“Active Citizenship” encompasses & specifies the broad meaning of “full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others” (UN CRPD, Preamble, item e)
The main issues

• Are disabled people in the position to exercise Active Citizenship? Are their possibilities for being active citizens improving?

• What are the main enablers or barriers in exercising Active Citizenship? How can European and national policy help to remove the barriers and strengthen the facilitators?

• Are some groups of disabled people more likely than others to face barriers in exercising Active Citizenship?

• How could a European typology linking national disability policy systems with disabled people’s prospects for being active citizens look like?
Key concepts 1: Active Citizenship

• **The security dimension:** Is public policy enabling citizens with disabilities to maintain a sense of security by making effective use of the social rights meant to protect them against major risks and contingencies?

• **The autonomy dimension:** Is public policy allowing citizens with disabilities to be capable of exercising autonomy, defining their own needs, making their own choices and pursuing the kind of life they have reasons to value?

• **The influence dimension:** Is public policy ensuring the conditions for disabled citizens’ participation in decision-making, related to the services or transfers to which they are entitled, or the direction of public policy?
Key concepts 2: Multi-layered disability policy systems

**Redistributive provisions**

*E.g.*

- Cash transfers for persons with disabilities
- Services delivered to person with disabilities

**Regulatory provisions**

*E.g.*

- UN CRPD
- European and national equal treatment & non-discrimination legislation
- Accessibility & universal design legislation
- Common Provisions Regulation No 1303/2013 on European funds
- National wage subsidies & other supports and incentives for employers
- Awareness-raising campaigns
**Figure 1:** The DISCIT model for change towards Active Citizenship for persons with disabilities
Design and structure

- Participation from (and coverage of) nine European countries (CH, CZ, DE, IE, IT, NO, RS, SE and UK), plus European Disability Forum (EDF) as full partner

- Data collection combined:
  - Analytical reading and condensing of policy documents & existing research, plus re-analysis of available survey data
  - Coordinated life course interviews with 217 women and men from 3 birth cohorts and with 4 types of disabilities
  - 85 expert interviews

- Focus and structure of work:
  - Thematic work packages on community living, employment, organisational and political participation, new technologies, fiscal innovation, psychosocial disabilities and social services
  - Work packages on analytical framework, methodological challenges, dissemination & management
Findings 1

• Despite considerable developments towards community based support & community living in the 9 countries, still need for substantial progress, even signs of re-institutionalisation

• Enduring gap in employment rates between persons without and with disabilities, in spite of the strengthening of national policy efforts & EU 2000 Directive & Europe 2020 strategy; women tend to have lower employment than men

• Clear contrasts in civil society and political engagement of persons with disabilities across the 9 countries; physical inaccessibility as well as mobility issues and a range of other factors hinder participation; DRPD facilitates DPO influence on structured collective participation
Findings 2

• *New technology* has a positive impact in supporting both short and long term changes in the lives of disabled people; at the same time considerable barriers to the effective and equal access to & use of accessible technology.

• Various forms of *fiscal innovation allowing asset-building* can protect persons with disabilities against poverty or benefit traps, but such innovation is unknown in many countries.

• The variable or fluctuating character of *psychosocial disabilities* has often effects on the lives of the person, but appropriate social services can hasten recovery to a situation of capability
Findings 3

• A cross-cutting finding is that in most areas, *persons with psychosocial issues* and *intellectual disabilities* meet greater hindrances in exercising Active Citizenship than other groups of persons with disabilities,

• Moreover, existing forms of social support and assistance in many instances are insufficiently adapted to the needs and requirements to members of these two groups
Findings 4

• Efforts to reanalyse *existing comparative data* (e.g. LFS, ISS, SILC) in thematic WPs and work of a separate WP on methodological issues & indicator development show:

  – *Severe gaps in the systematic coverage of data* on whether disabled people’s are actually exercising of Active Citizenship; barriers and facilitators to such citizenship, including the role of public provisions, especially related to social regulatory ones

  – *Lack of consistent time series* of such data, with at least annual measurements points, and *lack of cross-national longitudinal data*
Table 1: Tentative typology of redistributive national disability policy systems with regard to Active Citizenship (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Upper Half of Rank Order Spending on Cash Transfers</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Upper Half of Rank Order Spending on Services</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Means-Testing Has Marginal Role</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries with this Profile</td>
<td>Finland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden</td>
<td>Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Spain, Switzerland</td>
<td>Croatia, Italy, Portugal</td>
<td>United Kingdom, Slovakia</td>
<td>Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania</td>
<td>Greece, Ireland, Malta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Three indicators of missing conditions for exercising Active Citizenship

- **Share not in employment** = percent of persons with disabilities aged 15-64 who were not employed in 2011 (EU LFS 2011)

- **Material deprivation risk** = percent of persons with disabilities aged 16-64 reporting to lack at least 3 of 9 items considered by most people to be desirable or even necessary to lead an adequate life (EU SILC 2012)

- **Relative poverty risk** = percent of people with disabilities aged 16-64 who had an (equivalised) disposable income (after social transfers) below 60 % of the national median equivalised disposable income after social transfers (EU SILC 2012)

Source definitions and data used: [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/data/database) - Please note the *confounding effect* of striking cross-national differences in the share of the working-age population who report having a disability
Figure 2: Indicators of missing conditions for Active Citizenship, by profile of countries’ disability policy system (means per profile, 2011 & 2012)
Recommendations 1

• Re-focus public policies in Europe, including the European Funds, to ensure & safe-guard the conditions for *community living* (e.g. by enabling independent living through personal assistance or budgets & provision of affordable & accessible housing)

• Stimulate greater imagination, diversity and experimentation in European & national efforts to enable disabled people to take up and keep relevant and accessible *employment*, with safe working conditions and adequate wages on an equal basis with others

• Strengthen provisions to enable all persons with disabilities to participate in *organisational and political activity* on an equal basis with others, by removing current barriers (e.g. physical, economic & attitudinal) and consolidating facilitators (e.g. appropriate supports & technologies)
Recommendations 2

• Remove legal, economic and organisational barriers to ensuring all people with disabilities equal access to and use of affordable, accessible and relevant technology.

• Encourage national and subnational authorities to pilot fiscal and asset-building innovations in income protection.

• Give more political attention not only to reducing gaps in Active Citizenship between persons with and without disabilities, but also to diminishing gaps in Active Citizenship between groups with kinds of different disabilities.
Recommendations 3

• Decision-makers at European and national level must act on the insight that effective monitoring of the implementation of the CRPD and new legislation in line with the European Disability Strategy in member states require
  – Better tested, piloted & validated instruments for the collection of cross-national data to ensure reliability, consistency and comparability across space & time,
  – Longer times series adopting the same instruments and more frequent measurement points
  – Greater investment in longitudinal comparative data

• Such improvements will enable more robust & reliable estimation of policy effects and evidence-based policy development & expansion of standard available indicators

• Similarly, ensure that current and future European research programmes, including Horizon 2020, do not rely excessively on the virtues of “mainstreaming”, but also includes calls with a disability-specific focus.
Thank you for your attention!

- Visit [https://blogg.hioa.no/discit](https://blogg.hioa.no/discit) for more information:
  - DISCIT Final Report – Executive Summary
  - 8 European Policy Briefs
  - 25 Working papers («Deliverables”)

- DISCIT has organised more than 60 dissemination events at the EU-level and in participating countries

- Scientific publishing:
  - Two edited volumes based on DISCIT will be published by Routledge early 2017
  - At least 10 articles based on DISCIT are published or will be published in refereed international journals in the coming months
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**Appendix: Redistributive and regulatory disability provisions - complements or substitutes for each other? (Source: Technosite et al. (2011) Monitoring eAccessibility in Europe 2011: Annual report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILES OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES’ REDISTRIBUTIVE PROVISIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</th>
<th>A STRONG REDISTRIBUTOR (HHH)</th>
<th>B STRONG REDISTRIBUTOR (HHL)</th>
<th>C MIXED REDISTRIBUTOR (HLL)</th>
<th>D MIXED REDISTRIBUTOR (LHL)</th>
<th>E WEAK REDISTRIBUTOR (LLH)</th>
<th>F WEAK REDISTRIBUTOR (LLL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profiles of European countries’ social regulatory provisions for persons with disabilities: eAccessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status of policy implementation on eAccessibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NL: 45</th>
<th>DK: 39</th>
<th>IT: 33</th>
<th>UK: 64</th>
<th>CZ: 48</th>
<th>GR: 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO: 39</td>
<td>DE: 41</td>
<td>PT: 52</td>
<td>HU: 41</td>
<td></td>
<td>IE: 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE: 43</td>
<td>ES: 73</td>
<td>(Mean: 47)</td>
<td>(Mean: 43)</td>
<td>(Mean: 45)</td>
<td>(Mean: 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status on achieved eAccessibility:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NL: 49</th>
<th>DK: 37</th>
<th>IT: 48</th>
<th>UK: 57</th>
<th>CZ: 37</th>
<th>GR: 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO: 50</td>
<td>DE: 42</td>
<td>PT: 36</td>
<td>HU: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>IE: 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE: 35</td>
<td>ES: 54</td>
<td>(Mean: 45)</td>
<td>(Mean: 42)</td>
<td>(Mean: 42)</td>
<td>(Mean: 30)</td>
<td>(Mean: 42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>