordination between different departments like education, youth justice and youth work are necessary in order to pool together resources for better implementation of policies.

With regard to funding, Irish Interviewee Six holds that ‘in some cases, getting the money to do youth work has become more important than the work itself. So, sourcing funding has become nearly a full time job of most managers in youth work areas.’ According to Irish Interviewee Four, ‘the main thing is finance, at the moment, which influences policy.’ Stressing the need for inclusive youth work, Irish Interviewee Five poses a pertinent question: “youth work is done in terms of its focus on the marginalised or the disadvantaged youth and that’s where the funding is gone. But what about the good kids, don’t they also need to have access to youth work?” Irish Interviewee Eight observes, ‘There is a vast increase in funding now...but the number of young people who are reached out by the youth organisations or the youth programmes would not have increased from the sixties and the seventies when there was practically no funding available.’

Irish Interviewee Two makes an important observation as follows: ‘I do think that some of the major philanthropic foundations particularly Atlantic Philanthropy is extremely influential in relation to the children’s agenda and is likely to be influential in relation to the youth agenda.’

**7.4.2 Policy Structure**

According to Irish Interviewee Eleven, there has been significant progress in terms of youth policy development over the last ten years. As he remarks:

We had the Youth Work Act and then the amendment to the Act. Then we had the National Youth Work Development Plan and then a National Children’s Strategy, which meant that obviously the government was taking responsibility for youth work
and for youth activity. To oversee, they set up a group called the National Youth Work 
Advisory Council (NYWAC) which is made of sixteen representatives from voluntary 
youth work organisations and another [category within the] thirty three members who 
represent Vocation Educational Committees, education boards and representatives of 
different government departments.

Furthermore, Irish Interviewee Eleven reveals that the government showed its 
commitment by initially having a junior minister for young people and children and 
have recently allocated a full minister responsible for all services relating to young 
people and children. Irish Interviewee Ten appreciates the fact of having one integrated 
department for youth. Irish Interviewee Two, however, holds that this disengagement 
of the Department of Children and Youth Affairs from the Department of Education 
has both positive and negative ramifications: ‘I suppose the biggest negative is that 
structurally it has cut off the link between education and youth work.’ He, therefore, 
calls for holistic link between departments so that there may be greater synergies in the 
implementation of policies.

Irish Interviewee Four holds that the present structure gives a lot of importance 
to children and not the youth *per se*: ‘We have a new department called Ministry of 
Children and Youth affairs that is much focused on the younger child and the 
preschool and a lot of money is going into early years of programme and recreation.’ 
Irish Interviewee One explains how youth work is carried out through various service 
providers: “I suppose the National Youth Council of Ireland and the Children’s Rights 
Alliance bring together nearly all of the children and youth organisations in Ireland. 
But neither of them would call themselves as service providers. So, within youth work, 
there are bigger organisations like Youth Work Ireland, Foróige and CYC. There are 
also organisations from mental health backgrounds, the youth cafés, and the scouts and 
guides.” Irish Interviewee Five notes that there is a vacuum in the policy development 
process due to the lack of involvement of youth workers ‘on the ground’.

Irish Interviewee Three describes how the principle of subsidiarity is advocated 
by voluntary sector in youth work: ‘The principle of subsidiarity is something very 
prominent in Catholic Social Teaching. It is prominent in economics as well. I think 
that has really energised the voluntary sector and given it a mandate for what it can do. 
The Church was at the forefront of social care provision, education and health care. I
think the presence of this principle has created a vibrant and dynamic voluntary sector.’

7.4.3 State Interventions

The state plays the principal part in all policy making and implementation. Most of the interviewees expressed the view that the government is not doing enough with regard to young people. Irish Interviewee Six asserts that ‘they [the government] are struggling to deal with young people. They struggle to find the answers to issues that are being thrown up by them.’ Irish Interviewee Eleven, however, observes that the government has shown its interest and commitment by the youth work act and the NYWDP; and that VECs (now the Education and Training Boards) are much more about coordination and support than direct delivery.

Irish Interviewee Five refers to an important recent intervention by the Department of Children and Youth Affairs: ‘I am not sure exactly how much it has been thought out. Now, if you look at the [National] Quality Standards Framework, it has a very strong commitment. One of the overarching principles is to do with equality and diversity. But how that gets panned out I don’t know. It would be interesting to see over the next couple of years how that works out’. Irish Interviewee Ten has certain reservations as to how the National Quality Standards Framework is going to measure relationships and good practices that are evolved in youth work and that “they can’t be measured by ticking a range of boxes on a form.”

7.5 Ideas

7.5.1 Impact of Research

The present youth policy of Ireland is the product of the confluence of many studies, perceptions of various interest groups including youth, youth workers, scholars and politicians. They had and continue to have a lot of say in modifying, shaping, and formulating policies according to the changing times. Many of the interviewees refer to the Costello Report commissioned by the government and published in 1984 as having provided the base for future youth initiatives. Irish Interviewee Eight holds that reports such as the Costello report ‘were actually quite good. They were good in stating
objectives and highlighting weaknesses.’ While appreciating the Costello report for recognising young people as active citizens and agents in their own right, Irish Interviewee Five remarks ‘I think that the current policy stuff really focuses on young people’s personal and social development and omits reference to them as citizens and the political dimension of being a human being, being a citizen.’

Irish Interviewee Eleven holds that child abuse reports in Ireland is a good example of how research and analysis can influence policy changes. As he remarks:

It arises out of a range of reports over the last ten years dealing with a whole range of scandals, some church based, some school based, some sports organisation based and then about the failure of systems to deal with that. So there probably have been at this stage five or six very significant reports, all of which highlighted the failure of the state protection services, either through incompetence, negligence or organisations not being prepared to work together…obviously there’s huge emphasis to make sure that the child protection piece is given a primary focus.

Irish Interviewee Two also holds that in the development of new youth policy framework, there is a big emphasis by the department of children and youth affairs on what the evidence is saying or on what the research is saying. As he comments:

The most recent research we did was on young people and unemployment and we then used that to lobby political parties. We have managed to get our research and the recommendations into some of the policy documents. One of the things we were looking at was the need for the government to put something in place to bridge the gap between young people leaving university and not being able to make it into the world of work and that they had a risk of being deskilled. So, they have established an internship scheme called Jobsbridge. We have some significant concerns about it. But still they have put together a kind of strategic advisory group for it. And NYCI is represented in that group. Therefore, for us the purpose of doing research is so that we have a very sound foundation on which we can then move forward on trying to lobby government policies on a wide range of issues. The other area where we have done research is in relation to young people and alcohol and the influence of advertising in terms of how it influences their attitudes and behaviours. We then have used that to try and move government policy in relation to advertising alcohol. That is a significant uphill struggle because the drinks industry has huge influence on government policy here.
In an important contribution to the debate, Irish Interviewee One asserts that ‘the implementation challenge is huge for Ireland. On paper, I can give you lots of reports to show you how wonderful we are but sadly they don’t translate into action.’ Irish Interviewee Four holds that rather than just having research projects it is important to have statistical comparative studies across cities. That way, we would have detailed reviews of individual projects. As she writes: ‘We would know what is happening with the young people and hear from them about what they think of policy implementations. If we do this three or four times every year, we can be very effective with the help of these comparisons and statistics.’

7.5.2 Perceptions of Media, Politicians and Society on Youth

Almost all of the interviewees agree that the media presents the young very negatively as socially disruptive, out of control. As Irish Interviewee Nine put it the media ‘stereotype them as problems.’ According to Irish Interviewee Eight, members of the media ‘pay lip service to young people being the future and all that’, while also presenting rather negative attitudes towards young people. Irish Interviewee Six holds that “media usually brings young people under special interest group and they target a lot of educational stuff towards them. There’s a lot of tokenism in the media towards young people and the national media steer clear of them unless they achieve something. After that the local media try to promote something for a locality.” Irish Interviewee Seven holds a similar view: ‘The media highlights the positives of the well-educated and successful young people. But the general tendency is to pigeon-hole them with negative attributes – young people causing trouble, hanging around, disaffected youth, alcohol problems, underage drinking, etc.’ Irish Interviewee One contends that young people are often stereotyped negatively and they portray youth or minors as offenders rather than celebrating all the good that they do.

Irish Interviewee Four accuses the media of creating a psychologically destructive portrayal of young women: “the perfect size six, being thin and blonde, heavy make-up and mascara, and micro-clothing are presented as fad; and fitting into that must be real hard for a young woman, if she’s not very thin. That’s why a lot of girls smoke, drink a lot, dress provocatively and are very free with their bodies.”
The politicians too are seen as having a negative perception of the young. Irish Interviewee Six says, “Politicians perceive young people not really as being important. Unless the young person has voting rights and unless they do something to create a persona for them, they might be disadvantaged. Other than that they don’t really engage with young people and for politicians it is a good photo opportunity to be seen with the young and that’s it.”

The interviewees recognise many positive traits in young people. Irish Interviewee Six comments, ‘I think of a group of people who are very creative, vibrant, willing and able to do a lot more than people can actually realise.’ Irish Interviewee Three visualises ‘a vibrant group of young people with possibilities, aspirations, and ambitions.’ He contends that ‘if people are honest with themselves, they can see young people as positive contributors to society and as active citizens.’ Irish Interviewee Nine holds that ‘the barriers to young people responding positively are usually external and beyond their control like lack of educational opportunities.’ Irish Interviewee Two can think of lots of positive things in terms of the energy and the talents of young people. As he remarks: ‘Obviously there are reducing opportunities particularly in relation to employment. I think they are seen very strongly as consumers and therefore lots of time, energy and money goes into targeting them and I think that’s very challenging for young people.’

Irish Interviewee Five holds that that the society’s views of young people are ‘very different depending on whether they are Irish born, white; whether they are immigrant young people; whether they are Travellers; or whether they are marginalised working class.’ Irish Interviewee Eight contends that young may be individualistic and pleasure seeking, but the society’s expectations on them are high. Irish Interviewee Nine argues that the society “tends to see them in a more superficial and possibly have a negative picture of young people as being lazy, and addicted to alcohol and drugs. May be that they are cheeky and that they don’t give people respect.” Irish Interviewee Six notes that the society considers young people as necessary evil and tolerates them and its understanding of a young person’s development and maturity is lacking.

Irish Interviewee Four alleges that the policy makers and the government like to control young people and have them in different boxes: “you’re in Montessori;
you’re in primary, post-primary, college, work; you’re in this and you’re in that; you’re involved in crime, you’re in jail; you’re in a diversion project; you’re in a probation project. Very much box, box, box and everyone has to fit into a box.” She adds, “I think that the young people of today are perceived by society as very spoiled, having lots of material possessions, and there’s a helplessness which comes from their spoiled nature. I think that the adults perceive the world the young live in as very unsafe and they want them to be protected and cosseted.” Irish Interviewee Six argues that in the wider society there is always an anxiety about young people that they are a risk.

7.5.3 Definition and Purpose of Youth Policy

Age bracket, according Irish Interviewee Six, is an important factor while trying to define and implement youth policies: ‘what age bracket do you want to cover; with the challenges, how far over the age bracket do you want to go. The organisation that you are actually going to be working with or for has a specific remit. Now, how flexible are the people involved in that, to actually go outside that remit and maybe bring in other stuff if it’s needed to help young people.’ Irish Interviewee Eleven looks at this matter rather differently: ‘the difficulty is that youth work looks at a cohort from the ages of ten to the age of twenty five. Whereas the children’s strategy only goes as far as the age of eighteen. So there is a complete overlap.’

The interviewees expressed varied views on the purpose of youth policy. According to Irish Interviewee Seven, the aim of youth policy is to encourage youth development. Irish interviewee Ten, however, presents a very different view:

I think youth policy has always been driven by an agenda of social control. I just think that the only reason that there would be interventions made, though it may be dressed up in a different language of equality and opportunity, is to balance the imbalance of structure. So, if you read particular policies, you will realise that they are about intervening in the lives of young people but not changing the circumstances – the structural circumstances in society that result in that inequality in the first place. So you present it as ‘I’m supporting young people to achieve their potential’, but actually what you’re doing is only changing the order. For example, if you go from the most privileged to the most under privileged and put them all in a queue the intervention
only changes the order of where individuals stand in the queue but it doesn’t change the fact that the queue exists.

Irish Interviewee Five presents an interesting opinion: ‘there is a move in government circles to see youth work as a way of targeting to reach young people. The whole language of targeting sounds managing a threat in lots of ways.’ She contends therefore that ‘something is potentially lost in youth policy, in terms of its potential to be a force of liberation for young people.’

7.5.4 Youth Empowerment and Participation

The interviewees analysed different efforts made by the government and voluntary organisations to empower youth and the challenges they encounter. Irish Interviewee Six notes: ‘I suppose one big challenge and issue is how you understand young people. I suppose the other is how you understand the culture of young people.’ Irish Interviewee Four talks of how NGOs try to make inroads in this regard: ‘We encourage them to be given space at the local level, be it in their club or their project and the focus is on them. We involve them in forming strategic plans and have them in focus groups, have their opinion and if we are doing anything we always make sure that their voice is heard.’ She adds: ‘To empower young people, you need to spend time with them. You are competing with TV screens and play stations. You have to make them feel valuable and make them feel listened to. I think time seems to be in short supply for us youth workers.’ Referring to youth participation initiatives, Irish Interviewee Four remarks:

We have Comhairle na nÓg and Dáil na nÓg.. We work with the city council to involve young people from youth projects. There is a bit of laziness in Ireland. For, when there is a youth parliament and you want to hear the voice of young people, the city council goes to schools, has an easy audience and takes members from there. What we have tried to do with the city council is to make sure that people who are in the youth projects and youth clubs get a chance to be involved. We do some of the facilitation.

Delving into youth development, Irish Interviewee One makes an important assertion: what is important is that we give them their own space to develop and to grow so that we don’t impose our views on young people and that is where, for me,
non-formal and informal education are very important – to give young people that
space for creativity and innovation, and to allow them to be a young person... I think
organisations are moving towards greater participation of young people in developing
their programmes and being part of that development, but we still have a long way to
go.

Irish Interviewee Seven too stresses the need for listening to young people in
order to empower them. He dislikes mere tokenism in empowerment:

There are programmes out there which basically work to empower young
people... You cannot have tokenistic empowerment. So, if you want a real
impact you need to ensure that you can provide continuous opportunities for
young people to be empowered and to feel empowered in their local area. What
I mean is, it’s not good enough to parachute in to do a programme to empower
young people and leave them in the exact same situation that they were in.

Irish Interviewee Ten is forthright in his condemnation of tokenism: Any influence that
policies have on young people have is fairly tokenistic and it has been so for years. The
voluntary organisations have become multi million pound service providers. I’m
excluding the likes of Scouts and Guides now, and I’m talking about organisations like
Foróige and Youth Work Ireland. Moreover, the government established the likes of
Dáil na nÓg and Comhairle na nÓg, the local and national structures to give voice to
young people. But the number of young people that participate is very minimal. Given
its electoral structure, only the clear, articulate and committed young people from the
middle class are the ones that get elected onto it. But if you go and look at their annual
plan or their report, it only talks about a very small number of young people who are
active at the local and national level vis-a-vis the population. The entire effort, for me,
is mere tokenism Furthermore, he adds an important point concerning projects for
young people:

Any experiment that I’ve been part of where young people were really given power,
they took it, went with it, and were delighted with it. If you look at an organisation like
Belong To, it has built its structure from the ground up on the concept of empowering
young people. It is one of the few organisations where young people really control, but
it is a rare entity. It was established from the outset for giving voice to a group of
young people who were made silent by the society. We need to replicate their idea of
empowerment, especially by the way they practice the running of their organisation. If we don’t do that, then asking the young people to be empowered to change society is nonsense. It’s mere tokenism.

Irish Interviewee Two, however, holds that “one of the biggest issues in relation to young people’s participation and their general empowerment is adults not wanting to let go of the power that they have.” Irish Interviewee Five makes an interesting observation:

There are already young people who have a lot of power and who are privileged and who are wired to succeed. You have look at young people who are part of the marginalised, the excluded – migrant, Traveller, or working class communities. It’s not just them individually that needs to be empowered because their whole communities and their whole identities are disempowering.

### 7.6 International Environment

Discussing the influences on Irish youth policy, Irish Interviewee Four notes that ‘the framework that we are implementing now is a mix from the States and from UK. Some of the frameworks that are being implemented are very similar to the UK and they had been adjusted by the pilot task group.’ Irish Interviewee Five refers to the post-colonial experience and holds that Irish youth work developed out of youth work in Britain. It equally had an ideological component and equally saw young people as people whose views could be shaped for the future. Irish Interviewee Eleven acknowledges the strength of the British influence: “I suppose the historical influence has meant that most of the legislative bases for the original Children’s Acts in Ireland were all passed by the British government. Our whole education system is based on the British system. Personally, I don’t think it is a great system.” Irish Interviewee Ten agrees that youth work was influenced by Britain: ‘I think it did indirectly, not particularly because we were a colonised country. A lot of social structure and our policies were historically modelled on Britain and even the health service idea came from the British model.’

Irish Interviewee Seven and Irish Interviewee Eight, however, hold a different view. Irish Interviewee Seven writes: “A lot of the British youth work is statutory. In Ireland, we have had a grassroots development of the voluntary youth sector and it
wasn’t government directed. Though there is a statutory framework in the form of VECs, it has been a bottom-up approach.” Irish Interviewee Eight articulates a similar position as follows: ‘In the UK, the state has primary responsibility for directly establishing youth services. Apart from Dublin, in Ireland, youth work was done indirectly through voluntary organisations. There are various structures that bring together different organisations.’

Taking a positive stand on the role of European-level cooperation in youth work, Irish Interviewee Eight states:

In the mid-seventies, the National Youth Federation in Ireland, the National Association of Youth Clubs in the UK and the National Association in Denmark came together to set up the European Confederation of Youth Clubs and also got a great deal of funding for study trips, exchange visits, etc. This international exposure had a very big impact in Ireland because people in Ireland realised that in Europe youth services were very well established, very readily funded by governments. Not only did it help the case that was being made here in Ireland for more funding, all sorts of creative ideas came from Europe and fed into the Irish scene.

Irish Interviewee One recognises the role of UN, the Council of Europe and the EU: ‘I think the UN commission for the rights of children and the UN Convention for the same have very much influenced organisations like the Children’s Rights Alliance. The Council of Europe has hugely influenced youth policy in Ireland.’

7.7 Policy Outcomes

Irish Interviewee Six lists five broad benefits which are the outcomes of youth policy implementations: ‘One, it gives them better sense of themselves; two, it impresses on the value of education; three, it helps other organisations address the issues that are facing young people; four, it makes them know that there are adults who understand and who care about what they are as young people; and five, it helps young people take their place in society and to actually reach their potential.’ Irish Interviewee Ten, however, takes a critical stance: ‘the impact of youth work on a social change level is fairly limited but the impact of youth work and the impact of workers on the lives of young people is very significant. Having been involved with different groups of young people for the last thirty years, treating them with respect,
listening to them, giving them the opportunity to influence and making that real and meaningful created long lasting impact on them.’

The key-informants gave insightful and critical responses to various aspects of Irish youth policy and its implementation. It is hoped that the presentation of their views under the “five I’s” may prove useful and enable a better interpretation and comparison of Irish and Indian youth policies.
Chapter Eight
Comparing and Contrasting Youth Policy in
Ireland and India

The overall aim of this thesis is to explore and compare the youth policies of Ireland and India through the lens of a particular set of parameters known as Gough’s “five I’s”: industrialisation, interests, institutions, ideas and international environment. The thesis examines how various factors and actors have influenced youth policies and compares them in order to achieve a better understanding of youth development in both countries. The thesis, on the basis of our findings and analysis, makes recommendations under each of Gough’s parameters.

In order to achieve the objectives of the research, the following key question was posed: ‘What are the similarities and differences between Irish and Indian youth policies and how can these be explained in a socio-scientific context?’ In order to address all aspects of this question, a number of sub-questions were identified under each of Gough’s five main dimensions. These guided both the documentary analysis of policy development and, slightly reworded as appropriate, the semi-structured interviews with key-informants in both countries. They are listed below in the form that was used for the interviews.

I. Industrialisation

1. What are the major issues and needs of contemporary young people in Ireland/India and how can these be properly addressed?

2. Comparing the youth of India/Ireland today with those of former times, what do you think are the distinct features? And how do they differ from the youth of other countries?

3. What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and the old in the present-day context?

4. Have the increasingly multicultural & multi-religious contexts played a role in shaping youth policy? If yes, in what way?

II. Interests

5. Who are the main service providers of young people?
6. Is there a pattern in the way in which services are provided locally, regionally and nationally?
7. What is your opinion on the relationship between the different partners in policy making? Where do the young people fit in?
8. What is the role of NGOs in youth work? How do you rate the collaboration between the government and the NGOs in the youth work sector?
9. Are there particular benefits from participating in youth work as compared with other services?

III. Institutions

10. What is your view of the current administrative structure for youth work & other youth services in India/Ireland?
11. What are the gaps in policy and provisions?
12. What are the issues and challenges in empowering young people, and implementing youth policy?

IV. Ideas

13. When you think of young people in India/Ireland what idea or issues come to your mind?
14. In what way do society, politicians and media perceive young people in Ireland/India?
15. What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind the government’s youth policy?
16. Do you think there are other factors that have shaped youth policy in India/Ireland? If so, can you name them?
17. Do young people have a share in formulating policy pertaining to them?

V. International Environment

18. Do you think history and politics have impacted on youth policy? If yes, in what ways? Does the historical link with Britain have any impact on youth policy?
19. In what ways have international institutions or organisations influenced policy-making?
The remainder of this chapter provides a synthesis and discussion of the key findings from the two main strands of the research, the empirical analysis and the interviews, as described in the previous four chapters.

8.1 Industrialisation

The contemporary world’s social terrain and cultural environment appear to have been defined and moulded by the major transformations involved in the process of industrialisation. All countries have experienced, either directly or indirectly, this phenomenon. It has changed the way the world looks, functions and evolves. Urbanisation, globalisation, liberalisation and social, political and economic reforms are all offshoots of this revolutionary process. India and Ireland are no exception. Having been colonised and ruled by Britain, the birthplace of industrialisation, both India and Ireland have been impacted to a large extent. The ripples are still being felt today. Industrialisation has changed their social, economic and cultural fabric. The governments, forced by these changes, have conceptualised, formulated and implemented many socio-economic policies for the welfare of different groups among their citizens. One such group, on whom industrialisation made a direct impact, is youth.

8.1.1 Economic Changes

In the 1990s, both India and Ireland went through an economic transition due to globalisation that had a direct bearing on the youth of both countries. The economic reforms of India and the economic boom in Ireland, also referred to as the ‘Celtic Tiger’, opened new avenues of employment and economic opportunities, especially, for the youth. The mood was upbeat and there were ‘promises of higher employment opportunities, a reduced poverty ratio, and higher national growth’ (Hambrock and Hauptmann-Socrates, 1999: 4). There were high influx of multinational companies and industries. In India, efforts were made to link ‘employment and education, giving them skill training and life skills’ because there were huge requirements for young qualified professionals (Indian Interviewee Two). In Ireland, many young people left school early to take up employment in the booming construction industry (Irish Interviewee Ten).
However, recession soon followed. Though Indian youth escaped the brunt of recession to some extent, young people in Ireland had to face the sudden loss of jobs and its consequences. In Ireland, recession created a slump in people’s confidence. There was a huge economic deficit and suddenly, Ireland was seen as a ‘disaster state’ (Irish Interviewee Eleven). Young people, especially, had to bear the brunt through reduction of opportunities in employment (Irish Interviewee Two). Unemployment reached its highest level since 1994 with more than 440,000 people or 14.5% of the labour force unemployed. Almost three quarters of them had never been out of work before. The largest increase in unemployment occurred among people who already had good qualifications and experience. The Irish Central Statistics Office reveals that between 2007 and 2010 there was a 300 percent rise in the number of people with a third-level educational qualification losing their jobs. Many of these people worked in the construction, manufacturing and retail sectors which have been hardest hit by the economic crisis. The current government (Fine Gael / Labour coalition) recently announced a jobs initiative which, amongst a range of measures is providing 6000 free higher education places with a view to up-skilling and reskilling unemployed people in order to support them to change career paths and give them a real chance of re-entering the workforce (Brady, 2011).

In India, the effects of recession were considerable. Youth employed in multinational companies and in the service sector experienced wage reductions or loss of jobs. The government tried to respond with certain positive measures. According to Tripathi (2003: 215-216), the global trend of insecurity in the field of private companies and in the service sector enabled the government to introduce policies to help young people to become entrepreneurs. Government policy also allowed national and private banks to become more entrepreneur-friendly which led the young educated professionals to start their own business or industry. Globalisation in the package of NEP enabled the young entrepreneurs to reach the international market with their products and services because of their being cheap and simultaneously world class.

Emigration is a common issue in both countries. It is often termed a ‘brain drain’ which means that the knowledgeable and the skilled leave their home country for better prospects. Indian Interviewee Eight holds that the reason for this factor is because youth today do not get suitable employment and even if they do so, they are not paid as much as in other countries. According to her, in India, there is a peculiar
phenomenon of ‘reverse brain drain’ wherein people who go abroad, return home to invest their money, experience, and knowledge. Kumar (2011: 243) identifies three distinctive phases in India with regard to emigration: ‘The first immediately after independence was mostly to the UK. The second, since the mid-1970s to the Gulf, was triggered by the oil boom and has continued with ebbs and flows. The third to USA in the 1990s was led by IT.’ Indian Interviewee Eight lists unemployment as the reason for this factor. This idea is echoed in the study done by the Levin Institute (2013: 1) entitled *Push Factors of Migration*: ‘In some countries, jobs simply do not exist for a great deal of the population. In other instances, the income gap between sending and receiving countries is great enough to warrant a move. India, for example, has recently experienced a surge in emigration due to a combination of these factors.’ It was noted in chapter 5 that Ireland is an increasingly popular destination for Indian emigrants, as is clear from the fact that the number of Indian people living in this country doubled between 2006 and 2011. Many of these are young children who will be in need of, and hopefully in receipt of, support from youth policy and youth services in the years ahead.

In Ireland, unemployment has been a major reason for forced migration. In the 1940s and 1950s, Kennedy states, there was a high rate of unemployment and emigration especially to England where there was great demand for Irish labour (Kennedy, 1987:8). In recent times, recession has forced Irish youth to emigrate to countries like Australia or Canada, concludes Irish Interviewee Ten. Moreover, environmental problems have also been a cause for migration from Ireland:

Environmental problems and natural disasters often cause the loss of money, homes, and jobs. In the middle of the 19th century, for example, Ireland experienced a famine never before seen in the country’s history. By late fall 1845, the main staple of the Irish diet, the potato, was practically wiped out. With the government not clear on how to respond, many people died of starvation. The famine killed hundreds of thousands and forced millions of Irish to flee. Between 1841 and 1851, the Irish population decreased by 1.6 million people, or approximately 17% of the total population, due to starvation and emigration (The Levin Institute, 2013: 2).

‘Youth bulge’ is an occurrence that can directly affect the ‘demographic dividend’ of economic growth due to which the workforce grows faster than the overall population (Hugo, 2005: 67). This dividend is common to India and Ireland for
diverse reasons. India does not seem to have fully exploited its demographic dividend or the youth bulge by providing adequate educational and skill development opportunities. As Indian Interviewee Six feels, the youth seem to be ‘neither educated nor healthy enough to exploit the demographic dividend.’ A study conducted under the aegis of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare concluded that the youth from several Indian states are not ‘educated enough for employment’ in order to be able to gain from the market demand. The findings also indicated that ‘most youth were neither adequately educated nor equipped with vocational skills’. ‘Just two in every five young men (40 percent) and one in every three young women (33 percent) had completed secondary education...(and) one in every 12 young men and one in four young women had never been to school at all in the country’ (Deccan Herald, 2013).

Ireland, like India also experienced a bulge and as in India, the Irish government, does not seem to have fully taken advantage of this factor by providing sustainable employment. Between 1971 and 1981, there was an unprecedented increase in population of 15.6 percent (Central Statistics Office, 1982) and the number of young people also increased with the number of people under 25 having reached 48 percent by 1981 (Central Statistics Office, 1984). Fahey and Gerald (1997: 98) explain the impact of the high-dependency ratio at that time. The mid-1980s experienced huge levels of economic dependency. A small workforce had to support a very large child population, a very large number of unemployed persons and a large elderly population. Lalor et al., (2007: 333) reveal that Ireland still has a relatively youthful population compared to other European countries and it is better placed to counter the challenges than many other countries. Ireland’s dependency ratio has been falling sharply since independence, as against the general European trend and continues to do into the twenty-first century (Economic and Social Research Institute, 1997 cited in Kiely, 1990b: 270). As discussed in chapter 4, the most recent census results show large increases in the number of young children (0-4) in Ireland, and it is likely that the number of second-level students will increase by more than one third in the next 10-15 years, adding to the ‘economic dividend’ but also placing greatly increased demands on youth services.

The rapid economic changes have redefined the value systems among youth and have created (at least potentially) a conflict between generations both in Ireland and India. They struggle between tradition and modernity. On the one side, there is
traditional way of living and thought in which they have been brought up and, on the
other hand, there is a temptation to adapt to emerging patterns of new values and
behaviour (Misra, 2003: 146). The Indian youth today live in a corrupt environment as
opposed to a ‘cleaner’ environment of the previous generation (Indian Interviewee
Eleven). The present Irish youth are much more confident and have much higher
expectations around lifestyles, and much more outward looking than the previous
generations (Irish Interviewee Eleven).

Urbanisation, an important consequence of industrialisation, has had a telling
effect on the traditional family systems and social structure. Even those parts of the
world that are not urbanised have accepted urban values (Irish Interviewee Nine). In
the 19th century, the traditional Irish social system was threatened by industrialisation
and migration to urban areas (Hurley, 1992: 13). Timothy Guinnane’s (1990: 447 –
449 cited in Powell et al., 2012: 13,16) analysis of census data of 1901 and 1911
reveals that young people in Ireland were left with a stark choice: ‘emigrate or marry
or migrate to the city’. Youth were considered as an ‘urban tribe’ and especially young
boys faced urban poverty and this situation motivated philanthropists to intervene to
set up boys’ social clubs, running or supporting mostly uniformed organisations. In
India too urbanisation is throwing up many challenges. Chowdhury (2012: 1), in her
article ‘Historic Urbanisation in India Means Big Changes for Youth, Family
Structure’ refers to this factor:

Researchers say that India is undergoing a historic urbanisation that will transform the
country economically, culturally, politically and environmentally. As a part of this
phenomenon, many young people are relocating to new cities for more education and
employment opportunities. Although they recognise the potential for growth, they also
say it is difficult to adjust to living away from their families and communities. The
government and other organisations are working to help the country adjust to this
urbanisation.

The Ministry of Urban Development launched the Jawaharlal Nehru National
Urban Renewal Mission at the end of 2005 to improve urban infrastructure, service
delivery mechanisms, community participation and accountability of parasitical
agencies to citizens. In its final year, the ‘National Urban Renewal Mission’ is the
government’s single largest initiative for planned development of cities and towns.
8.1.2 Socio-Structural Changes

Industrialisation and the related economic demands have had a major effect on family structures, roles of family members, as well as impacting on religions, culture and the class and caste systems. The interviewees reiterated how these changes have occurred at various levels within Irish society. Furthermore, class structure and the caste system have a very significant impact on the lives of young people in Ireland and India respectively. For example, Irish Interviewee Five holds that that the society’s views of young people are ‘very different depending on whether they are Irish born and white or immigrant young people; whether they are Travellers; or whether they are marginalised working class.’ In India for example, as Indian Interviewee One observes, ‘Youth are caught between caste and religion and they are discriminated against by others.’ A solution that he offers to counter this issue is social empowerment whereby social sanctions are done away with and the youth are given an opportunity to mingle freely with other caste groups. However, according to Indian Interviewee Two, empowerment is not possible when ‘someone is not on an equal plane’.

The fading agrarian lifestyles, changing structures within societies, power-shfits in families, confluence of cultures, and the rising inequalities are characteristic of both India and Ireland, despite their different stages and experiences of industrialisation. There are different but overlapping patterns of inequality in India and in Ireland. Almost all the interviewees refer to the rampant inequality that exists in Ireland and the need for economic as well as cultural integration. Irish Interviewee Five holds that ‘there will always be groups of young people who would be marginalised. Even during the Celtic tiger era, there were young people who were excluded from the fruits of that boom.’ Irish Interviewee Ten also notes that ‘during the Celtic Tiger period, the divide between the haves and the have-nots, that economic division and social inequality were actually compounded.’ This situation reflects the persistence of class inequality in Ireland. Other structural inequalities also persist, in spite of equality legislation (the Equal Status Acts 2000 to 2011 and the Equality Employment Acts 1998 to 2011) as well as related government policies in the areas of gender equality.
In India, in spite of gradual economic growth from the 1990s, persistent social and economic inequality persists up to the present due in part to the caste system and to poor and inadequate government planning and implementation of policy. Young people are most affected by these policy failures through lack of opportunities and employment. While the constitution assures the right to equality as a fundamental right (the Employment Discrimination Law), in reality this is often not the case as may be seen in India. The rich-poor divide is a cause for major concern among the youth in India. Indian Interviewee One observes that there are ‘unseen youth’ whose aspirations and struggles are never covered by the media and are not considered by policy makers and politicians. Economic inequality together with caste and religious discrimination have been detrimental to youth in the realisation of their true potential.

The youth of India and of Ireland have lost the ‘natural connection’ (Irish Interviewee One) because of ‘the need for migration to cities in search of employment’ and setting up of nuclear families. The traditional support of elders and parental control have been replaced by disconnection and independence. In India, Kingra (2005: 134) argues, the extended family system has given way to nuclear family and young people deprived of familial support are led to stress and abnormal behaviour. Tripathi (2003b: 215) refers to how the NEP and the reservation policy of the government helped more women to enter the world of work; this also helped young women to be liberated from the traditional joint family control of the elders and so become independent. In Ireland too, the profile of the ‘typical’ Irish family has been changing in recent years because of increased participation of women in the workforce, a falling birth rate, a fluctuating marriage rate, and an increase in separation and divorce (Lalor et al., 2007: 61). Kiely (1999: 257) states that a greater need for the policy intervention of the state is required in addressing different issues arising in the ‘modern family’. These include child welfare, the integration of work and family roles, family income support, regulation of adult relationships, and care by family members.

Another major change in the traditional family pattern is the recognition of LGBT communities. Though there is some recognition of their human and civil rights in Ireland and India, still a lot more needs to be done to ensure their social inclusion and remove the stigma that has been attached to an LGBT identity. Ireland seems to be faring better in this regard than India. For instance, the key-informants themselves did not even make a mention of LGBT while discussing changing family systems. In
modern Ireland, it is important to accept this group into mainstream society (Irish Interviewee Four and Irish Interviewee Ten). Crimmins (2011) states that though Irish society is now generally more accepting towards homosexuality; nonetheless, teachers and students who belong to LGBT experience fear and discrimination. There are many national organisations that continue to lobby for constitutional change and equal rights such as One Family, Treoir and Marriage Equality (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 29).

In Ireland recently, the Constitutional Convention voted positively for amending the Constitution to allow same-sex marriage by a 79% majority (MaCaughren and Parkes, 2013). Socio-economic changes have also brought about alterations in family patterns in India. For instance, the recent open protests for the rights of LGBT are indicative of changing attitudes in India (The Hindu, 2013b). In 2009, the Delhi High Court decriminalised adult consensual homosexual relations; this was seen as a landmark judgment for the Indian gay rights’ movements. By this, India becomes the 127th country to decriminalise homosexuality (Mitta and Singh, 2009). The draft NYP 2012 also has proposed, for the first time, various programmes for the LGBT community (NYP: 2012). But at the same time Amnesty International (2013) India mentioned that ‘in a recent ruling by India’s Supreme Court making consensual same-sex conduct between adults a criminal offence marks a black day for freedom in India’. The following is also noteworthy: ‘The Supreme Court today agreed to consider the plea for an open court hearing on curative petitions filed by gay rights activists against its verdict criminalising homosexuality’ (NDTV, 2014).

Multi-religious contexts define modern Ireland and India. In India, the general attitude towards religions is one of tolerance except for various right-wing fundamentalist groups that advocate exclusivism. Although certain sections of young people are influenced by these organisations, a vast majority evince respect and tolerance for other religions. Unlike Ireland, India has a long tradition of being a multi-religious society. The highly spiritual fabric of India was moulded by many religions. The youth do not discriminate on the basis of religions (Indian Interviewee Three) and they are willing to accept the differences (Indian Interviewee Four). Nayyar’s (2011) article ‘Anger and Hope’ based on the India Today magazines opinion poll conducted among the youth substantiates this view: ‘Young India is deeply religious. Eighty-six per cent of respondents believe in God. Seventy-six per cent pray every day. …The youth seem to be staunchly secular and non-discriminatory towards religions other
than their own - 90 per cent say that they have friends born to other religions.’ Irish society has long since been shaped by the teachings of the Catholic Church. Now, as Irish Interviewee Two shows, there is a huge shift away from the Church among the youth. Irish Interviewee Six also states that the Church’s contribution is dwindling and that Irish society is becoming secular. There are many faith-based organisations that work with the youth and youth work is no more the prerogative of the church alone. Even the government took steps to reduce the interventions of the Church in many policies. In the past the educational institutions managed by the Church have limited the choices of LGBT people and sometimes actively discriminated against them (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 22). Recently, the government has indicated its willingness to make constitutional change to allow for same sex marriage, as well as reduce the number of schools that fell under the Church’s remit (Crimmins, 2011).

Multi-cultural influence on the psyche of Indian and Irish youth is very significant. The youth in both countries are caught between the traditional and the modern and in the ensuing tension they define and practice their own culture, what is generally termed as ‘youth culture’. It is predominantly influenced by US culture. Though some may hold that this phenomenon has created respect and understanding towards different cultures, traditional forms of life and behaviour are mocked at times. In India, dilution of native culture has happened due to the influence of other cultures (Indian Interviewee One). Indian Interviewee Four, however, holds that the confluence of cultures has removed rigidity in the mind. While it is good to note that young people are not so narrow-minded as to be carried away by the monopoly of any one as the supreme, it is saddening, however, to note that youth culture ‘apes’ all that it considers modern rather than Western (Stanislaus, 2006: 16). Since it is necessary to preserve native culture and values, one of the objectives of Indian Youth Policy is to promote and instil in the young a respect for their culture (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012). The Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports has made efforts through its Exchange of Youth Delegations and International training programmes to promote the exchange of ideas, values and culture amongst the youth of different countries and also to develop international understanding (Government of India, 2012: 33).

Irish youth also faces a similar predicament. Though there is great respect for multiculturalism and a greater understanding (Irish Interviewee Six), they share a lot of cultural traits with the US, rather than with Europe and they are very much influenced
by the celebrity culture (Irish Interviewee Four). Furthermore, lifestyle choices and pressures drive young people earlier in their lives to embrace sexuality and relationships in a world where the solidity of the traditional family and community is under strain (Department of Education and Science, 2003: 3-3, as quoted in Powell et al., 2012: 5). The government has realised that the makeup of the youth population is much more culturally diverse than before and hence, there is a need to increase intercultural/multicultural aptitudes and awareness among young people (Department of Education and Science, 2003: 2-3, as quoted in Powell et al., 2012: 4).

Peer pressure is a trait of modern youth culture. It can be a conscious or unconscious influence on the youth. Young people are forced to behave, act and express themselves in a certain way, which may not be constructive and often times it could be self-destructive. This sort of peer pressure is common in India as well as in Ireland. In India, peer influence, at times, destroys the relationship between young people and parents (Indian Interviewee Eight). Parents generally shape the personality of their children in accordance with their own beliefs and traditions (Misra, 2003: 147). But today, non-family groups such as pubs, dancing, and singing clubs for teenagers and young people are becoming increasingly important, since it is within them that they have the opportunity to talk freely about their aspirations and anxieties, besides finding freedom of thought, expression and action in a relaxed atmosphere (Srivastava, 2003: 180-181). The draft NYP 2012 recognises both positive and negative peer pressure. Peer pressure plays a significant role in the lives of young people, especially adolescents. Positive peer pressure may exhort students for higher academic performance and towards excellence in other fields, such as arts and crafts and creativity (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012: 7). Negative peer pressure leads them to substance abuse and risky sexual behaviours (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012: 9, 15).

In Ireland, peer pressure is very significant and cannot be underestimated; it can lead the youth to alcoholism, sex, smoking, and other anti-social behaviours (Irish Interviewee Four). The report of the Department of Children and Youth Affairs entitled Teenage Mental Health: What helps and what hurts? - Report on the outcome of consultations with teenagers on mental health acknowledges both positive and negative peer influences. Young people are aware of the enormous impact of peer pressure. They consider the fact that it affects their lifestyle choices (such as drinking,
taking drugs, smoking and having sex) as having a very negative impact on their mental health. Other peer pressure issues are music, ‘mitching’ (truancy) and looking a certain way or dressing. Some young people felt that peer pressure can be positive - for example, ‘friends can give you encouragement to do something’ and ‘to try things you wouldn’t normally do’ (McEvoy, 2009: 26). Moreover, another report by the same Department titled *Life as a Child and Young Person in Ireland: A report of a National Consultation* reveals how young people dislike peer pressure: ‘Young people also dislike bullying and peer pressure. In particular, they dislike that bullying occurs, bullying for the person who is being bullied, that people make fun of others and that there is peer pressure on them to smoke, drink alcohol and dress in a certain way’ (Department of Children and Youth Affairs, 2012: 51).

**8.1.3 Education, Employment and Health**

Education is an important empowering factor for young people and for the economic development of a country. Not just education but employable education is required in the contemporary job market. When education is directed towards employment, then human resource becomes one of the powerful factors of economic development. India and Ireland have pledged to provide compulsory education to all children and youth through the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009 and the Education Welfare Act, 2000 respectively (and, in Ireland, through a constitutional requirement that children receive ‘a certain minimum education, moral, intellectual and social’). India woke up to this reality only as late as 2009. However, in both Ireland and India, there is a great need for skill training, up-skilling, and bridging the gap between education and employment. In India, the education system is focused on marks, exams and results. It should provide youth with skills and critical thinking to decide about their future and employment (Indian Interviewee Two). It is not enough to provide education, there should be a broadly based provision though which young people have easier access to information and skill training (Indian Interviewee Seven). Moreover, there is a gap between what is taught in the educational institutes and the needs of the market and it is necessary to provide good education with sound employable skills (Indian Interviewee Four). In doing so, the government should give priority to dropouts who are outside the educational system because they are among ‘the most exploited, underpaid, unskilled, and vulnerable’ (Indian Interviewee Five). The National Policy on Skill Development took
initiatives to empower individuals through improved skills, knowledge and qualifications to gain access to employment in an increasingly competitive global market (Planning Commission, 2009). This policy also aims to achieve by 2012, the skills needs of 500 million individuals with special attention to youth, women and school dropouts (International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010: 7). However, a lot remains to be done in assessing, meeting the target and providing skills-training. According to a study done by IMACS (2010: 4) entitled, The Skill Development Landscape in India and Implementing Quality Skills Training:

For the economy to grow at 8% to 9%, it is required that the secondary and tertiary sectors grow at 10% to 11%, assuming agriculture grows at 4%. In such a scenario, it is obvious that a large portion of the workforce would migrate from the primary sector (agriculture) to the secondary and tertiary sectors. However, the skill sets that are required in the manufacturing and service sectors are quite different from those in the agriculture sector. This implies that there is/will be a large skill gap when such a migration occurs, as evidenced by a shrinking employment in the agriculture sector. This scenario necessitates skill development in the workforce.

In Ireland too, the scenario does not seem to be any better. Education is no guarantee that young people will secure a job because there are key issues on a structural level that affect young people’s possibilities (Irish Interviewee Three). There is a need, therefore, for non-formal and informal education and to give young people the space for creativity and innovation and thus make them employable (Irish Interviewee One). There is a large number of people who have not completed their schooling and the dropout rates are quite high because they consider education as laborious and repetitive (Irish Interviewee Six). Irish Interviewee Five also points out that early school leavers have become unemployed and unemployable. Social Justice Ireland, while admitting that education can be an agent of social transformation and a powerful force in counteracting inequality and poverty, asserts that the present education system has had quite the opposite effect and it continues to facilitate the vicious cycle of disadvantage and social exclusion between generations. Government initiatives in this regard remain ineffective (Healy et al., 2012: 205). The present academic model does not suit the needs of the market and there is no future for young people unless they go back to education and training and re-skill accordingly (Irish Interviewee Ten). Therefore, like in India, there is a need for imparting employable skill during education. The government seems to be taking different initiatives to
tackle this problem. For instance, according to a document published by Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA, 2010: 16) of the European Commission: ‘As a standard practice, higher education institutions in Ireland engage with employers in the review and development of higher education programmes so as to ensure that programmes are relevant to the skills needs of enterprises. In addition, research and reports of the Expert Group on Future Skills Needs (EGFSN) provide an input to the development and reform of higher education courses.’

The holistic health of young people has become a challenge in contemporary highly-industrialised society. Governments are forced to address diverse issues arising from physical, mental, psychological, social and emotional health needs of young people. However, in India and to a certain degree in Ireland, government health policies have not really impacted the young people for want of concerted efforts. In India, the government does not seem to be doing enough to address these issues (Indian Interviewee Seven). Indian Interviewee Nine asserts that today’s youth are ‘more and more prone to crimes and they become addicted to drugs, alcohol, and substance abuse’. The success-driven society, she contends, has resulted in suicidal tendencies among youth. The growing issues related to the health of the young people required the government to initiate programmes that relate to youth nutrition and health (Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports, 2012). The National Health Policy of 1983 and other follow-on policies articulated India’s commitment to promoting and protecting the health and rights of adolescents and youth, including those relating to mental, and sexual and reproductive health (International Institute for Population Sciences, 2010:8). Indian Interviewee Six and Indian Interviewee Seven observe that there is a lack political will to implement health policies. The government itself accepts that it has had only limited success with regard health care for youth. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare in its report of the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-3) – 2005-06 entitled ‘A Youth Profile in India’ remarks:

To fully exploit the demographic dividend, India’s youth need to be healthy, educated, forward-looking, and skilled. Instead, the report finds that significant proportions of youth have little education, many are still illiterate, and many are burdened with responsibilities. Female youth and rural youth are particularly disadvantaged with respect to education. Thus, the preparation of youth for the challenges of nation building is very limited....If youth are to become a national asset, it is urgent that their unique need for education and reproductive and other health information and resources
be met. This report finds only limited progress toward this goal (Parasuraman et al., 2009: ix, x).

The health issues of young people are of serious concern in contemporary Ireland. There is a massive increase in teenage suicide, alcoholism and drug abuse because of the economic crisis, and worries and concerns about their own future (Irish Interviewee Eleven). Depression and suicide are major mental health issues (Irish Interviewee Six). The rising health issues of young people, both mental and physical, are of serious concern and constitute a challenge to the government (Lalor et al., 2007: 153). According to the mental health report entitled Changing the Future: Experiencing Adolescents in Contemporary Ireland (UNICEF, 2011), ‘1 in 2 young Irish people report that they have suffered from depression in the past, a further 1 in 4 report that they have felt suicidal, 1 in 5 report that they have self-harmed, and more than 1 in 10 report that they have suffered from Anorexia or Bulimia. ….. When we asked young people if they were receiving any help to address their concerns, the overwhelming majority reported that they were not. The fact that 82% of young people who were still experiencing the problem also reported that they were not receiving any help, professional or otherwise, is of significant concern (UNICEF, 2011: 7, 15)’. The major focus, therefore, should be to develop healthy lifestyles to tackle the mental-health issues of young people like inclusion in sports, arts and drama, and to take measures to rectify young people’s disillusionment with society (Irish Interviewee Eleven).

8.1.4 Technological Revolution

The technological revolution is very characteristic of the modern age and that section of society which has been most directly influenced and defined by it is the youth. It has changed social interactions and relationships. Significantly, it has swiftly broadened the gap between generations. In India, technological advancement has resulted in a generation gap between the youth and the elders and the youth seem to have their own set of values and they are ‘far ahead of their times’ (Indian Interviewee Eight). Srivastava (2003: 183) calls the new generation of consumer kids as a lucky generation which has not seen any real hardship except on television.
In Ireland also there are suggestions of a generation gap between the young and the old. Moving away from home in search of employment, the youth become independent and from the point of view of some adults they seem to ‘lose their respect and understanding for older people’ (Irish Interviewee Two). The generation gap has widened with technological advancement. As Riegel (2013: 1) remarks in his article, “‘Technology gap’ is widening as older people shun interest”, “a ‘technology gap’ has emerged between older people who shun the Internet and the younger generation, which has embraced it.” Irish Interviewee Five refers to how some youth projects try to bridge the perceived gap between the young and the old. Cunningham (2011: 81) in her article, ‘Intergenerational Solidarity and its Role in Shaping the Future’ in the book *Sharing Responsibility in Shaping the Future*, proposes that through intergenerational solidarity the gap between generations can be bridged. Younger people can learn from older people, from whom the values, experience and knowledge acquired through life can be passed on, while older people can benefit from young people’s recently acquired and continually-updated knowledge. Young people can also share their energy, vitality, commitment and optimism with the older generation.

Staying connected is the new mantra among youth. Social media forms a vital part of their lives. Internet users are growing day by day and it has also had a great impact on the lives of young people. In India, cybercrime and security risks are on the rise along with an increase in the number of users. *The Times of India* (2009 cited in Swamy, 2012: 563) states that ‘India will be the third largest Internet user base by 2013 - with China and the US taking the first two spots respectively.’ This phenomenon has brought in newer issues and problems that have to be tackled (Indian Interviewee Nine). The government, through the introduction of the Information Technology Act 2000, and later the Information Technology Amendment Act, 2008 has made efforts to safeguard citizens from crimes that arise from the electronic environment. For instance, in 2013, the government of India introduced a Central Monitoring System to scrutinise phone calls, text messages and social media conversations (Nandakumar and Srikant, 2013). Though the government has responded with various acts to create a safe Internet environment, a lot more remains to be done by enacting better laws. As Yadav and Quraishi (2011: 383) remark in their article ‘Emerging Platform for E-Crime: Issues of Social Networking Websites in India’ published in *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, ‘Indian laws governing electronic commerce and data security are not that complex; all that is
needed is effective enforcement of the same and to ensure that laws are more stringent and easy to act upon.'

In Ireland, the Internet usage among the youth is very high and therefore, lot of problems, crimes and risks are also on the rise. Contemporary Irish youth are defined by a ‘sense of immediacy’. They are being led by that one big machine – the Internet (Irish Interviewee Six). Irish Interviewee Four talks about the changing nature of socialising and points out how the youth are able to connect instantly with anyone around the world. The technological and electronic revolutions transformed the perceptions and experiences of the urban-rural divide and created common online communities and consumers (Lalor et al., 2007: 327). The Internet had a great impact on the everyday life of young people. The modern devices and Internet growth have changed the traditional notion of space, place and social interaction. The uses of television, Internet and other technologies have become mediums of leisure, social interaction, socialisation and relaxation, which are different from the traditional forms of interaction (Lalor et al., 2007: 221-222). Young people in Ireland are described as ‘digital natives’ and they live comfortably in the ‘virtual reality’ (Coyne and Donohoe, 2013: 252). Irish Interviewee Eleven, at the same time, is wary of the abundance of misinformation available on the Internet. Cyberbullying is a matter of serious concern in Ireland and, according to the findings of a new report released to mark Safer Internet Day 2013, is having a significant emotional impact on the young people of Ireland. The study, Cyberbullying among Irish 9-16 year olds, was written by researchers at the Dublin Institute of Technology and shows that over half of Irish young people who said they were cyberbullied confirmed that the online harassment seriously upset them. According to the statistics, some 26 per cent of 9-16 year olds said that cyberbullying made them ‘very upset’, while the same number of young people said they were ‘fairly upset’ by online bullying. A further 20 per cent said they were ‘upset’ by what they had been subjected to online. The government has responded with a new sets of action plans presented by Anti-Bullying Working Group to the Minister of Education and Skills (January, 2013) to control this sort of bullying.
8.2 Interests

Forms of self-expression like movements, protests, social service and volunteerism define every civilized, free, and open society. The youth can play a major role by involvement in such efforts and thereby to contribute to social reconstruction and nation-building. In modern India, youth involvement for a social cause is very minimal. Though Pinto (2012: 28) holds that “young people are actively involved in several protests asking for changes in many areas of the economy and polity, even the few protests that happened in recent times opposing the atrocities committed against the Tamils in Sri Lanka and the anti-rape protests in Delhi and Tamil Nadu respectively were ‘high on the emotional quotient’”. There were no persistent efforts taken to achieve the desired result. This sort of non-involvement could be partly due to the fact that the government of India enacted a kind of social control through diversionary measures. The Indian social and youth policies were influenced to the extent of bringing down the student unrest and revolts through various schemes including NCC, NSS, and Yuva Kendras as well as by increasing their participation in national development. According to the interviewees (Indian Interviewee Nine, Indian Interviewee One, and Indian Interviewee Two) too, the social involvement of youth is close to being nil at present.

In Ireland, as in India, though young people have in the past been very active in freedom movements and other political causes, their social involvement now is generally seen as ‘negligible’. Irish Interviewee Eight suggests that the modern-day youth in Ireland march or campaign mostly on issues of self-interest only and they seem to live in a smaller world comprising only their friends or associations. Of course this interpretation of young people’s political views and interests is subjective and open to debate. Volunteerism helps to develop altruism and a concern for society. Youth volunteerism is of paramount importance in any healthy society. Both in India and in Ireland, youth response to volunteerism is mixed. Indian Interviewee Five and Indian Interviewee Four assert that today’s Indian youth do not like to spend their time and money for a social cause and that there is a lack of volunteerism. Ahluwalia (2011: 1) through his study on ‘The Status of Volunteerism among Indian Youth’, however, suggests the following: “Volunteerism or tendering ones skills and time for altruism, usually for free, may seem to be a farfetched activity on their agenda. Although there aren’t sweeping figures which will make us believe that the allegation isn’t true, but
the passing years have shown an overall increase in the awareness and participation of the youth in the act of volunteering.” In Ireland, according to Irish Interviewee Eight, it is difficult to get young people to volunteer because even those who do so seek great media coverage. Irish Interviewee Four and Irish Interviewee Eleven, on the other hand, assert that there is still a very good volunteer base. The fact sheet about volunteering in Ireland presents a realistic picture: “Compared to other European countries, Ireland’s volunteering rate is average and its citizens’ membership of community and voluntary associations is above average; both rates are on the increase (Volunteering Ireland, 2005: 1).”

Political parties wield a lot of influence in policy making and their ideologies and interests are reflected and are used to shape policies. Depending on whether they are in power, their selfish interests promote or block formulation and implementation of policies. The key-informants in India and in Ireland assert that political parties influence policy making with vested interests and that they lack an awareness of youth problems and needs. According to Irish Interviewee One, safeguarding their own survival is the primary concern of political parties and Irish Interviewee Six argues that politicians lack an understanding of young people. Different political parties have taken different positions on the structures that should be put in place to support youth work. For instance, it has been suggested that the Fianna Fáil party has favoured a strong role for the VECs because of their dominant position on the VECs around the country since the VECs are structurally linked to the system of local government. But other parties that did not have this position have tried to abolish the VECs on several occasions (Devlin, 2008: 47) and in fact they have been recently merged into Education and Training Boards. In India too, political parties have strategic interests in youth and youth work and can target youth for their own immediate gains (Indian Interviewee Two). Their ideologies have influenced youth policies to a great extent. Each and every political party has its agenda and ideology based on which their programmes and policies are drafted (Van Gyampo, 2012: 138).

The voluntary sector and their affiliation or non-affiliation to government agencies hugely influence policy making. If through affiliation they are funded by the government, they practically have to follow the government line with regard to policy making. Whereas if they do not receive any funding, their influence on policy making is independent and it often reflects on findings based on research. This factor is
common to both Indian and Irish voluntary organisations. In India, however, there is a void through the non-existence of a forum for both NGOs and the government to come together (Indian Interviewee Seven). The National Policy on the Voluntary Sector (NPVS) is an initiative of the Indian government adopted in 2007 and is still in its infancy as it evolves into a new working relationship between the government and the voluntary sector without affecting the autonomy and identity of the voluntary organisations (Government of India, 2007: 1). In Ireland, on the contrary, there is the National Youth Council (NYCI) and its relationship with the government is good and it does a lot with regard to advocacy and policy side of things (Irish Interviewee Seven). More recently, the National Quality Standards Framework was set up to ensure ‘an improvement in good practice and better value for money and is assisting youth organisations and services in addressing the developmental needs of young people to an even greater extent and in a more cost effective manner (Department of Children and Youth Affairs, 2013: 1).’

8.3 Institutions

Implementation is of paramount importance in achieving the objectives of a policy. It needs a proper and well-organised institutional structure. If not, a gap would emerge and the entire policy making process would become futile. Both India and Ireland seem to be facing this impasse. Lack of an implementation plan and political seem to have jeopardised well-framed and carefully-articulated youth policies. According to Indian Interviewee Nine, a lot of good ideas are articulated in Indian youth policy, but the problem is translating them into action and making them reach the young. Almost all the Indian key-informants subscribe to this observation. Ireland too seems to be facing a similar issue. Irish youth policy, according to Irish Interviewee One, is good on paper. A problem emerges when one considers the question of implementation. Irish Interviewee Six adds another dimension to this problem as to who is going to say what needs to be implemented. Irish Interviewee Two forthrightly condemns the fact that there is ‘implementation deficit disorder’ in Ireland.

It is not possible for youth policy in any nation to achieve its goals unless it is supported by other policies. Since youth is an intermediate age group there is a greater need for coordination between policies: policies related to children, women, the
population policy, national policies governing education, health, child labour, employment, etc. (Saraswathi, 2008: 72). There is a strong need, therefore, for proper coordination mechanisms to be set up in order to achieve all of the youth policy objectives. The reason for such mechanisms seems to be similar in India and Ireland. In India, Indian Interviewee Six argues that the needs of youth are multi-sectorial and inter-sectorial because different programmes of different government ministries have some commitment to youth issues. There is a need, therefore, to involve NGOs and to develop methods to work in a cohesive manner. In Ireland, according to Irish Interviewee Ten, though there is VEC (now ETB) support for youth work – a similar structure is not present in India – that was first proposed by Youth Work Act 2001 and recently included in the Education and Training Boards Act 2013, there is nonetheless a lack of a coherent national strategy to coordinate between government departments as is the case in India. Every organisation seems to follow the diktat of the funding agent. Hence, NYPC (1984: 104; Devlin, 2004: 44) suggested that emphasis should be placed on co-ordination of all youth-related policy and provision in such a way that there is a context which facilitates regular planning for the future and review of performance and coordination of all services to youth.

Chasing funding by many youth-work organisations becomes a hurdle in proper policy implementation both in Ireland and India. Irish Interviewee Six refers to how sourcing funding has become more important than the work itself and has become a sort of full time job of most managers in youth work areas. For Irish Interviewee Four, finance is the main thing that influences policy. Devlin (2008:52 cited in O'hAodain, 2010: 62) agrees: “youth organisations have become involved in competing for funding that is available to support ‘work with young people’, which may not qualify as youth work in the strict sense, and which poses dilemmas for youth work organisations in their struggle ‘to maintain key principles’.” In India, according to Indian Interviewee Eleven, the availability of funding is a challenge to policy implementation. Indian Interviewee One suggests that NGOs are project-conscious and their services are defined by the type of funding available for a particular project. Indian Interviewee Two laments the absence of a proper budget coordinating mechanism.

With regard to the issue of having a separate ministry for youth, both India and Ireland seem to have similar problems. Allotting a separate ministry for youth would
show that the governments are serious about the welfare of youth and the implementation of youth policies. While in India youth affairs is coupled with sports (Indian Interviewee Two), Ireland has a full minister responsible for most services relating to young people and children (Irish Interviewee Eleven). However, some believe it would be better to have a separate minister (even junior minister) for youth affairs alone because the present structure gives primary importance to children in Ireland (Irish Interviewee Four) and to sports in India (Indian Interviewee Two). Nevertheless, the Constitution of India recognises the importance of investing in youth and through its broad Directive Principles of State Policy for the youth. These guarantee certain fundamental rights to them, whereby the youth are protected against all social, economic and political hazards (Chowdhry, 1988: 155).

Bureaucracy as a group of persons responsible for execution of policies has a significant impact on the implantation of a policy. In India, youth live in an environment of corrupt politicians and bureaucracy and this has resulted in the failure of state interventions. For instance, NYK, NSS, NCC, Scouts and Guides have failed to reach the rural youth (Indian Interviewee Eleven). An expansion of these agencies is required (Indian Interviewee Three) because nothing cohesive is done by them (Indian Interviewee Eight). In Ireland, after the government began to take a more active role in relation to youth work, there was a growth in personnel and services but the whole thing has become a lot more bureaucratic. This bureaucratic tier does not promote youth work at the ground level (Irish Interviewee Eight). The government has at some times shown interest and commitment, such as through the preparation of the Youth Work Act and the NYWDP, but neither of these was fully implemented (Irish Interviewee Eleven).

Mere tokenism on the part of the state in implementing youth policy is very evident in Ireland as well as in India. For instance in India, the NYK is busy all year around organising singing and dance competitions at the national level without creating any real impact on the youth (Indian Interviewee Seven). In Ireland, the Dáil na nÓg or the youth parliament is considered by many to be insufficiently representative of young people. The majority who really need to be heard are not given a chance to voice their opinions (Irish Interviewee Four).
With regard to training youth workers, Ireland is far ahead of India. There is only one national institute, Rajiv Gandhi National Institute of Youth development (RGNIYD) for the whole country to train personnel for youth work (Indian Interviewee Two). There is a need for more training centres (Indian Interviewee Eleven). In Ireland, in the mid-sixties, priests were sent by bishops to UK to be trained as youth directors (Irish Interviewee Eight). In the 1980s, the National University of Ireland, Maynooth started its professional youth workers’ training programme. Later, other universities including University College Cork also started similar programmes. Now, there is an increasing need for adequate training for volunteers as well as paid professional youth workers (Irish Interviewee Seven). The National Quality Standards Framework is a recent state intervention that is likely to have a significant long term impact on professionalism in youth work (Irish Interviewee Five).

8.4 Ideas

Every policy is a product of the emerging needs in a particular sector that is articulated through research, perceptions and opinions of various actors, and governmental pressures. The present youth policies of Ireland and India have been shaped by years of practical analysis and experience of the needs and issues faced by young people. Research or the lack thereof can have a major impact on the policy being framed. That is a major difference between the two countries under study. Indian youth policy, according to key-informants, still lacks proper research. Indian Interviewee Seven doubts that there is a correct analysis of youth needs while framing policies. He recommends an analysis of youth through organisations like NYK. Indian Interviewee Eleven calls for a census to have statistical information on the aspirations of youth. There is no real research done because there is no research funding from the ministry (Indian Interviewee One). However, there have been many independent studies undertaken by scholars. But these are not made available for other purposes such as policy making (Indian Interviewee Five). Expertise from the UN and the Commonwealth Youth Programme were fundamental in providing information towards the formulation of a National Youth Policy in India (Angel, 2005: 52). The government started RGNIYD to encourage research and evaluation studies on youth. This is a recent development and a lot more needs to be done on this front. Ireland, on the other hand, has moved further towards the development of research-informed youth policy. The Report entitled Development of Youth Work Services in Ireland
(1980) (the O'Sullivan Report) and the final report of the NYCP (1984), recognising
the importance of research, recommended undertaking research in the field of youth
services (NYCP, 1984: 120). The Costello report itself was based on a detailed
consideration of research findings. It is regarded as a landmark document in the
development of youth policy in Ireland. It recognised young people as active citizens
and agents in their own right (Irish Interviewee Five). One of the major positive
contributions of research is that the findings have been used as concrete evidence for
lobbying among political parties on issues like youth unemployment. The
recommendations have found their way into the policy documents (Irish Interviewee
Two).

Perceptions of important actors like the media, politicians and society do matter
a lot in framing policies. Any distorted perception can lead to formulation of defective
policy points. This is an important issue in Ireland and India. In India, the media
mostly concentrates on success stories of youth (Indian Interviewee Nine). The youth
who are not part of this success are, therefore, led to despair and stress. In extreme
case, suicide is considered an option (Indian Interviewee Eight). Everyone including
the politicians, the media and the society seem to have a negative perception of youth
(Indian Interviewee Two). Society derides the artificial show of prosperity and
dependency syndrome among youth (Indian Interviewee One). They are considered as
entities ‘to be taken care of’ (Indian Interviewee Two) and as destructive (Indian
Interviewee Ten). The social stigma of caste burdens the youth to a large extent. They
are discriminated by the society based on their caste affiliations (Indian Interviewee
One). A study titled Youth, Endogenous Discrimination, and Development Conundrum
in India by Arabsheibani et al., (2013: 17) makes the following observation with
regard to caste discrimination among youth: ‘Interestingly, our results indicate that the
effect of coefficients is higher among young cohort over time. From our results one
may also perceive that the relevant policy for SC/ST, which was designed to improve
social connectedness with privileged class, suggests that the government intervention
programmes has been less effective in the last two decades. The overall observed gap
has increased between HC and all social groups. Comparing the effect of
discrimination between young and old cohorts for the same social group, our result
indicates that the discrimination effects are fairly acute among young population over
time’.
Perceptions of media, politicians and society on youth in Ireland are similar to that of India. Media presents the youth rather negatively and stereotypes them as problems (Irish Interviewee Nine). Just like their Indian counterparts, the Irish media too highlight mostly success stories of young people and paint all others with negative attributes – as troublemakers, disaffected youth, and addicts (Irish Interviewee Seven). They also create a psychologically destructive portrayal of young women (Irish Interviewee Four). Vested interests of politicians force them to perceive youth only as vote-bank (Irish Interviewee Six). The policies and the government’s perspective on youth is that they are a section of the society which needs to be controlled (Irish Interviewee Four). Society’s perceptions of youth, according to the interviewees, are varied. Race is an important factor of judgement just like caste discrimination in India. Youth are discriminated based on whether they are Irish, immigrant, Traveller, or marginalised (Irish Interviewee Five). According to Walsh et al., (2012: 28), ‘Racism is a serious concern for many people from minority ethnic backgrounds. Evidence shows that incidents of racism are on the increase in Ireland. Racism has a major impact on the mental health, sense of identity, sense of self and wellbeing of young people from minority ethnic backgrounds. Take active steps to prevent and address racism at your organisation including the development of clear and visible rules, policies and disciplinary procedures.’ A means of countering racial and other forms of racial discrimination and inequality the Equal Status Acts 2000 and 2004 declare: ‘it is unlawful to discriminate against a person on the grounds of their race (ethnicity, skin colour or national origin), or religious belief, in the provision of goods and services, education, sports, access to public facilities and accommodation (Walsh et al., 2012: 1).’

Youth policies should be framed for the holistic development and empowerment of youth. They should be inclusive and non-discriminatory. They should address the needs and issues of all groups of youth. The purpose of Indian youth policy is to unite all sections and therefore it is necessary to have a common policy and not different policies for different sections of youth (Indian Interviewee Three). However, within this uniform policy we need priority groups such as tribal youth, rural youth, urban youth, female youth, etc. They need special attention (Indian Interviewee Two). The interviewees did not speak of LGBT youth. The government, in its new draft of youth policy, makes a special mention of LGBT and transgender. It speaks of how they are discriminated against and not accepted by the society. It, however, notes that now
there is some degree of acceptance, though certain degree of prejudice remains (Government of India, 2012: 10). This is a significant development in the area of youth work and policy in India. In India, the youth are considered as a problem (Indian Interviewee Seven). In Ireland, however, youth policy focuses on youth with a problem (Irish Interviewee Three). This difference in outlook has tremendous implications for policy making. However, the Irish youth policy seems to be driven by an agenda of social control and it does not correct the imbalance of structure and it never changes the fact that the queue of the most privileged to the most underprivileged exists (Irish Interviewee Ten). Moreover, the government seems to view youth work as targeting young people as if managing a threat (Irish Interviewee Five).

Age is another major issue in both Ireland and India. In Ireland, youth work takes care of the cohort from the ages of 10 to 25 and the children’s strategy goes as far as 18. This overlap of age groups in the category of children and youth causes much confusion in policy implementation (Irish Interviewee Eleven). In India, the intermediate age group of 14-15 were not attended to as the ministry of child development took care of children between 7 to 12 and the youth ministry dealt with the age group of 15 and upwards. So, the government intervened and lowered the age of youth to 13 (Indian Interviewee Seven). More recently, ‘While proposing change in the age-bracket that defines youth, the draft NYP aims at realigning the definition of youth in the country in keeping with definitions framed by the international bodies such as United Nations (15-24 years) and the Commonwealth (15- 29 years) (Joshi, 2013: 1).’ The upper age limit for youth in the draft NYP 2012 has been reduced to 30.

The youth policies of India and Ireland strike a common ground through Panchayat Raj (Self-governance) of India and the principle of subsidiarity in Ireland. There is a need for grass root level involvement in policy making and a statutory body like the village Panchayat should be involved in structuring and framing youth policy (Indian Interviewee One). The youth should be given a greater role at the Panchayat level (Indian Interviewee One and Indian Interviewee Five). Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, in his Address at the Chief Ministers’ Conference on Panchayati Raj on 29 June, 2007, stated that ‘the transfer of responsibilities should be on the basis of subsidiarity theory’. The ideology of Panchayat Raj is greatly influenced by the similar concept of Mahatma Gandhi’s ‘Village Swaraj’ and Pope Pius XI’s Encyclical ‘Quadragesimo Anno’ which advocated the principle of subsidiarity (Tharakan, 2007).
This is also reflected in the National Youth Policy draft 2012 which encourages and supports youth clubs at the village level to take active part in Panchayati Raj. In Ireland, the principle of subsidiarity is advocated by the voluntary sector. It has created a vibrant and dynamic voluntary sector. This principle is derived from Catholic Social Teaching (Irish Interviewee Three). This principle emphasised that the State should only have a secondary (‘subsidiary’) role in providing for people's care, welfare and education and the primary responsibility should be met by individuals themselves or by their families, communities and/or voluntary associations (Powell, 1992: 233; Devlin 2009: 368).

For a policy to be really effective, the involvement and participation of the beneficiaries is essential. In Ireland, NGOs try to involve the youth in forming strategic plans and have them in focus groups (Irish Interviewee Four). One of the principles of Youth Work Ireland, federal body of regional youth organisations, takes this stance: ‘Youth participation is at the core of good youth work. Good youth work is informed by young people deciding what they need and what they would like to take place. Youth organisations benefit from young people’s involvement; if the young people have involvement and have ownership, they will value the work of the organisation. Youth participation is necessary in order to keep young people engaged and to ensure that youth work is enjoyable (Seebach, 2010: 13).’ In India it is a sad fact that the youth are not part of the youth policy process (Indian Interviewee Seven). The State of the Urban Youth report, based on a 2009 UN-HABITAT survey of the determinants of youth inequality and deprivation reiterates this fact with regard to India: ‘In Mumbai, India, respondents to the survey say the national Youth Policy should be participatory and more programme-oriented so that each state and city can develop complementary plans (Cities Alliance, 2013: 1).’

One of the best ways for youth to voice their opinions and get directly involved in policy making is by entering politics and becoming members of parliament. ‘Since India is a country known for reservations, why not make some reservation for youth in parliament’ (Indian Interviewee Eleven). In Ireland, young people’s participation and general empowerment is curtailed because of adults not wanting to let go of the power that they have (Irish Interviewee Two). Dáil na nÓg is the ‘national youth parliament’ in Ireland. Even this is not representative of all young people as participants are mostly from the middle class. It is mere tokenism (Irish Interviewee Ten). The thematic report
of the study titled, *Youth participation, agency and social change* reiterates that in Ireland, ‘a frequent criticism of the national youth parliament is that it merely follows an agenda set by adults and is unrepresentative of the vast majority of young people (Loncle and Muniglia, 2008: 33).’ Furthermore, it declares that ‘enquiries made amongst young people in an informal manner on the streets revealed that school councils are not common and that the agenda for those councils that do exist is usually controlled by adults (teachers) and that certain topics are not open for debate and discussion. Areas suitable for discussion can be vague and ill-defined or are otherwise viewed as problematic aspects of youth culture (e.g. what can be done to limit drug use) (Loncle and Muniglia, 2008: 75).’

### 8.5 International Environment

Both India and Ireland have been shaped by the history of British colonisation. The influence of the British system in many aspects of governance and policy making is very evident. The key-informants from both countries agree that the British influence on the youth policies is significant. According to Indian Interviewee Four, the legal, educational and employment systems in India still have a residual imprint of colonisation. Irish Interviewee Eleven admits of similar influence in Ireland while saying that ‘most of the legislative bases for the original children’s acts in Ireland were all passed by the British government.’ Irish Interviewee Ten agrees that youth work was influenced by Britain: ‘I think it did indirectly, not particularly because we were a colonised country.’

The role of the UN in developing youth policy is quite noteworthy in Ireland and India. For instance, the UN convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC - Article 1) states that normally ‘a child means every human being below the age of 18 years’. Like many other countries, this is reflected in Ireland today, where the age of majority – the age when somebody becomes an adult – is normally eighteen. The UN Convention becomes law in those countries that ratified it. Ireland ratified the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1992, thus binding Ireland to its Articles on international law (Lalor et al. 2007: 8). After signing the UN convention, the following key initiatives taken include the following: the establishment of the Children's Rights Alliance in Ireland between 1993 and 1995, the National Children's Strategy in 2000, and the National Children's Office in 2001 to implement the strategy (Powell et al.,
The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child set out the rights of children and young people in all areas of their lives, and Ireland agreed to implement these rights when it signed the Convention (Kilkelly, 2007).

In India, according to Indian Interviewee Two, before 1985 the Indian society did not speak much about the young people but the announcement of the International Youth Year in 1985 by UN made the government to focus on the young. The announcement of International Youth Year in 1985 required a compelling effort from its member states. Thus, India established a Department of Youth Ministry in the Department of Human resource Development which paved a clear way for the Indian National Youth Policy. In the 1970s, in response to the international recommendations to promote and use youth resource, the Planning Commission took steps to evolve a holistic programme for youth as a separate segment, the student youth and the non-student youth. Similarly, rural youth and women also received recognition as distinct categories within the youth population that need exclusive attention (Saraswathi, 2008: 59). Indian Interviewee Five refers to how India being a signatory of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) helped focus on children, education, health and development.

Regional organisations of countries like EU, SAARC, the commonwealth, BRICS and ISO have influenced and shaped youth policies in India and Ireland. The emergence of Irish youth policy, like other aspects of policy and society, is also influenced by major international agencies. Powell et al., (2012: 218) state that Ireland was modernised and internationalised by joining the United Nations in 1955, the Council of Europe in 1948 and European Union in 1973.

The Indian key-informants like Indian Interviewee Eight, Indian Interviewee Six and Indian Interviewee One acknowledged the role of regional and international agencies like SAARC, UNFPA, UNICEF, the World Bank and the Commonwealth in influencing youth policy in India. The Commonwealth Secretariat was another forum which emphasised youth development through Commonwealth Youth Programme since 1974 and has helped the Commonwealth Governments in partnership with youth and civil society organisations (Commonwealth, 2008: iii). The Commonwealth Youth Programme provided consultation in revising the First National Youth Policy in 2003-
04 (Angel, 2005: 52). The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) was also fundamental in influencing the youth development initiatives in India. The SAARC Year of Youth was commemorated in 1994. As a result, SAARC Youth resolution was adopted with the aim to advance the overall development of youth in the region through SAARC Ministerial conference on youth, youth Camps and SAARC youth Awards. A Youth Volunteers’ Programme was initiated to enable volunteers from one country to render social work in other countries within the SAARC region (Saraswathi, 2008: 65; SAARC, 2013). The youth employability and increasing opportunities for employment are some of the emerging outcomes of the latest BRICS Summit in 2012 (BRICS, 2013). The ISO influenced industries in developing countries with standardisation and in turn has empowered the youth of the developing countries to realise the need for skill development through technical and professional education. The government also made efforts to create an opportunity for youth mobility to neighbouring countries through different international exchange programmes for promotion of durable world peace, brotherhood and general prosperity of mankind. One of the objectives of the new NYP 2012 is also to ‘help youth to develop an international perspective on issues of global significance and work for promoting international understanding and a just and non-discriminatory global order’ (Government of India, 2012: 6).
Conclusion

Young people are an integral part of society, a major resource and a key agent for social change, economic development and technological innovation. Their imagination, ideals, energies and vision are essential for the continuing development of the societies of which they are members. Youth workers, social scientists, educationists, policy makers and NGOs have an important role in enabling young people and creating an environment for active participation. There is a need to continue to create a space for all those who work with young people, and who take decisions affecting young people’s lives, to be more reflective in their approach and to challenge themselves to involve young people actively in all areas of social life. The formulation and implementation of integrated, cross-sectoral youth policies with a long-term vision developed in collaboration with young people is an indispensable, task for every country. Young people can only commit themselves to active participation and full integration in society when they find ‘enabling’ environments for the fulfilment of their civic potential and when their actual needs and conditions are taken into account (UNESCO, 1969: 35). It is hoped that this exploratory comparison of India and Ireland can help to throw some light on the ways in which youth policies have evolved in different contexts and on how they might best develop in the future.

This study has made use of Ian Gough’s “Five I’s” as a lens through which to analyse youth policy development in the two countries under consideration. This chapter summarises the main points of comparison and contrast under each of the five headings. Figures 9.1 and 9.2 present these points in more condensed form.
Figure 9.1: Factors shaping Irish youth policy

Industriationalisation: Late and rapid modernisation and urbanisation by European standards. Stagnation of 80s/early 90s followed by short-lived "Celtic Tiger" boom and then economic collapse, with young worst affected. Persistent inequalities. Among EU’s youngest populations

Interests: Strong tradition of religious involvement in youth movements; most political parties have "youth wings"; established voluntary youth work sector (with collective representation)

Institutions: Unitary state. Department of Children and Youth Affairs with responsibilities in child care & protection, youth justice, youth work (etc.). ETBs responsible for youth work coordination locally, but voluntary sector primary providers. Multiple "youth professionals".

Youth Policy Outputs: Separate education, health, justice, employment (etc.) policies
National Policy Framework for Children & Young People (2014)

International Environment: Administrative system still shows colonial legacy. Membership of EU (European Youth Strategy 2010-14, use of "OMC"), Council of Europe (impact on human rights) and UN (UNCRC influence on e.g. child/youth participation).

Figure 9.2: Factors shaping Indian youth policy


Interests: Political parties involved ("vested interests"). Many voluntary organisations but lack of cohesive voice/structure. Student movements influential on youth policy development.


Ideas: “Panchayat Raj” key to youth policy. Relatively recent focus on “youth” separately from childhood. Youth defined as aged 15-29 years. Major concern with health (HIV, nutrition). Equality guarantee in Constitution (but caste & gender inequality persists).

Youth Policy Outputs: Separate education, health, justice, employment (etc.) policies
National Youth Policy (2014)

International Environment: Administrative system still shows colonial legacy. Membership of Commonwealth (Commonwealth Youth Programme). UN (International Youth Year, UNCRC), SAARC ("Young volunteers" programme).
Industrialisation

Despite obvious differences of size, culture and location, it can be seen that India and Ireland have both undergone very significant economic transitions in recent decades. Ireland’s period of ‘modernisation’ is generally said to have decisively begun only in the late 1950s – later than most of western Europe - with an opening up of the economy to international investment and global trade. Implications for the education system and therefore for young people’s position in society followed immediately after, and along with economic trade came increased cultural exchange and a marked increase in diversity. When economic success finally arrived in the 1990s with the ‘Celtic Tiger’, young people acquired greatly enhanced opportunities in education, employment and leisure, but when that success proved to be short-lived and was followed by economic collapse, young people paid the highest price. As in previous recessions, the impact has been particularly severe on some young people. Clear patterns of class inequality remain and in some cases have worsened, while gender inequality also continues but has a more complex character (showing improvements for young women in some respects). Throughout recent decades, Ireland’s youth population was high by European standards: in the 1980s half of the population was under 25 and the country continues to have one of the youngest populations in the EU. In the event that economic success returns this may prove to be a ‘demographic dividend’, but one way or the other the link between economy and demography has been an important influence on Irish youth policy for several decades, and will continue to be.

The same is true of India, which has the largest youth population in the world. India embarked on a drive to modernise and industrialise after independence, but with a centrally planned economic model (partly Soviet inspired) and, like Ireland, a protectionist and isolationist approach for many decades. The move to an open economy in 1991 was akin to Ireland’s in 1958 and the consequences were similar in terms of a massive increase in the globalisation of Indian society, reflected among urban youth in particular. India is still very much in transition economically, as Ireland was some years ago, with more than half of all workers still employed in agriculture and related occupations but with the services sector already accounting for more than half of GDP (up from 15% in 1950) (Quandl, 2013). There have also been enormous developments in the Indian education system in line with the changes in economic
policy, and as in Ireland the place of the English language within the education system and in society more broadly has been key to attracting foreign capital. But while the vast majority of children of primary school age are enrolled in school, second level enrolment remains at less than 50% and progression to third level is about 20%. When we compare these figures with Ireland, which has more than 90% completing second level and almost 60% attending third level, it is clear how the structure of youth transitions remains different in the two countries. The differences are even greater when factors such as caste, gender, region and religion are taken into account. While child poverty remains a serious concern in Ireland, the extent and severity of child poverty in India is much greater, and child labour is also still widespread. All these matters are in turn reflected in the priorities identified within youth policies.

Interests

Given their shared historical link with the British Empire and their experience of colonisation, it is not surprising that in both India and Ireland nationalist ideas, and nationalist political movements, have had an impact on youth movements and youth policies. Major religious denominations have also been important interest groups in shaping debate about youth and responses to young people’s needs, although the religious diversity has been much more marked in India than in Ireland. In both cases too, religion and political ‘interests’ have frequently overlapped.

The voluntary or non-governmental ‘youth sector’ has been a key interest group, particularly in the field of youth work, and particularly in Ireland where the voluntary organisations come together under an umbrella body (National Youth Council of Ireland) that gained formal recognition as a representative voice for the sector under the Youth Work Act 2001 (religious and political organisations are among its members but there are many other generalist and specialist youth organisations). India also has a Committee of Youth Organisations (ICYO, with almost 400 members) but it does not have the formal recognition or role that NYCI does. This reflects the more general fact that the idea of ‘civil society’ is less well developed in India than in Ireland. The Indian National Youth Policy 2014 itself describes the non-governmental stakeholders in youth policy as ‘small and fragmented’ (Government of India, 2014: 16).
Institutions

An obvious difference between the two countries is that while India has a federal constitution with 28 states (each with its own government) and seven union territories, Ireland is a unitary state. This means there is much more variability within India in all areas of social policy and administration than there is in Ireland. Also because of the massive difference between the two countries in population and territory, there is a difference of scale in how all institutions operate. Therefore, while there is a national ministry responsible for youth in both countries, there is a difference in the extent to which its policies or plans might be expected to be implemented at local level. Also, while in the case of India youth affairs shares a ministry with sport, in Ireland there is now (since 2011) a full Department of Children and Youth Affairs overseen by a full cabinet minister and intended to integrate a wide range of policies and services for children and young people (early years; child care, protection and welfare; youth justice; educational welfare; family support; child and youth participation; youth work and others). This move towards integration can clearly be seen in the fact that the review and extension of the National Children’s Strategy has resulted in the first ever National Policy Framework for Children and Young People (Government of Ireland, 2014), designed not just to include the responsibilities of the DCYA but to apply on a ‘whole-of-government’ basis.

As stated earlier, a National Youth Policy has also been published in 2014 by the Indian Ministry for Youth Affairs and Sports, with five major objectives and eight priority areas. However it recognises that ‘keeping in mind the diversity of the country…each state should also enunciate its own State Youth Policy’ and it goes on to say that ‘consistent with the suggestion made in earlier Policy documents…[it] advocates the establishment of a coordinating mechanism at the Centre and state levels’ (Government of India, 2014: 76). The Irish Policy Framework, on the other hand, sets out such a coordinating mechanism from the outset. Whether the policy actions and objectives are pursued and implemented in practice, however, remains to be seen in both cases.

An important institutional difference is the role of the voluntary sector, already referred to above. Because of the history of the principle of subsidiarity in Irish social policy, which subsequently evolved into a ‘partnership’ approach (recently under
pressure) in a range of areas of social and economic policy, the non-governmental sector has always had a strong role in the Irish context. In the case of youth work this is enshrined in the legislation in the definition of voluntary organisations as the ‘primary providers’ of youth work, with the support of the state. The voluntary sector is much less institutionalised in youth policy and provision in India.

Finally, we have seen that youth work is more institutionalised in Ireland in another sense. It has professionalised much more than is the case in India, as reflected in the number of paid full-time jobs, the increasing number of education and training programmes at third level and the growing demand from employers that job applicants have a youth work qualification (although this is not a legal requirement). Furthermore, youth work is just one of a number of ‘youth professions’, or occupations concerned with young people for which staff have been professionally trained, which also include teachers, social workers and care workers, probation officers, adolescent health professionals and so on. India has not travelled so far along this road, which can be related to the point made earlier that ‘youth transitions’ (associated with mass participation in second-level and increasingly third-level education) have not as yet developed in India to the extent that they have in Ireland and elsewhere in Europe (although they are developing in that direction).

Ideas

The principle of subsidiarity has already been referred to above as a central principle of Irish social policy, drawing on Catholic social teaching. As discussed earlier in this thesis, the Indian principle of Panchayat Raj can usefully be related to that of subsidiarity, and it too can be seen to have been influenced by Pope Pius XI’s Encyclical ‘Quadragesimo Anno’ as well as Mahatma Ghandi’s ‘Village Swaraj’. In the 73rd Amendment to the Indian Constitution in 1992 the government made Panchayats (villages) the third tier of the political system after the two-tier system of India: the union government and the state governments (Singh and Goswami, 2010: 3). Prime Minister Mannohan Singh, in his Address at the Chief Ministers’ Conference on Panchayati Raj on 29 June, 2007, stated that ‘the transfer of responsibilities should be on the basis of subsidiarity theory’. Subsidiarity is therefore common to both countries, in the sense of the lower level being supported or ‘subsidised’, rather than supplanted, by the upper level. However the application has been different in each
case. In Ireland subsidiarity in practice meant that voluntary associations and organisations (often affiliated with one or other church) came to play an active part in social policy at both local and national level, and over time contributed to the development of civil society as a partner of government (although not necessarily an equal partner). In India the Panchayats have been, as stated above, a ‘third tier’ within the political system and it could be argued that this has limited their capacity to develop a strong partnership role (but this is a matter that requires further research).

Also at the level of ideas, there appears to be a difference in the extent to which ‘youth’ itself has been seen as worthy of separate attention from childhood and adulthood, and separate policy and provision. In Ireland such attention seems to go back further than in India (for example the first explicit statutory intervention in youth work or ‘youth welfare’ in Ireland dates from the 1940s). Again it is likely that is related to the different patterns and stages of social and economic development in the two countries. The cases of India and Ireland bear out the suggestion that youth as a subject of social and governmental intervention and ‘control’ is associated with processes of industrialisation, urbanisation and modernisation, and that historically as well as chronologically it follows childhood in this respect.

Other differences in the ideas associated with, and influencing, youth policy in India and Ireland reflect the realities of young people’s lives in the two countries. For example there is a more urgent emphasis in India on certain aspects of children’s and young people’s health (HIV, TB, nutrition). The fact that there are cultural similarities but also differences is reflected in the regular references to substance abuse in policy documents in both countries but far fewer references to alcohol abuse in India than in Ireland. The variability in definitions of ‘youth’ itself can be seen in the most recent policy documents (an upper age limit of 25 in the case of the Irish Policy Framework, of 29 in the Indian National Youth Policy, and this is down from 35 in the Indian policy of 2003). These differences are broadly in keeping with different approaches to, and definitions of, youth in the northern and southern hemispheres (Tyyskä, 2005).

Finally there are different approaches to equality in the two countries and this has a bearing on the situation of different groups of young people, and policies that impact on them. India has had an ‘equality guarantee’ in its Constitution since independence which includes ‘religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them’.
As the European Commission has observed, ‘while this is unique in covering caste, notably absent from this list are disability, sexual orientation and age’ (European Commission, 2012: 6). As already discussed in this thesis there have been conflicting legal decisions in India in recent years with regard to whether sexual orientation should be covered by the equality provisions. In Ireland, the constitutional provisions on equality are relatively non-specific (Article 40.1 says that ‘all citizens shall, as human persons, be held equal before the law’) but Equal Status legislation since 2000 has prohibited discrimination on nine grounds which include all the above mentioned categories except caste and place of birth. Significantly, however, its age ground does not apply to persons under 18. In any case, regardless of ‘ideas’ about equality in constitutional provisions, laws or policy documents, in practice inequalities continue to affect young people in both India and Ireland, in ways discussed above and returned to briefly below.

**International environment**

The fact that the political and administrative systems of both India and Ireland continue to display aspects of their colonial legacy is one way in which they have been influenced by the international context. In the case of India the link with the British Empire continues through its involvement in the Commonwealth of Nations, which has a very active youth programme. It is also part of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). The SAARC year of youth was commemorated in 1994. As a result, a youth resolution was adopted with the aim of advancing the overall development of youth in the region through the SAARC Ministerial conference on youth, youth camps and SAARC youth awards. A “youth volunteers’ programme” was initiated to enable exchange of volunteers within the SAARC region.

Earlier sections of this thesis indicated how Ireland’s membership of a number of international bodies has had an impact on social policy, including youth policy. The most significant current example is perhaps the European Union’s ‘youth strategy’, the Renewed Framework for Cooperation in the Youth Field 2010-2018 (Council of the European Union, 2009), which involves use of the ‘open method of coordination’ (OMC) to encourage EU member states to set common objectives and work progressively towards their achievement. Among other things this includes a ‘structured dialogue’ with young people, which the DCYA is now implementing. It is
also likely that the youth-specific measures implemented under the National Policy Framework for Children and Young People 2014-2020 will take account of the EU youth strategy. Separately, Ireland’s membership of the Council of Europe and the fact that it is subject to the rulings of the European Court of Human Rights has had an important impact on Irish policy and legislation in a range of areas, and on the lives of Irish people of all ages.

Finally, while they are associated with different regional groupings, both Ireland and India are members of the United Nations. This has made a difference in a range of aspects of policy and politics. As in the case of the Council of Europe, the human rights dimension has been a vital consequence of membership. Specifically, the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) are relevant in the current context and the inclusion of youth participation as a key policy objective in India and Ireland, including in the most recent major policy documents, is at least partly attributable to article 12 of the UNCRC. However it is also evident from this research that in practice too many young people in both countries have little or no opportunity to participate in making decisions that affect their life. Many are not even aware of those rights, or the policies and programmes available to them.

**Conclusion**

India and Ireland have important things in common. Their shared colonial experience means that there are significant constitutional, political and administrative similarities between the two countries. They have both experienced rapid social, economic and cultural change in a relatively short period of time, meaning that young people are coping with considerable volatility and instability in their lives, which calls for a range of responses in policy and practice. Ireland has travelled further along the road of ‘development’, but its relatively recent transformation from a primarily agrarian and rural society to an urban and (post) industrial one means that there is still a strong affinity between the two. India contains extraordinary contrasts between subsistence ways of life that have changed little in centuries and hi-tech ‘lifestyles’ in urban centres that are in the vanguard of cultural and economic globalisation (these contrasts are frequently the subject of popular entertainment in fiction and film). India has always been strikingly diverse; Ireland has never (or not for centuries) been entirely monocultural but the extent of diversity has increased enormously in recent
years. Both countries have persistent inequalities, India with a caste system that is notoriously rigid and with gender inequalities that have recently been manifested in ways that are so shocking that they have made headlines globally. Ireland, after years of slow economic growth or stagnation, had a ‘Celtic Tiger’ boom followed by a profound economic crisis but the nature and extent of socio-economic inequality has remained remarkably entrenched throughout. The discrimination experienced by Travellers appears at times as rigid as the caste system and recent experiences of Roma people in Ireland provides further evidence of deep-seated racism.

Youth work and youth policy have been concerned with addressing some of the most negative features and consequences of such inequalities. There are some strong similarities between the values and ideas that underpin youth policy (and other social policy) responses in the two countries. The role of the voluntary sector is key in both. This thesis has suggested that a fruitful comparison can be made between the principle of subsidiarity in Ireland and that of ‘Panchayati Raj’ in India, although the latter applies more within the sphere of government (as a ‘third tier’). This may be partly why in India there is less emphasis on the role of ‘civil society’ and no formally recognised forum for youth NGOs to come together whereas ‘social partnership’ has been central to Irish social policy since the 1980s (although it has recently been undermined). A crucial difference is that youth work in Ireland, despite the continuing contribution of very large numbers of volunteers, has professionalised to a much greater extent than in India and is one of a number of ‘youth professions’, although not yet perhaps recognised as an equal of the others. The situation regarding professionalisation is itself related to the different patterns of, and stages of, socio-economic development in the two countries as well as to cultural differences. Overall, this thesis suggests that these patterns, and the broader cultures in which they are located, both overlap and diverge in significant ways, and that young people, youth workers and youth policy makers in India and Ireland would have much to gain from further mutual exploration and collaboration.
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Appendix 1: Ireland & India Key-Informants Interview Questions

Key-informants Interview Questions

(The information gathered here is for research purposes only; the information you provide in this interview is anonymous and it will be held confidentially)

Title: Youth Policy in Ireland and India: A Comparative Study

Main Question: What are the similarities and differences between Irish & Indian youth policies and how can these be explained in a socio-scientific context?

1. Industrialisation

1. What are the major issues and needs of contemporary young people in Ireland/India and how can these be properly addressed?

2. Comparing the youth of India/Ireland today with those of former times, what do you think are the distinct features? And how do they differ from the youth of other countries?

3. What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and the old in the present-day context?

4. Have the increasingly multicultural & multi-religious contexts played a role in shaping youth policy? If yes, in what way?

2. Interests

5. Who are the main service providers of young people?

6. Is there a pattern in the way in which services are provided locally, regionally and nationally?

7. What is your opinion on the relationship between the different partners in policy making? Where do the young people fit in?

8. What is the role of NGOs in youth work? How do you rate the collaboration between the government and the NGOs in the Youth Work sector?

9. Are there particular benefits from participating in youth work as compared with other services?
3. Institutions

10. What is your view of the current administrative structure for youth work & other youth services in India/Ireland?
11. What are the gaps in policy and provisions?
12. What are the issues and challenges in empowering young people, and implementing youth policy?

4. Ideas

13. When you think of young people in India/Ireland what idea or issues come to your mind?
14. In what way do society, politicians and media perceive young people in Ireland/India?
15. What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind the government’s youth policy?
16. Do you think there are other factors that have shaped youth policy in India/Ireland? If so, can you name them?
17. Do young people have a share in formulating policy pertaining to them?

5. International Environment

18. Do you think history and politics have impacted on Youth Policy? If yes, in what ways? Does the historical link with Britain have any impact on youth policy?
19. In what ways has the International institution or organizations influenced policy-making?
Appendix 2: Key-Informants Consent Form

The Key-informants Consent Form

Full title of Project: Youth policy in Ireland and India: A comparative Study

Name, position and contact address of Researcher: Casimir Raj Motcham
NUIM-PhD research student, St.Catherine’s Centre, Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland

This part is filled in by the participant

Please initial the box

1. I confirm that I have read and have understood the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.

3. I agree to take part in the above study.

Please tick the box

4. I agree to the interview / focus group / consultation being audio recorded

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications

_________________________________________________________________________  ________________________________________________________________________  ________________________________________________________________________
Name of Participant                         Date                         Signature

_________________________________________________________________________  ________________________________________________________________________  ________________________________________________________________________
Name of Researcher                          Date                         Signature
Appendix 3: Letter from the Department of Applied Social Studies

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, MAYNOOTH
MAYNOOTH, CO. KILDARE, IRELAND
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MA NUAD, CO. CHILL DARA, ÉIRE

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED SOCIAL STUDIES
ROINN AN STÁIDÉIR MHÓRCHAILTA PHEIDHOMIGH

24th June, 2010
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Fr Casimir Raj Motchan

This is to state that Fr Casimir Raj Motchan is currently enrolled as a PhD student at NUI Maynooth, undertaking comparative research into youth policy in India and Ireland. He has previously completed the Postgraduate Diploma in Community and Youth Work and the MA in Applied Social Studies. He was awarded a Hume Scholarship for his doctoral studies.

Any assistance you can offer Casimir in facilitating the fieldwork for his dissertation, or providing access to information, documentation or support in other ways, will be very much appreciated. All respondents in the research project can be assured of confidentiality and anonymity.

If you require any further information or clarification please do not hesitate to contact me.

With thanks and best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr Maurice Devlin
Senior Lecturer and PhD supervisor

DEPARTMENT OF APPLIED SOCIAL STUDIES
NUI MAYNOOTH
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## Appendix 4: Phase 1 - Open Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Open Codes Developed</th>
<th>Code Definitions (Rules for Inclusion)</th>
<th>Interviews Coded</th>
<th>Units of Meaning Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence</td>
<td>Health Issues related to adolescence and the ministry that deals with that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Politicians</td>
<td>Age of the Politicians do influence youth policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social Behaviour</td>
<td>Reference to anti-social behaviour of youth because of mental health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism in the family changed</td>
<td>What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and the old in the present-day context?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Reference to the role of bureaucrats play in controlling the government</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Intervention</td>
<td>International influence on youth work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Reference to employability there is a need to build capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste &amp; Class System</td>
<td>Reference to the impact of colonisation and caste system itself</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity</td>
<td>What are the major issues and needs of contemporary young people in Ireland? How do you think they can be properly addressed?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Centralise Youth</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelize the youth energy</td>
<td>Youth energy to be channelised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasing the Funders</td>
<td>What is your view on the current administrative structure of youth work and other youth services in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Reports</td>
<td>Is this focus on child protection and safety because of the report and investigation recently done?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Voluntarism set back because of the state rules on child protection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Does child protection keep the adult far away from involving?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children seen &amp; not heard</td>
<td>How do you compare the young people of yesterday and today? What are the distinctive features of young people today?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>Influence of Religion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Thinking, Standardised &amp; Streamlines, Quality</td>
<td>What is your view of the current administrative structure for youth work &amp; other youth services in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonisation Impact</td>
<td>Reference to the question-What you think about the colonization of British has it got any impact in youth policy?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Interventions</td>
<td>International interventions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing for Fund</td>
<td>What is the role of NGOs in youth work? How do you rate the collaboration between the government and the NGOs in the youth work sector?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing mentality - No Choice</td>
<td>What is your view of the current administrative structure for youth work &amp; other youth services in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over youth declining</td>
<td>Reference to youth being controlled is changing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Mechanism</td>
<td>Need for linking different youth related department</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling need</td>
<td>There is a need for counselling among today’s youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals generated by adults</td>
<td>Reference to youth are good but they are made bad by adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Are there particular benefits from participating in this type of programme as compared with other services?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Education Model</td>
<td>What are the issues and challenges in empowering young people and implementing youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Differences</td>
<td>How do they differ from the youth of other countries?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Bullying</td>
<td>Participants view on youth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Dividend</td>
<td>Reference to the perception that the large number of youth contributes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominational Approach</td>
<td>Do you think history and politics have impacted on Youth Policy? If yes, in what way? Does historical link with Britain have any impact on youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth work</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Issues of youth today</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Service Providers</td>
<td>Is there a pattern in the way in which services are provided locally, regionally and nationally?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Reference to discrimination starts later in life not at when they are young</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Power</td>
<td>What are the issues and challenges in empowering young people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domesticating - Liberating</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose being government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>Youth today are influenced by drugs /alcohol</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Return from query on Economics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy controls youth</td>
<td>Do these youth issues reflect in the policy making?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Reference to Education as resource central to developing young people</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>Reference to government need to look into employability skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Reference to Issues to be addressed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>What are the major issues are needs to the young people today issues or needs of today’s young people?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education</td>
<td>Are there particular benefits from participating in this type of programme as compared with other services?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>Education is for those who are able to get it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Interventions</td>
<td>International interventions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation of Youth Agenda Factors</td>
<td>Reference: What are the factors that shaping the youth policy and what is the principle behind the youth policy?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaping Youth Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Reference to What you about the relationship between the young people and the old people?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Job</td>
<td>What are the major issues and needs of contemporary young people in Ireland? How do you think they can be properly addressed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgotten History</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Government and NGO’s Funding impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Project</td>
<td>Do you think there are also other factors that have shaped youth policy in Ireland? If so, can you name them?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation gap</td>
<td>Reference to modern day youth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical imbalance</td>
<td>What are the gaps in policy and provisions?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Opportunity-resources</td>
<td>How do you think these issues of youth can be addressed properly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give their Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global issues</td>
<td>What are the major issues and needs of contemporary young people in Ireland? How do you think they can be properly addressed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Recession</td>
<td>The globalisation today and the Western culture, has it in any way influenced young people and policies?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalisation Impact</td>
<td>Reference to the impact of globalisation and the views of the participants</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Reference to the issues to be addressed by the Government</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous to Heterogeneity Culture</td>
<td>Has the increasingly multi culture, multi-religious contexts played a role in shaping youth policy? If yes, in what way?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas can come from anyone</td>
<td>Participants view is that ideas are important more than where it comes from</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity is a major issue</td>
<td>For Today’s youth identity is another major issue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant about Youth Policy</td>
<td>Reference to youth policy participant point out that many are not aware of it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Recession</td>
<td>What are the major issues and needs of contemporary young people in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Youth Policy</td>
<td>Reference to participants speaking about the Indian youth policy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism-Independent</td>
<td>Youth today are ore independent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry impact</td>
<td>The demand of the open market enabled young people to equip themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral youth</td>
<td>Irish youth policy challenges of structural challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Agencies</td>
<td>Reference to the question does international agencies influence youth policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland Geographically on the Periphery Irish are Second class</td>
<td>In what way have the International institution or organizations influenced policy-making regarding young people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Youth are confident</td>
<td>Do you see a difference between young people here and in Europe? What are the differences?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Youth are different</td>
<td>Comparing the youth of Ireland today with those of yester-years, what do you think are the distinct features?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Youth Policy</td>
<td>And how do they differ from the youth of other countries?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Youth work Different from UK</td>
<td>About the Irish youth Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish youth work gives choice - marginalised</td>
<td>The link between Britain and Ireland?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Segregation</td>
<td>Irish youth work providers do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Youth today</td>
<td>Are these multi-cultural issues affecting the policy makers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues specific to Women</td>
<td>Reference to what are the major issues that affect young people according to you?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep them out of trouble</td>
<td>Reference to women sexual and reproductive health</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Budget</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Co-ordination</td>
<td>Reference to challenges in implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Faith in the government</td>
<td>Reference to duplication of programmes because of lack of coordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Resources</td>
<td>What are the major issues and needs of young people in Ireland today?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of respect - obedience to elders</td>
<td>Reference to the Indian Youth there is no sufficient resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Services</td>
<td>today’s youth lack respect and obedience to elders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of youth issues</td>
<td>Reference to Do you think we have sufficient centres, facilities available for the development of young people?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of young leaders</td>
<td>politicians other fail to understand the youth issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalization impact</td>
<td>Reference- What are the challenges that are faced?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skill Training</td>
<td>The industry standardised and the government opened the door to liberalization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Choices</td>
<td>Participants view that every youth should be give life skill training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the young</td>
<td>Participants view on Youth today</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>The need to listen to the young people is important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at Youth with wider lens</td>
<td>Reference to young people look for livelihood after completing their education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking lost</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materialistic</td>
<td>contains references that perception that some young people do not have opportunities and confidence like others and also geographical influences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Controls Youth</td>
<td>Today youth become more materialistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media impact</td>
<td>Comparing the youth of Ireland today with those of yester years what do you think are the distinct features?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Views on Youth</td>
<td>Because of Media youth are brought close to the Western culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Reference to how youth are viewed by media and presented</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>reference to the growing need for mental, psychological, physical needs of youth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>Reference to participants saying migration is changing now we talk of international</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and Engaging them</td>
<td>Need for separate ministry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Culture</td>
<td>What are the challenges in empowering the young people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Religion</td>
<td>Reference to how multi-culture impact youth and policy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Quality Standard Framework</td>
<td>Has the increasingly multi culture, multi-religious contexts played a role in shaping youth policy? If yes, in what way?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism - Voluntarism</td>
<td>What you think about voluntary organization involvement in this?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring country division</td>
<td>Reference to Pakistan division on youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Participants view is that need to network with other youth related agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs - Partnership</td>
<td>What you think about that should be done [or] in order to facilitate many centres with NGOs?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No attitude of power sharing</td>
<td>Indian attitude of not willing to share power decentralise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No equality</td>
<td>youth are angry because the nation is not equal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No listening capacity</td>
<td>Today youth are not ready to listen to others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Natural Connection young &amp; Old</td>
<td>What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and the old in the present-day context?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Respect for elders</td>
<td>What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and the old in the present day context?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not willing for decentralisation starting from family, government not willing to decentralise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old people are Terroised</td>
<td>What do you think of the relationship that exists between the young and the old in present day context?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old people experience &amp; Knowledge not valued</td>
<td>What do you think is the relationship between the young people and the elderly people in the present day context?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>Reference to creating opportunities for youth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome focussed</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government policy? What is the basic purpose or philosophy behind it?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of youth involvement in service</td>
<td>Reference - If young people involved in services. What you think about positive outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjayat Raj Training on Panjayat Raj</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>State and NGO partnership with regard to youth employment initiatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern National-Local level</td>
<td>Is there a pattern in the way in which service provided locally, regionally and nationally?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Pressure Participants view on youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Youth contains references of the participants of their perceptions of youth</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception depends on Birth</td>
<td>When you think of young people in Ireland. What springs to your mind?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal skill development</td>
<td>Are there particular benefits from participating in youth work as compare with other services?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy Interventions</td>
<td>In what way have the International institution or organizations influenced policy making?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon-Hole Youth</td>
<td>In what way do society, politicians and media perceive young people in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Involvement of planning commission to youth related issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure seeking Today’s youth are interested in pleasure seeking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Gap</td>
<td>Participants view on the existing gap in the employment department what is taught and in practice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td>Reference participants speaking about Policies are good but not implemented and monitored</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy is to control</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers not aware of Youth issues</td>
<td>Reference to factors influencing youth policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Provision &amp; practice</td>
<td>What are the gaps in policy and provisions?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>Reference to different political parties with their own agenda influence policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician, Media come from different society</td>
<td>In society, in particular the society they come from what concept do they have?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians view</td>
<td>Reference to their perception on youth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Youth</td>
<td>Reference to NGOs involvement in education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Indian society</td>
<td>Participant telling about the 3 principles under which Indian Government functions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged Youth</td>
<td>What are the issues and challenges in empowering young people, and implementing youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism in Youth work</td>
<td>When paid youth workers are involved in youth work it creat lot of impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Cantered Service</td>
<td>Reference to participants view on funding and NGO's youth service centred on project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective attitude</td>
<td>Reference to youth need to be protected and they are not capable etc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Youth Policy</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose behind government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising Old &amp; Young</td>
<td>What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and old in the present-day context?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate with any one Adult</td>
<td>What do you think about the relationship that exists between the young and the old in the present-day context?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Reference - influence of Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Health</td>
<td>Reference to UNFPA involvement in Health issues and the different ministries involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Reference to value the importance of youth research</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Youth Policy</td>
<td>Reference to participants view on the importance of reviewing youth policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness &amp; problem</td>
<td>We are living in a multi-cultural multi religious context, played a role in shaping youth policy? If yes, in what way?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and Duties</td>
<td>Reference to the idea of rights and responsibilities come from Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of young people - Referendum</td>
<td>What has been the political involvement in the area?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Grandparents</td>
<td>Relationship between young and old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of NGO's</td>
<td>Reference to the society's/NGO's role in delivering service</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of State</td>
<td>Reference to State role in Youth work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Youth</td>
<td>Reference to youth services in rural area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Place for Young people</td>
<td>What has been the political involvement in the area?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School is not a best model</td>
<td>What are the major issues and needs of young people in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employment</td>
<td>Reference to government should create self-employment opportunities for the youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Provision</td>
<td>We are living in a multi-cultural multi religious context, played a role in shaping youth policy? If yes, in what way?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
<td>Reference to the role and impact of service providers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Development</td>
<td>Need for Skill development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>New style of youth work started at the time where there ws not much was done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social impact is limited</td>
<td>Are there particular benefits from participating in youth work as compared with other services?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society view on youth</td>
<td>How the society views young people today this influence the policy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Participants view that youth should be give opportunity to play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and NGO Relation</td>
<td>Reference to what is the relation between state and NGO's</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants Moved beyond</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose being government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State struggling to tackle Issues</td>
<td>State struggling to understand the issues of today youth and tackle it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>Issues of youth today</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival skill</td>
<td>Participants view is that every youth should be given survival skill training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>In what way have the International institution or organizations influenced policy making?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting Youth</td>
<td>What is your opinion on the basic purpose being government youth policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Reference to how youth are changed according to the changing technology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Clubs</td>
<td>Government programme on teen clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Jobs</td>
<td>Youth today keeping moving from one job to the other...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend</td>
<td>What are the issues and challenges in implementing your policy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenistic</td>
<td>Do young people have a share in formulating policy? Do the young people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>have a participation in youth formation? Reference to governments involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and Faith</td>
<td>in working with youth What are the issues and challenges in empowering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need in working with youth</td>
<td>young people in Ireland?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Interventions</td>
<td>International interventions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Reference to anti-social behaviour because of unemployment</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Youth</td>
<td>Reference to young people are crowded in the urban and government programmes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values of youth</td>
<td>to the urban youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the young</td>
<td>Voice of the young not heard only represented by others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent against Young people</td>
<td>Any difference or similarities between young people of European countries,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia with young people of India?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>Reference: Youth Attitude of volunteering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are Energetic</td>
<td>perception of youth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are in Spending category</td>
<td>participants view on youth today</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are kept in a Box</td>
<td>Reference to Challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are lazy</td>
<td>youth are not prepared to do work or get involved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are projected</td>
<td>Youth are perceived as being projected as rich or great</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are pure like water</td>
<td>Reference to youth of today comparing to yesterday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are Stereotyped- negative</td>
<td>In what way society, politicians and media perceive young people in Ireland?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are Under pressure</td>
<td>Any difference or similarities between young people of European countries,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia with young people of India?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are Well-educated &amp; Well-informed</td>
<td>perception of youth according to the participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as a partner</td>
<td>Reference - Youth should be considered as a partner in their development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as a Positive contributors</td>
<td>In what way does society, politicians and the media perceive young people in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland today?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as an agent of Social Change</td>
<td>the youth policy doesn’t portray youth as an agent of social change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as an Asset</td>
<td>participants perception of youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as a-with a Problem</td>
<td>Youth are considered a-a-with a problem which also determine the youth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>policy programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as Dependent</td>
<td>Youth are perceived by the participant as a dependent on others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as one Experimenting</td>
<td>Perception of youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You as Problematic</td>
<td>Reference to Youth are portrayed as problematic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can’t be label Celtic-selfish</td>
<td>because of the economy, family - participants view on youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
<td>Participants vies is that every youth should be a member of a youth club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Culture</td>
<td>In what way the lives of the young people in India similar or different to</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>young people in other countries?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Definition</td>
<td>Reference to different age category in defining youth because of various</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>Reference to participants view on youth development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Difference Between Developed and</td>
<td>What is the difference between young people compare to other country like</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Countries</td>
<td>Europe and India, and what are the issues that are same when comparing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>them?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth dress pattern from outside</td>
<td>youth culture influenced by media - dress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth expect others to be Genuine</td>
<td>Today’s youth expect other to be genuine in dealing with them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Forum</td>
<td>Do you have a youth forum? - Youth Parliament</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth have different interest</td>
<td>Young people have different need can't fix in one box - participants view on youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Politics</td>
<td>Youth participation in politics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Social Issues</td>
<td>Youth involvement in social issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth live under pressure</td>
<td>Comparing the youth of Ireland today with those of yester-years, what do you think are the distinct features?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ministry is most insignificant</td>
<td>Reference to participants view is that the Youth Affairs Ministry is considered as a most insignificant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Movements</td>
<td>Reference to youth movements and now</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth not involved in Social Issues</td>
<td>Comparing to youth yesterday - today youth don't involve in social issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth not prepared for work</td>
<td>the perception that today rural and urban youth are not prepared for hard work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth parliament</td>
<td>Do you think the young people are given a chance, an opportunity in the formulation of youth policy in Ireland?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Participation</td>
<td>Reference to youth policy participation in policy making process</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Policy</td>
<td>Reference to views on youth policy and policy making</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Policy Structure</td>
<td>Reference: What you think about structure of the policy? or what can be done?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Representation</td>
<td>In policy making process youth are not given proper representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Service Centres</td>
<td>Do you thing we have a sufficient centres for the development of the young people?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Services and Programmes</td>
<td>Reference to the participants view on youth services and programme</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Unrest</td>
<td>Youth work started because of unrest among youth but now also youth work is considered youth as a problem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth who are Marginalised</td>
<td>Another type of youth who are marginalised - involve in anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work</td>
<td>Reference to participants view on youth work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Marginalised</td>
<td>Do you think there are also other factors that have shaped youth policy in Ireland?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work not articulated</td>
<td>Are there particular benefits from participating in youth work as compare with other services?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Started as Voluntary</td>
<td>Since there was no fund the voluntary organisation started</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Workers</td>
<td>Reference to their relationship with the young</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Yesterday and Today</td>
<td>Reference to the similarities and difference of youth yesterday and today</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth-Out of Control</td>
<td>In what way society, politicians and the media perceive young people in Ireland? - Media view</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Example of Annotations

Appendix 6: Phase 2 - Categorisation of Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation of Codes</th>
<th>Interviews Coded</th>
<th>Units of Meaning Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Industrialization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste and Class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste System</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Economic situation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy controls youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalisation Impact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Recession</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalization impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Education Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School is not a best model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skill Training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival skill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Jobs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family impact</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism in the family changed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over youth declining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over youth declining (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family in Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not willing for decentralisation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Gap</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Grandparents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health impact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social Behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality in India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality in Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues &amp; Needs of today’s youth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channelize the youth energy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation of Youth Agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity is a major issue</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Segregation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of Youth today</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues specific to Women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Faith in the government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the young</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers not aware of Youth issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State struggling to tackle Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend with Young</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and Faith need in working with youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Unrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protestation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Religion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyber Bullying</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Culture</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Differences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogenous to Heterogeneity Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Culture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richness &amp; problem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Provision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Empowerment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Opportunity- resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give their Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the young</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and Engaging them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in Service Providers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Choices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Youth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Youth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Service Centres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Services and Programmes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Marginalised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work not articulated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Interests</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult interventions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the Politicians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation of Youth Agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation gap</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of youth Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers not aware of Youth issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s (Voluntary Organisations)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing for Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism - Voluntarism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs-Partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of NGO’s</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and NGO Relation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Work Started as Voluntary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Politics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Movements impact</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of young leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Place for Young people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the young</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Social Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Movements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth not involved in Social Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth not prepared for hard work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth parliament</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Participation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Unrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating different Departments</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Mechanism</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral youth policy Challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Coordination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in the Youth Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical imbalance</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant about Youth Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland Geographically on the Periphery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Gap</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Provision &amp; practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Youth Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of the Funding</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasing the Funders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing for Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing mentality - No Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack Budget</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected centred Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer Place for Young people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants Moved beyond</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of the young</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Participation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Youth Policy</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralise Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domesticating - Liberating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgotten History</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at Youth with wider lens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Pressure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Gap</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy is to control</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting Youth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State interventions</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation gap</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of young leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Quality Standard Framework</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of State</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and NGO Relation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth ministry is most insignificant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Youth work professional</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No attitude of power sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism in Youth work</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Policy in Ireland and India</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Youth Policy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Youth Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Policy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Policy Structure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Thinking, Standardised &amp; Streamlines, Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No attitude of power sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjayat Raj</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern National-Local level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Provision &amp; practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Ideas</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards Elders</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Natural Connection young &amp; Old</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Respect for elders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old people are Terrorised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old people experience &amp; Knowledge not valued</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognising Old &amp; Young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate with any one Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth expect others to be Genuine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Youth</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spend with Young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are in Spending category</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are kept in a Box</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are lazy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are projected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are Stereotyped-negative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are Under pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as Dependent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as one Experimenting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as Problematic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Media</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Views on Youth</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Politicians</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians view on Youth</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Society</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society view on youth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Youth</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are Energetic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are pure like water</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are Well-educated &amp; Well-informed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as a Positive contributors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as an agent of Social Change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as an Asset</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth can't be labelled Celtic-selfish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Definition</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as a-with a Problem</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth as Problematic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Definition</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Yesterday and Today</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values of youth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent against Young people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Difference Between Developed and</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth have different interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth live under pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth who are Marginalised</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Yesterday and Today</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. International Environment                  | 17| 59|
| British Intervention                         | 6 | 9 |
| Colonisation Impact                          | 11| 12|
| Commonwealth Interventions                   | 0 | 0 |
| EU Interventions                             | 8 | 9 |
| International Agencies                       | 9 | 18|
| Irish Youth work Different from UK           | 2 | 2 |
| Philanthropy Interventions                   | 2 | 2 |
| Sustainable development                      | 1 | 2 |
| UN Interventions                             | 4 | 5 |

6. Outcomes of Youth Policy                   | 10| 19|
| Critical Thinking                            | 1 | 1 |
| Irish youth work gives choice -marginalised  | 1 | 1 |
| Outcome focused                              | 1 | 1 |
| Outcomes of youth involvement in service     | 10| 13|
| Personal skill development                   | 1 | 1 |
| Social impact is limited                     | 1 | 1 |
| Youth Work not articulated                   | 1 | 1 |
## Appendix 7: Phase 3 - Coding on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>289 Codes Consolidated under Six categories with 41 Sub-themes</th>
<th>Definitions of Themes</th>
<th>Interviews Coded</th>
<th>Units of Meaning Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Industrialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Socio-Economic &amp; Political situation</td>
<td>How the changing economic situation create impact on youth and influences youth policy?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>How the changing socio-economic situation has affected education of youth and the youth policy?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td>The changing socio-economic situation affect the employment of youth and youth policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family impact</td>
<td>How the changing pattern in the family has affected youth and influenced youth policy?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health impact</td>
<td>How the current changes in Health related issues have influenced policy?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Religion</td>
<td>In changing socio-economic, political situation how religion has influenced youth and youth policy?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td>What causes inequality among youth?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>How the changing socio-economic situation has affected youth culture and influenced the youth policy? Openness to integrate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Impact</td>
<td>Participants views on the influence of technology in the lives of youth and youth policy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Yesterday and Today</td>
<td>participants views on youth of today comparing to their past</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Interests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Political Party</td>
<td>Reference to different political parties and politicians with their own agenda influence policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO’s (Voluntary Organisations)</td>
<td>NGO’s influence on youth policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Movements &amp; Volunteering impact</td>
<td>How youth movements &amp; Volunteering have impacted youth policy? involvement of youth in social issues</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaps in youth Policy, Provision &amp; Practice</strong></td>
<td>Participants views on gaps in policy, provision and practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of the Funding</strong></td>
<td>Participants information and opinion on funding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State interventions</strong></td>
<td>Intervention of the State in youth policy making process</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training of Youth work professional</strong></td>
<td>Participants views on youth work training facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Policy in Ireland and India</strong></td>
<td>Participants views on youth policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Policy Structure</strong></td>
<td>In changing socio-economic, political context participants’ views on youth policy structure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Provisions</strong></td>
<td>Youth services available to tackle youth needs and issues</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact of Research</strong></td>
<td>participants views on the value of research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media, Politicians &amp; Society Perception of youth</strong></td>
<td>How young people are perceived by the society, media and politicians?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Media</strong></td>
<td>How the media views youth?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Media - Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative views of Media</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Media - Positive</strong></td>
<td>Positive views of Media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Politicians</strong></td>
<td>How the politicians view youth?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Politicians - Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative views of the politicians</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Politicians - Positive</strong></td>
<td>Positive views of the politicians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Society</strong></td>
<td>How society views youth?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Society - Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative views of the society</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of the Society - Positive</strong></td>
<td>Positive views of the society</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants perceptions of Youth</strong></td>
<td>Contains references of the participants of their perceptions of youth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants perceptions of Youth - Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative views of the participants on youth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants perceptions of Youth - Positive</strong></td>
<td>Positive views of the participants on youth</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Youth Policy</td>
<td>Participants views on the purpose of youth policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth attitude &amp; relation with Elders</td>
<td>Changing attitude towards elders and the relation, Generation gap</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Definition</td>
<td>Participants views on youth definition, demography, profile</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Empowerment &amp; Participation</td>
<td>Participants opinion and suggestion for youth empowerment, participation in youth policy making process</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. International Environment

| Colonisation Impact | Reference to the question-What you think about the colonization of British has it got any impact in youth policy? | 15 | 21 |
| UN & EU Interventions | What are the opinion of the participants on the interventions of UN & EU & others? | 12 | 20 |

6. Outcomes of Youth Policy

| Benefits of youth policy | What is the outcome of the policy? | 10 | 15 |
### Appendix 8: Phase 4 - In Case Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1 - Industrialisation</th>
<th>Linked Analytical Memo</th>
<th>Interviews Coded</th>
<th>Units of Meaning Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Industrialization</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Socio-Economic &amp; Political situation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family impact</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health impact</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Religion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Yesterday and Today</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 2 - Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Interests</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Political Party</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO's (Voluntary Organisations)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Movements &amp; Volunteering impact</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 3 - Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Institution</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>418</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Research Site = India</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4 - Ideas</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media, Politicians &amp; Society Perception of youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants perceptions of Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants perceptions of Youth - Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants perceptions of Youth - Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Media - Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Media - Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Politicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases ~ Research Site = Ireland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Research Site = India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Politicians - Negative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Society - Positive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Youth Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth attitude &amp; relation with Elders</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Youth Policy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Empowerment &amp; Participation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5 - International Environment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. International Environment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonisation Impact</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN &amp; EU Interventions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 6 - Outcomes of Youth Policies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outcomes of Youth Policy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits of youth policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 9: Phase 5 - Cross Case Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 5 Cross Case Analysis</th>
<th>Research Site = India</th>
<th>Research Site = Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrialization</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Socio-Economic &amp; Political situation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family impact</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of Religion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequality</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Yesterday and Today</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>