



## Helpdesk Research Report

# Increasing youth participation in accountability mechanisms

William Robert Avis

24.08.2015

### Question

*Review of literature for evidence on youth and governance: What interventions have been effective in increasing youth participation in accountability mechanisms (formal and informal)? In what circumstances, if any, have these led to a) improved outcomes for the young people involved in them and/or b) improved government accountability to young people addressing young people's priorities and concerns?*

### Contents

1. Overview
2. State of the evidence
3. Approaches
4. Formal accountability
5. Informal accountability
6. References

## 1. Overview

The literature argues that empowering, organising, capacity-building and partnering with young people can contribute to good governance and improved accountability of governments (DANIDA, 2007; UNDP, 2006; Walton, 2010). To this end, governments, donors and NGOs have supported a variety of interventions that encourage youth<sup>1</sup> participation both formally and informally. The extent to which these interventions have improved the outcomes of young people, or of government accountability, is however open to question.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report adopts the UN definition of youth, understood as a period of transition from the dependence of childhood to adulthood's independence and awareness of our interdependence as members of a community. Youth is a more fluid category than a fixed age-group. The UN, for statistical consistency across regions, defines 'youth', as those persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years,

Despite this uncertainty a consensus has emerged that increasing youth participation in government accountability mechanisms has both instrumental and intrinsic value and can result in positive outcomes for young people and society in general. Research suggests that there are three reasons why it is critical that young people are encouraged to engage with governance processes (Walker *et al*, 2014):

- there is **intrinsic value** in upholding young people's right to participate in decisions that affect them
- there is **instrumental value** in young people's engagement in governance processes due to the value they provide in improving policy and programme outcomes
- there is **instrumental value** in developing young active citizens who play a role in improving development gains nationally and globally and who become active and participative adults.

Despite the focus of donors and governments alike, youth participation in governance mechanisms remains uncoordinated and fragmented and what **evidence** there is of improved outcomes for young people or improved government accountability is limited, mixed, context specific and subject to interpretation. What evidence is available is also largely subjective, difficult to verify or establish causality between interventions and outcomes. Key findings from this report include:

- Evidence gleaned from qualitative case studies suggests a wide range of development outcomes stem from the participation of youth in accountability mechanisms. These can include **benefits for the young people, for their communities and for society**. It is a common refrain that youth participation is a necessity for many development outcomes and that **societal change, including behavioural change, is often driven by young people**. Youth participation is seen to encourage greater respect for youth rights in relation to early marriage, access to education, ending discriminatory practices and exploitative conditions of work (UNICEF, 2004).
- Young people cite that participation in a broad sense (including accountability mechanisms) can lead to the development of **social capital** (the acquisition of **enhanced skills, confidence and self-esteem and greater awareness of their rights**) (CSO Youth Working Group, 2010: 19).
- Case studies suggest that youth participation can lead to better **informed and more effective policy and planning, budgeting and programme management**. IDS *et al* (2011) report better results and greater awareness of young people's needs, capacities and aspirations stemming from greater participation.
- However, the literature reviewed suggests that the benefits of youth participation are **mixed and context specific, dependent on a range of factors and difficult to verify**. Outcomes can also be negatively affected if support for participation ignores or perpetuates the **marginalisation of the young** (both as a group and a collection of subgroups). The inclusion of girls and young women, ethnic minorities, young people with disabilities, youth affected by HIV/AIDS, slum dwellers, and other excluded groups are considered particularly important.
- Finally, supporting the development of an **enabling environment** is of pivotal importance to ensuring effective participation of young people in accountability mechanisms. This includes both formal and informal interventions to facilitate engagement with young people and to encourage greater receptiveness within government.

## 2. State of the evidence

There is a **limited empirical evidence base** for how the political participation of young people in accountability mechanisms can lead to improved development outcomes. Evidence is gleaned largely from qualitative case study material and some secondary analyses. This literature makes broad statements regarding the impact of youth participation during the life course of programmes, but this research typically lacks an analysis of the long term impact or sustainability of interventions. Available reviews that deal explicitly with youth participation in governance mechanisms tend to draw out general findings from a range of case studies (IDS *et al*, 2011; Walker *et al*, 2014, ActionAID, 2015).

Carter (2015) notes that there is some discussion in the literature on the limitations of the evidence, in particular its variable quality, a tendency not to critique outcomes in-depth and methodological and data constraints. There is more on outcomes of processes (participation levels in processes, policies approved etc.) and less exploration of the more intangible and longer-term impacts such as societal or behavioural change.<sup>2</sup>

The **research gaps** identified in this review highlight the dearth of longitudinal research on the impact of young people's participation in accountability mechanisms. What evidence there is, is drawn from programme evaluations or the reflections of stakeholders involved in the interventions. As Carter (2015) highlights, there appears to be little empirical evidence from low and middle income countries on the link between greater civic engagement and young people's future political engagement, or on the economic outcomes of greater political and social participation. There is some literature focused on analysing the effects of including girls and young women.

## 3. Approaches

There is a limited, but expanding, literature that suggests that youth participation in accountability mechanisms contribute to improvements in outcomes for the young and of increased government accountability to this group (see for example UNICEF, 2006; IDS *et al*, 2011, Walker *et al*, 2014, ActionAID, 2015). This literature notes that young people are important stakeholders in government and other policy and programme processes and represent a significant proportion of the global population (estimated at between 1.8 and 3 billion) (ActionAID, 2015). This group is considered to remain an excluded demographic in development, caught between childhood/adolescence and adulthood. Academics, NGOs and development agencies alike argue that they should be included in decision making processes, particularly on issues that affect their lives directly (education, employment) as well as on broader issues that affect their communities (corruption, service delivery, elections).

Commentators such as Huxley and the CSO Youth Working Group (2010), in their guide for development agencies and policy makers, note that young people can be engaged in promoting governance in a variety of roles:

- **target groups** (beneficiaries)
- **collaborators** in the initiative (partners)
- **initiators** who 'create' governance space (leaders) – or a combination of these

---

<sup>2</sup> These limitations of the evidence base echo conclusions of reviews of the broader literature on voice, empowerment and accountability approaches (Combaz and Mcloughlin, 2014) and inclusive societies approaches (see for example Carter, 2015).

It is important not to view interventions to improve youth participation in isolation. The success of initiatives and programmes is influenced by a number of factors including institutional structures, policy frameworks etc. The key challenges to youth participation in governance identified by this research include: council, legal and policy constraints, funding constraints, a narrow vision of youth needs, limited capacity of councillors, partisan politics and the use of tokenistic participation projects that can reinforce negative perceptions of piecemeal youth engagement. At the level of youth representation and civil society, key challenges include the quality and calibre of youth leaders and representatives and the organisation and capacity of civil society and formal youth structures. Further to this, Walker *et al* (2014) identify the following impediments to the effective participation of young people:

- the presence of discriminatory social norms (such as negative attitudes and practices)
- the types of space in which young people engage
  - Closed: those where elites make decisions and provide services without broader consultation
  - Invited: those into which people are invited to participate by various kinds of authorities
  - Claimed/created: those where people gather to debate, discuss and resist outside of 'official' spaces
- the technical capacity and systemic constraints specific to young people's participation
- gender dynamics
- opportunities and challenges around decentralisation
- individual capacities that lead to collective change

Research conducted by the CSO Youth Working Group (2010) compiled a collection of case studies of what worked, and generated a number of lessons on how to enhance youth participation in accountability mechanisms:

- Youth structures and leadership **can benefit from cross-party or non-party support**. However, too much isolation from mainstream political discourse can reduce their impact
- **Youth mainstreaming is an ambitious proposition** in most countries, but there are no clear alternatives given the cross-cutting nature of youth issues
- **Young people can be successfully involved in executive decisions**, e.g., budgeting, programme design and management that go far beyond consultation
- **Young people need to be skilled, experienced communicators** in order to engage with older decision makers in government and communities

## 4. Formal accountability

Formal accountability mechanisms are understood to include established institutions e.g. electoral systems, state commissions and ombudsmen's offices. In many parts of the world these institutions are under-resourced, have poorly defined roles and weak mandates, and are not accessible to those groups who need them most, including young people (IDS *et al*, 2011: 24).

A global review for Plan UK of children and young people's participation in government decision making spaces and processes highlights a series of positive case studies and suggests that youth participation in

formal accountability mechanisms enabled young people to influence final statements at conferences (War Affected Children conference) and develop a programme of future action (Millennium Young People's Congress). At other events (Zimbabwe Child Parliament) child delegates were present and actively engaged in developing recommendations (Kirby & Kwast, 2009). More critically, the review highlighted a number of instances (see case studies of Nicaragua, South Africa and India) where participation was achieved but the benefits of this participation were hard to identify.

Balcoso *et al's* (2015 forthcoming) literature review exploring youth participation notes the importance of the **wider enabling environment** for ensuring youth participation interventions deliver improved outcomes for young people and garner improved accountability of governments. Citing Percy-Smith and Thomas (2010), Balcoso *et al* note that to support genuine participation, there need to be established: legal frameworks; information provision; cultural and attitudinal change amongst adults and decision makers; mechanisms for youth involvement in formal policy, service or organisational processes; and opportunities for complaints, such as through a Children's Commissioner or independent child rights committee.

In what follows, a range of interventions are presented that have been broadly identified as having some success in encouraging youth participation in formal accountability mechanisms and have led to some improved outcomes for the young.

### ***Budgeting schemes in Argentina***

The Municipality of Rosario undertakes a participatory youth budget which engages 1,000 youths annually from across its six districts. Young people are asked to select representatives and decide upon budget allocations for youth services. In this scheme, young people are invited to elect delegates to district youth-participatory councils and identify neighbourhood priorities. Youth councils meet regularly to develop project proposals based on neighbourhood priorities. Participants are also encouraged to engage with other participatory budgeting processes beyond those pertaining to young people (CSO Youth Working Group 2010).

The CSO Youth Working Group (2010), in their compendium of case studies, note that these budgeting schemes that involve young people at the municipal level have enabled young people to become more integrated into decision making processes. The CSO Youth Working Group (2010) identified the following results: 3,500 young people were involved by 2008; gaps in service provision were identified and addressed; funding was allocated to new music and dance workshops, recreational sites and a community library; the scheme inspired new youth projects in adult participatory budgeting processes; and the scheme saw the development of new democratic skills, knowledge and attitudes. The programme is undergoing a steady scale-up process.

The CSO Youth Working Group (2010) notes that for this initiative to be successful, a significant and sustained investment was required in administrative support and political will on the part of the Argentinian government.

### ***National youth policy in Bahrain***

The Government Department of Youth and Sport (GOYS) in Bahrain, funded by the UNDP, undertook a nationwide assessment of the situation, needs and aspirations of Bahraini youth intended to inform the country's National Youth Policy (created in 2004). Around 16,000 young people aged 15 to 30 (8.9 per cent of the youth population) were engaged directly (through focus group discussions and surveys) or

indirectly in the formulation of the national youth policy. An Implementation action plan, comprising five major strategy programmes, was drafted incorporating 96 of the 136 recommendations made in the strategy document. These included the formulation of: a national youth parliament; a national youth commission; a national youth development fund; and an inter-ministerial committee for youth affairs (CSO Youth Working Group, 2010). Despite this early momentum, according to youthpolicy.org (2014), as of September 2014 the GOYS website has no mention of the youth strategy nor the partnership with UNDP. According to youthpolicy.org, it also remains unclear as to what role the Bahrain Youth Council plays in representing youth (Youthpolicy.org, 2014)

Large and complex processes such as the establishment of the National Youth Policy require clear transparent agreements between implementing parties at the outset to avoid delays and divergent expectations. It is also suggested by Bacalso *et al* (2015) that continued support and leadership is required to ensure that initial momentum is translated into sustained impact.

### ***National youth policy, commission act and manifestos in Sierra Leone***

The government of Sierra Leone has made (in policy formulation at least) sustained efforts to open up spaces for youth participation. The National Youth Policy of 2003 gives policy backing to the concept of youth as a national development priority. The policy is designed to “mainstream youth activities and contributions and to highlight youth concern as a critical input in the development process” (Government of Sierra Leone, 2003). The policy outlines the roles and responsibilities of youth, the state and other actors. The policy also identifies specific instruments for supporting and promoting youth issues at the district level through the creation of District Youth Councils (DYCs).

The government also established the National Youth Commission (NAYCOM) in 2009, with responsibility for realising the provisions of the National Youth Policy. NAYCOM’s responsibilities include: creating employment opportunities for youth, initiating youth development programmes, developing a national youth development plan, creating a network through which youth can access information about beneficial services and coordinating the activities of youth groups. Provisions have also been outlined for Youth Advisory Committees to be established in local councils with the purpose of assisting the Commission in the performance of its functions, sensitising the youth on the objectives of the Commission and submitting recommendations on measures (CSO Youth Working Group, 2010).

Restless Development (2012) comment that neither the National Youth Policy nor the National Youth Commission Act specify mechanisms or processes through which active participation in governance, decision making and democratic processes should be realised. They note that it is not clarified how the District Youth Councils or any other structure created by these instruments should interact with local councils, ministries or other decision making bodies when it comes to drawing localised youth issues to their attention, participating in planning processes or holding those bodies to account. Neither does it clarify how to avoid duplication with existing structures, for example whether the Youth Advisory Committees created under the National Youth Commission Act should interact with or supersede the Youth and Sports Committees which already exist at local council level.

To address these concerns, Restless Development worked with young people to develop a youth manifesto, which would demonstrate their commitment to working towards democratic rule and good governance. The manifesto was a platform that gave young people and youth representatives the opportunity to publicly share their opinions about the 2012 elections and the future development of the country, highlighting the positive and valuable contribution that young people can make to the election process (Restless Development, 2012).

### ***Youth governance in Sierra Leone***

As noted above, following the civil war, there have been efforts in Sierra Leone to introduce structures and programmes that serve the needs of young people. These include the establishment of a National Youth Commission Act (2009) that focused on the promotion of youth issues.

Having established these formal structures, Civil Society Organisations and International NGOs such as Plan USA have sought to initiate youth governance programmes that deliver improved outcomes for youth and encourage government accountability. Plan USA's (2009-2011) Youth in Governance Programme organised 900 participants from marginalised communities into youth groups (Plan USA, 2013). It provided training on projects such as maintaining water points and working to change laws to enable pregnant girls to attend school and gain access to livelihoods options. This project enabled youth to interact and actively participate in traditional governance activities including helping in the collection of taxes. Walker *et al* (2014) note that, previously, young people had been barred from taking part in community decisions and thus reacted by refusing to pay taxes. When they were empowered to become active decision makers within their communities they began to contribute. As a result, the communities collected three times the normal amount of taxes and were able to allocate tax money towards the construction of a new youth complex (Plan USA, 2013).

Plan USA comment that, as participants, young people made communities accountable for how they were spending their revenue and were able to advocate for some of the resources to be dedicated towards youth-focused activities (Plan USA, 2013).

### ***Poverty reduction strategy in Viet Nam***

The CSO Youth Working Group (2010) highlights the government of Viet Nam and Save the Children's efforts to include a youth perspective in the development of the country's poverty reduction strategy (PRSP). Save the Children was commissioned by the Government to conduct consultations with children and young people to provide opportunities for them to review the strategy's implementation.

The first assessment in 1999 was to inform national development planning and the World Bank's Viet Nam Development Report on poverty. The second consultation in 2001 sourced feedback on the interim PRSP. The third consultation in 2003 was part of a review of progress on the implementation of the country's first PRSP. These consultations sought to address the lack of long-term assessments of how children and youth can contribute towards national PRSPs.

The CSO and Youth Working group (2010) highlights the results of this process, including:

- the PRSP had greater reference to young people indicating government consideration of the impact of poverty on children and young people. More importantly, it was suggested that declarations in the PRSP make it easier for communities to hold the government to account for its action on poverty related issues
- local officials were able to learn from youth participation and apply this learning in their work
- finally, consultations highlighted the plight of migrant families in the capital who were not registered by authorities and thus had problems accessing healthcare, education and social welfare services. Consultations culminated in procedural changes to allow unregistered migrants access services more quickly

## ***Policy, planning, resource mobilisation and programme implementation in Kenya***

In November 2009, a governance programme was introduced by Plan Kenya intended to promote active engagement of young people with local authorities as well as transparency and accountability, making information about the use of public funds available (Ashley *et al*, 2011). Through the district gender and social development office in Embakasi, Plan Kenya provided training on governance to a group of 22 (9 male and 13 female) young citizens drawn from registered youth organisations. In 2010, a public district forum was organised, attended by district departmental heads and CSOs. At the forum, representatives of a coalition of youth groups highlighted key policy issues that they wanted the local administration to address, including: improved development and democratic outcomes, through the active engagement of young citizens in policy, planning, resource mobilisation and programme implementation in sectors including youth and governance, reproductive health and life skills, economic empowerment, environmental management and information and communication technology.

IDS *et al's* (2011) research shows that raising the voice and participation of young people in development and governance processes in Embakasi has had its challenges, including low levels of awareness about accountability among youth groups. This meant limited understanding and take-up of initiatives. Similarly Government officials themselves were uncertain of the purpose of public accountability boards. Alongside this, delays in the establishment of the public accountability boards meant that they were only established towards the end of the project in October 2010, and lacked means of systematically tracking impact over time and beyond the programme.

Despite these challenges, IDS *et al* (2011) comment that the governance initiative had some success, forging a network of individual youth groups that were able to gain a voice in the community and increase participation in decision making processes. Communication and information sharing was also seen to be key in strengthening the partnership and enhancing the quality of decisions taken to promote governance at the grassroots. With these successes, IDS *et al* (2011) comment that communities' expectations were raised and the demand for scaling up increased.

The youth governance initiative provides an example of a youth-focused initiative that not only addresses young people's concerns directly but also moves beyond these to enable young people to engage in wide-ranging public issues of governance.

## ***U-Report in Uganda***

In 2011, UNICEF and its partners launched "U-Report", a free, SMS-based platform enabling young people to voice issues of concern in their respective communities in Uganda. U-report is a tool for enrolling, engaging and inspiring youth participation and measuring their readiness as change agents. It is a tool for strengthening communities and specifically allows development workers and government to (UNICEF, 2014):

- Analyse young people's attitudes towards their communities and measure how they understand their role in shaping society
- Capture youth concerns and prompt action by community leaders to address the situation of young people
- Boost young people's participation, increase democratic accountability and build public support, trust and interest in public policies and political activities

ActionAID (2015) suggest that over the last three years, U-Report has encouraged increased accountability of government and that some duty bearers have taken action on local concerns related to public service delivery in their constituencies. For example, Members of Parliament have subscribed to U-Report to monitor what young people have to say in their constituencies. It has also been claimed that one MP was galvanised into action to address low immunisation levels for children under five in her constituency, prompting her to start an awareness campaign (U-Report).

### ***Youth parliament in Ghana***

ActionAID Ghana alongside the Northern Sector Action on Awareness Centre (NORSAAC) combined to create a platform for young women to meet and debate issues of concern to them. The young female parliament (YFP) was formed in 2009 with 40 members. ActionAid Ghana and NORSAAC also organise training for young parliamentarians based on needs assessments. These included:

- leadership and conflict management
- debating (debating skills and how to present a good debate)
- advocacy and lobbying with duty bearers

IDS *et al* (2011) argue that these activities are empowering participants to engage effectively in governance and decision making. They note that members of the YFP have developed the courage and confidence to contest leadership and political positions, contesting local government elections for the district assembly.

One tangible output of the YFP was the role it played in the circulation of a communiqué on behalf of young women, calling for government to allocate 50 per cent of district assembly seats to women rather than the 30 per cent allocated at the time. This call contributed to government issuing a circular to district assemblies to allocate 40 per cent of appointments to women.

IDS *et al* (2011) comment that the YFP, though gradually ensuring effective participation of women and girls, requires the wider support of local government, civil society and the communities from which parliamentarians are drawn. In particular, the research commented that local government needs to work with and finance this model, civil society needs to empower girls, and communities need to provide the space for girls to exercise their skills. Only then will young females be attracted into participatory governance and remain there.

## **5. Informal accountability**

Informal accountability mechanisms refer to the ways in which relationships between groups and the development of conventions and norms of reciprocity, facilitative behaviours, informal rewards and sanctions operate to hold those in positions of power to account (Romzek *et al*, 2009). It is here that the role of CSOs, NGOs, the Media and other groupings play a role in holding governments to account.

It is noted by Romzek *et al* (2009) that the participation of youth in accountability mechanisms can be based on both formal and informal rules and can include forms of ‘consensus building’ which sometimes underpin the relationship between citizens and state.

## ***Performing arts ensemble, Jamaica***

Ashe Caribbean Performing Arts Ensemble Jamaica, founded in 1992, is committed to the preservation and renewal of the Jamaican/Afro-Caribbean culture through the use of “Edutainment” (educating while entertaining), entertainment, community transformation, youth empowerment and social development projects. USAID allocated funds to support Ashe in their role as peer educators and teachers of the arts who specialise in using performing arts to inform youth about social issues. One output of this funding was the production of an educational video on pregnancy and STI/HIV/AIDS prevention.

Walker *et al* (2014) comment on the role Ashe plays in embedding youth–adult partnerships into the operational and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) aspects of targeted local schools. This is a model that has been scaled up to all government education institutions. Similarly Jamaica’s Ministry of Education (MoE) integrated the Ashe curriculum on HIV and AIDS awareness into the existing Family Life Education curriculum and implemented it in state secondary schools (Family Health International, 2007).

## ***Digital mapping in Mozambique, Kenya and Cameroon***

In 2008, Plan International began work on the Youth Empowerment through Technology, Arts and Media (YETAM) Programme, which utilises a participatory approach to create an environment where youth take centre stage in highlighting issues and identifying solutions. The programme aims to leverage new technology, arts and media as tools to gather information about youth concerns. The programme creates videos, paintings, songs, cartoons, photographs and maps and provides an opportunity for youth to learn, reflect, build confidence and strengthen communication skills. The ‘products’ made are seen as a starting point for involving the broader community, local councils and divisional authorities in dialogue and support for resolving youth issues. Piloting new information and communication technologies to better understand their potential to engage youth in community development and governance work is a cross-cutting theme of the initiative.

Digital mapping has been identified as means of providing youth with a tool to collect and process information, and to advocate for their concerns with local government. IDS *et al* (2011) note that through the production of digital maps, communities are able to identify the social amenities and socio-economic infrastructure that are found in the respective council areas and communities. They have generated useful socio-economic data that the council can use in strategic planning.

Plan (2012) claim that the YETAM project has contributed to a growth in youth capacities and confidence. They claim youth groups have become more aware of their rights and how to claim them from duty bearers. Youth now participate in the decision making process, budget allocations and development activities and are creating accountability mechanisms with their local councils. The community council and local governments are now working closely with youth during the planning and budgetary process to prioritise the rights of the young. They now allocate projects and resources to particular communities based on the information analysed from the digital maps to ensure balance and sustainable development.

Community councils and local governments are also using the digital maps to share information about their area with other leaders, stakeholders and international bodies via the web. The digital maps have facts and figures which are used by the community council, local government and youth themselves to analyse issues with regards to children’s and youth’s rights.

### ***Participatory video in Sierra Leone***

The Network Movement for Justice and Development (NMJD) and the Kenema District Youth Coalition (KYDC) are using participatory videos as an advocacy tool to engage in dialogue with local government, helping to build youth capacity to engage in governance processes.

IDS *et al* (2011) claim that these films have helped to improve relationships and change people's perceptions of youth. Some youths have since been elected to decision making positions in local governance. Nine youths were elected councillors in the district and municipal council elections of 2007. Three are heading standing committees. The health and sanitation, youth and sports committees of both Kenema city and Kenema district councils are now chaired by youth.

### ***The pastoral youth leadership project in Somalia and Somaliland***

The Pastoral Youth Leadership (PYL) project, supported by UNICEF, is a non-formal education project started in 2002. It targets pastoral communities in six villages (Badhan, Lasqoray, Baragaha Qol, Hingalol, Elbuh and Dhahar) in Sanaag Region.

Youth involved in informal pastoral governance have been at the forefront of community-driven initiatives that address local challenges. These initiatives include dissemination of health messages, improved animal husbandry and safeguarding the environment. IDS *et al* (2011) note that via the PYL programme, youth leaders have played a central role assessing the needs of their communities. In particular, the youth take leadership roles in community peacebuilding initiatives and are often called upon to facilitate community dialogue, or to mediate between parties in conflict.

The external evaluation of Oxfam's strategy in Somalia (of which support to PYL was a core element) noted that the project contributed to improved recognition by the public authorities of local community rights and competency in the management of education facilities as well as the specific needs of women and girls in education (Moussa *et al*, 2007). Oxfam's support to the PYL has contributed to increased value attached to education in particular for women and girls living in pastoral communities. There are significant changes in the attitude and practices of communities and parents towards education and acceleration of equal opportunities provided to boys and girls in all PYL target coverage areas. There are positive trends towards education for especially young girls and women groups in all target villages. However, the PYL centres currently have limited capacity for the number of young girls and boys seeking to enrol in terms of rooms, animators, learning and teaching aids, etc.

## **6. References**

- ActionAID (2015). *Democracy Watch Dogs: Youth Driven Participatory Monitoring and Accountability in the Post-2015 Development Agenda*. London: ActionAid.  
<http://www.actionaid.org/sites/files/actionaid/democracy-watchdogs-web.pdf>
- Ashley, H., Kenton, N. and Milligan, A. (2011). *Tools for Supporting Sustainable Natural Resource Management and Livelihoods*. London: IIED. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/14620IIED.pdf>
- Asker, S. & Gero, A. (2012). *The Role of Child and Youth Participation in Development Effectiveness a Literature Review*. Surrey Hills: Child Fund Australia.  
[http://www.unicef.org/adolescence/cypguide/files/Role\\_of\\_Child\\_and\\_Youth\\_Participation\\_in\\_Development\\_Effectiveness.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/adolescence/cypguide/files/Role_of_Child_and_Youth_Participation_in_Development_Effectiveness.pdf)

- Bacalso, C., Farrow, A. & Karsten, A. (2015). *The Case for Space: Research Brief*. Youth Policy Labs, Unpublished working paper.
- Carter, B. (2015 forthcoming). *Development Outcomes of the Political and Social Inclusion of Young People* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report 1237). Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.
- CSO Youth Working Group (2010). *Youth Participation in Development: A Guide for Development Agencies and Policy Makers*. London: Students Partnership Worldwide, SPW/DFID-CSO Youth Working Group. <http://restlessdevelopment.org/file/youth-participation-in-development-pdf>
- DANIDA (2007). *Children and Young People in Danish Development Cooperation: Guidelines*. Copenhagen: Danida. [http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/4485/pdf/Children\\_and\\_Young\\_People.pdf](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/4485/pdf/Children_and_Young_People.pdf)
- Kirby, P. and Kwast, E. (2009). *Literature Review: Youth Participation in Decision-Making Processes*. London: Plan UK. <http://www.plan-uk.org/resources/documents/40221>
- Family Health International (2007) *Jamaica Final Report, October 1995-September 2005 USAID's Implementing AIDS Prevention and Care (IMPACT) Project*. Arlington: Family Health International. [http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PDACP858.pdf](http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACP858.pdf)
- IDS, Plan UK, IIED (2011). *Participatory Learning and Action: Young Citizens, Youth and Participatory Governance in Africa*. Brighton: IDS. <http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/sites/default/files/documents/5504.pdf#page=183>
- Moussa, A. (2007). *External Evaluation of Oxfam Novib's Strategy in Somalia: Synthesis Report*. Oxford: Oxfam. [http://www.oxfamnovib.nl/redactie/downloads/jaarverslagen/landenevaluaties/ccpe\\_somalia\\_2001\\_2006.pdf](http://www.oxfamnovib.nl/redactie/downloads/jaarverslagen/landenevaluaties/ccpe_somalia_2001_2006.pdf)
- Mutsiwegota, S. (no date given). *U-Report to Give Young People in Zimbabwe a Voice*. U-Report. <https://zimbabwe.ureport.in/story/97/>
- Plan UK (2012). *A Governance Learning Guide*. London: Plan. <http://www.plan-uk.org/resources/documents/learning-guide-full/>
- Plan USA (2013). *Plan's Youth in Governance programme in Sierra Leone*. Plan USA. [www.planusa.org/contentmgr/showdetails.php/id/3033537](http://www.planusa.org/contentmgr/showdetails.php/id/3033537)
- Restless Development (2012). *Youth Manifesto for the 2012 Elections: what Young People Think About the Elections, Politics and the Future of Sierra Leone*. Freetown: Restless Development <http://restlessdevelopment.org/file/youth-manifesto-final-email-pdf>
- UNDP (2006). *Youth and Violent Conflict: Society and Development in Crisis*. New York: UNDP. [http://www.undp.org/cpr/whats\\_new/UNDP\\_Youth\\_PN.pdf](http://www.undp.org/cpr/whats_new/UNDP_Youth_PN.pdf)
- UNICEF (2004). *Programming Strategy with and for Adolescents in East Asia and Pacific*. Bangkok: UNICEF. <http://www.unicef.org/adolescence/cypguide/files/FinalReport-EAPROAdolesProg-Gerison-14june.doc>
- UNICEF (2006). *Children and Youth Participation: Resource Guide*. New York: UNICEF. [http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/Child\\_Youth\\_Resource\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/ceecis/Child_Youth_Resource_Guide.pdf)

UNICEF (2014). UNICEF Stories: U-Report. New York: UNICEF.

<https://unicefstories.files.wordpress.com/2014/05/u-report.docx>

Romzek, B. Le Roux, K. and Blackmar, J. (2009). *The Dynamics of Informal Accountability in Networks of Service Providers*. Kansas: Ohio State University.

<http://www2.ku.edu/~pmranet/conferences/OSU2009/papers/Romzek,%20Barbara%20S.,%20LeRoux,%20Kelly,%20and%20Blackmar,%20Jeanette.%20%20The%20Dynamics%20of%20Informal%20Accountability%20in%20Networks%20of%20Service%20Providers.pdf>

Walker, D. Perezniето, P. Bergh, G. and Smith, K. (2014). *Partners for Change: Young People and Governance in a post-2015 World*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

<http://restlessdevelopment.org/file/partners-for-change-full-report-amended-pdf>

Walton, O. (2010). *Youth, Armed Violence and Job Creation Programmes: a Rapid Mapping Study*.

Birmingham: GSDRC. <http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/EIRS11.pdf>

Kirby, P. & Kwast, E. (2009). *Literature Review: Youth Participation in Decision-Making Processes*. Plan UK:

London. <http://www.plan-uk.org/resources/documents/40221/>

Youthpolicy.org (2014). Bahrain Fact Sheet. Berlin: Youthpolicy.org.

<http://www.youthpolicy.org/factsheets/country/bahrain/>

## Expert contributors

Sarah Huxley, ActionAID International

Meda Couzens, University of Kwazulu-Natal

## Suggested citation

Avis, W. (2015). *Increasing youth participation in accountability mechanisms* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report 1267) Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

## About this report

This report is based on four days of desk-based research. It was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development, © DFID Crown Copyright 2015. This report is licensed under the Open Government Licence ([www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence)). The views expressed in this report are those of the author, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of GSDRC, its partner agencies or DFID.

The GSDRC Research Helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of key literature and of expert thinking in response to specific questions on governance, social development, humanitarian and conflict issues. Its concise reports draw on a selection of the best recent literature available and on input from international experts. Each GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report is peer-reviewed by a member of the GSDRC team. Search over 400 reports at [www.gsdrc.org/go/research-helpdesk](http://www.gsdrc.org/go/research-helpdesk). Contact: [helpdesk@gsdrc.org](mailto:helpdesk@gsdrc.org).