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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Global Citizen: Harnessing Youth Leadership to Reshape Civil Society

Photo: Rhize
Responding to New Challenges

Traditional civil society institutions’ (CSIs) engagement with youth is at a crossroads. International development and human rights professionals generally acknowledge the institutional barriers to addressing pressing global challenges like growing economic inequality and catastrophic climate change, yet they struggle to make the structural changes needed to ensure ongoing impact. Civil society is more than formal organizations, yet formal CSIs largely orient their support around these non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Meanwhile, decentralized networks and social movements grow in numbers and influence, reshaping the civil society landscape and challenging global development organizations’ relevance and authority. From the Nuit Debout movement in France to Occupy Wall Street, these networks and social movements are often driven by a critical mass of youth—the most well-educated in this world’s history, with unprecedented access to information.

To the global development sector, youth seem more disengaged than ever. Yet, youth increasingly are involving themselves in civil society outside of formal CSIs and established channels. They are leading on global issues in innovative ways by launching organizations, developing new technology, using new media to surface injustice, sparking social movements and initiating community-led projects that make global connections within local contexts. In so doing, they are defining new approaches and making way for new understandings of citizenship and civic participation. In order for CSIs to effectively and proactively engage this new generation of leaders, they must reframe their understanding of youth leadership and civic participation to include the breadth of ways in which youth are participating and leading social change.

Youth Pathways of Leadership

Critical to our analysis of youth engagement was a mapping of the civil society sector. We looked at youth’s relationship to institutions in six target countries—Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. Large global aid institutions make disproportionate contributions to build infrastructure for youth engagement in global development. However youth are embracing participatory citizenship and shifting their relationship to global aid.

“Our data indicates that youth leadership can be characterized as: participatory, intersectional, networked, resourceful and grassroots-based.”

Our data indicates that youth leadership can be characterized as: participatory, intersectional, networked, resourceful and grassroots-based. Youth have sought out new forms of participation in response to changing contexts, which has been characterized by increased visibility of social movements, the rise of digital tools creating accessible global networks and the shortcomings of civil society infrastructure. Overall, we found that the sector still has major gaps in its “architecture of participation” for long-term youth leadership development. We conclude that there is an ongoing need to develop infrastructure and create diverse and decentralized access points for youth to begin their journey to leadership and to continue over the long-term.
Acting Translocally

Youth leaders are breaking down conventional delineations between local, national and global action thanks to greater access to networks deriving from increased globalization, changing migration patterns and the mediation of digital technologies. This translocal emergent landscape—neither explicitly national, local or global in scope but rather a hybrid of all three—blurs distinctions between geography and issues-based causes. It allows for grassroots groups and movements to build local-to-local connections and solidarity and to work together to create specific strategies driven and informed by local experiences of global issues—whether it be climate change, gender or racial justice. These offer opportunities to provide supranational and global contexts to local initiatives and for bottom-up grassroots coordination on international development and social change, in contrast to being explicitly centralized or directed from international organizations downward to local levels.

The New Global Citizen

Today’s youth leaders are reinventing themselves as collective global actors, leading from a local level of grassroots action and community-driven solutions and connected to a network of people working on similar issues around the globe. Many of these youth-led initiatives are not aptly measured by traditionally defined indicators of civic participation due to outmoded, directive, institutions-centered conceptions of citizenship. We have framed these emerging approaches as “participatory citizenship”, informed by research and literature that have variously described this emerging form of civic participation as “active”, “actualizing” or “engaged.” This type of civic engagement spans across digital and physical spaces and is informed by connected yet diverse identities. It reflects a young citizens’ practice of engagement through looser, often autonomously-built and peer-to-peer networks that enable youth to build collective identities, take civic action and build more participatory communities.

The Global Development Sector’s Barriers to Engaging Youth Leadership

Focusing specifically on the global development sector we found a clear disconnect between engagement opportunities currently available to youth and the ways in which youth leaders want to engage. Analysis of the literature, organizational map and interviews with both practitioners and youth leaders revealed prevailing tensions that present challenges to meaningful engagement between INGOs and young leaders. First we find that INGOs tend to be dominated by professionals with a particular profile—usually highly educated and from elite circumstances, as opposed to organizers who may have deep but nontraditionally obtained knowledge and experience. The latter group tends to have more difficulty accessing formal resources and networks that favor professionalization, which makes initial buy-in and sustained participation between grassroots and INGOs difficult. It also makes identifying emerging leaders from marginalized or nontraditional contexts more challenging, given that INGOs tend to select the most visible, formally educated or outspoken community leaders rather than the organizers, participatory grassroots leaders most affected by injustice.

INGOs also continue to silo issues and strategies, which means their structural capacities are also fragmented. By contrast, grassroots leaders are shaping their work around intersectionalities of issues in relation to their varied and intersecting identities and layered contexts. Finally, existing funding structures, dominated by a handful of major donors, make it difficult for organizations working in emerging spaces—especially those led by youth—to have access to resources, creating a vicious cycle in which initiatives addressing new challenges in innovative ways are punished for doing so.
Collective Civic Participation

Engaging Youth to Renew Civil Society

A new paradigm of global leadership requires new frameworks to orient structures and practice for sustainable global development. The Collective Civic Participation Framework (CCPF) is a blueprint for formal institutions to use to reorient their work towards building an effective architecture for participation that will create more onramps for civic action from everyday people. This framework should guide INGO practitioners to foster participatory global leadership in emergent generations and create the necessary architecture that enables leaders to build translocal, networked communities for sustainable development. The CCPF is based on an underlying premise that youth are primary drivers of change and that global institutions must fundamentally shift approaches to successfully leverage the untapped power and potential of collective action and participatory citizenship in the networks and movements reshaping civil society. With effective implementation, the global development sector will achieve the following outcomes:

- **A generative pipeline** for global participatory leadership, grounded in grassroots networks, that scales capacity for collective action around iterative, innovative solutions.

- **Strong, translocal architecture** for participation that enables dynamic networks and movements to build multiple pathways for diverse communities to get involved.

- **Sustainable, decentralized funding sources** that directly fund youth or fund reliable, intermediary organizations whose mission is to build strategic capacity and connective infrastructure that accelerates community-generated action.

CSIs seeking to improve their own impacts and more effectively foster youth participatory citizenship should consider the following core principles of CCPF:

- **Develop a holistic architecture of participation** by shifting institutional structures and resources to identify participatory leaders and help them proliferate systemic solutions, rooted in the grassroots.

- **Align across organizations to collaborate**, share resources and build collective capacity throughout the sector.

- **Redefine impact and value** to measure participatory leadership, collective action and strong networks at all levels.

Testing Collective Civic Participation

For CSIs to actualize this framework, we must work with the campaigns, networks and movements embodying the new “global leadership”—participatory citizenship—to iteratively test the CCPF. Through this Emerging Catalysts project research, we built coalition of close to thirty organizations and donors that share a commitment to adapting their work to meet the needs of this changing landscape. To move this forward with intention, our goal is to instate a Global Citizenship Lab, a hub of learning, testing and exchange for organizations and donors to engender the CCPF’s initial blueprint.

The Global Citizenship Lab will enables INGOs to define and clarify their role in serving as effective intermediaries between high-level advocacy and grassroots initiatives and movements. Working together, members mitigate risk, coordinate resources and build shared sector knowledge and infrastructure for campaign and movement support. By testing and adapting Collective Civic Participation Framework principles into their work organizations can better root priorities for sustainable global development and shift systems to truly work for people—worldwide.
section two

INTRODUCTION
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Today, young people under the age of thirty make up just over half of the world’s population, coming of age at a time when global socioeconomic inequality is increasing in almost every country around the world. Youth are bearing the brunt of this, with high unemployment rates and lower opportunities for access and mobility. This is not only a phenomenon in primarily Global South countries, where youth outstrip other demographics, but also in the aging countries of the Global North, where youth unemployment rates and lack of social mobility have become major political issues. Meanwhile, youth civic participation has fallen in every measured indicator—voting, joining a political group, boycotting—with the exception of volunteering. In Europe, for example, only 13% of youth surveyed in the 2012 Eurobarometer believe that joining a political party is an effective way to channel their views. Civil society practitioners then worry about a seeming decline in youth participation and rightly so.

Our research began with the question of how to deepen youth leadership for global development in Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. We targeted youth here specifically because they live in countries with some of the largest budgets for international development aid and therefore, potentially have a disproportionate influence on the future of global development and aid. To ensure proper youth representation, close to 100 youth from all target countries and a coalition of representatives from over twenty-five leading global development and youth leadership organizations participated in surveys and data collection and helped shape recommendations for how to more effectively engage youth and foster their global leadership. This report reinforces the importance of youth leadership and buy-in to successfully achieve global sustainable development goals and create an active and engaged generation equipped to tackle the most pressing issues of our time. We examine the trends of youth engagement in civil society more deeply, expose why youth are critical in this changing civil society landscape and how their energy can be best leveraged towards positive social change and global development.

What we have found is that youth are participating possibly more than ever—just differently—and along the way, they are disrupting and reshaping the institutionalized civil society landscape.

What we have found is that youth are participating possibly more than ever—just differently—and along the way, they are disrupting and reshaping the institutionalized civil society landscape. They are engaging issues through more informal, yet highly networked channels, participating in movement-minded approaches outside of established mechanisms generally promoted by the traditional civil society sector orienting their work towards building translocal relationships and infrastructure and redefining the concepts of citizenship based on identity-driven politics and injustice. Youth are working on local manifestations of global issues, using technology to build local-local connections with groups in different spaces doing similar work. In so doing, they are challenging traditional conceptions of what global, national and local work means.
section three

ABOUT THE RESEARCH

This research sought to combine qualitative and quantitative data from individuals with an overarching analysis of the sector in order to determine broad trends while also representing individual experiences. The final sections of this report contains a blueprint for civil society institutions to use as a guide to adapting better practices to engaging youth and enabling stronger active citizenship. Accompanying this blueprint is an actionable strategy that suggests concrete steps for how to implement the recommendations. To arrive at these recommendations, our research process included the following elements:

SECTOR MAPPING

We mapped 425 civil society institutions across the six target countries—Australia, Canada, France, Germany, United Kingdom and United States. While mapping all major INGOs, we also sought out groups characterized by one or more of the following criteria: (1) focus on global sustainable development; (2) focus on youth development and engagement; (3) focus on social change issues correlating with the SDGs. You can find a visualization of the data at www.rhize.org/sector-map

YOUTH EXPERIENCES OF SUPPORT

Quantitative and qualitative survey and interview data from eighty-five selected Emerging Catalysts offered insight into youth leadership journeys and trends. We analyzed support received, best practices and continuing gaps. We compared this to the sector map to see what existing support youth found helpful and what required strengthening. We incorporated existing literature to round out the picture of current youth involvement practices. Additionally Emerging Catalysts served an advisory role in the creation of the final recommendations.

PRACTITIONER PERSPECTIVES

We built a coalition with twenty-nine diverse institutional partners from the sector, representatives of which made up our Sector Advisory Team. Members contributed to research, data collection and recommendations through monthly calls and individual interviews. These partners helped us reach new youth networks, better map the sector and provide insightful inputs into our analysis of best practices and trends. We also presented initial findings during the 2016 International Civil Society Week in Bogotá, where we reached more sector leaders and received feedback through an intensive, half-day workshop.

LITERATURE REVIEW

We examined existing research, including academic publications as well as papers and reports from seventeen organizations, that relate to youth participation, trends in youth involvement in the social change, and current engagement frameworks in the sector. This laid a critical foundation as we looked at best practices and current operating frameworks for youth involvement.
Meet Some of the Emerging Catalysts

These six Emerging Catalysts exemplify the leadership of many of the youth we engaged throughout the research. We profile them here as examples of the diverse and nuanced ways youth are leading.

**MEET SOME OF THE EMERGING CATALYSTS**

**ADAM EVERILL**

**GENDER & LGBTI EQUALITY**

**Australia**

**LEADING BY:**
Training a new generation of advocates to end gender based violence

**ABOUT:**
Adam founded Equal Playing Field, an organization doing community outreach and education to end gender based violence through the power of sports. To date, Adam has trained hundreds of volunteers to deliver Equal Playing Field’s training in schools and raised $500,000 for programming in Australia and Papua New Guinea.

**JOANNES PAULUS YIMBESALU**

**HEALTH**

**Canada**

**LEADING BY:**
Ensuring healthy futures and quality education for Cameroonian youth

**ABOUT:**
Joannes immigrated to Canada from rural Cameroon as a child. He is now working on a project in his hometown in Cameroon to improve the quality of care in terms of diagnosis and treatment of childhood diseases as well as their prevention. To date, he has increased school retention rates by 20% through increased infrastructure around access to water and hygiene as well as increased availability of books.

*Photo: Alejandra Sorto, USA, Long Island Civic Engagement*
LEADING BY:
Campaigning for women’s equality, health and sustainable development

ABOUT:
Isma is a Youth Ambassador with the ONE Campaign and a champion of aid and sustainable development. Through her work, she has galvanized local and national participation in advocacy campaigns addressing issues at the intersection of poverty alleviation, gender and LGBTI equality. Isma has met with and lobbied politicians to pressure them to increase funding for the Global Fund against AIDS and for women and girls living in poverty around the world.

ISMA BENBOULERBAH
France
PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

LEADING BY:
Building community power to end sexism

ABOUT:
Kristina is a movement builder focused on creating more space for women in the public sphere and building support for survivors of sexual assault. Her work has included putting pressure on media companies and outlets for displays of overt sexism, as well as a campaign to eliminate the scapegoating of refugees as sexual predators—operating at the intersection of advocacy for both refugees and survivors of sexual assault. To date, she has mobilized public support for three campaigns and built partnerships with UN Women and seven other NGOs in the women and girls sector.

KRISTINA LUNZ
Germany
GENDER & LGBTI EQUALITY

LEADING BY:
Enabling community-led solutions for education and development

ABOUT:
Zoe volunteered in Kenya though the Changing Worlds program during her gap year before university. This experience inspired her to co-found Nakuru Children’s Project, which raises funds to improve education and reduce poverty for children in Nakuru, Kenya. Nakuru community members lead the initiative, identifying specific community needs and funds required to address them. With this input, Zoe and her team raise the funds for these projects. To date they have raised over $30,000 in education funding for the community.

ZOE KELLEND
United Kingdom
POVERTY ALLEVIATION

LEADING BY:
Building a global network of local leaders on sexual and reproductive health

ABOUT:
Burcu is a Co-Founder of the International Youth Alliance for Family Planning (IYAFP), a youth-led global network that offers support, resources, and direct funding for youth leaders focused on sexual and reproductive health issues. Through IYAFP, Burcu has engaged and connected over 1000 youth leaders working on these issues in their local communities, increasing their impact through capacity-building and access to a support network.

BURCU BOZKART
United States
HEALTH
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THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

Youth and Civil Society at a Crossroads
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Civil Society in Crisis

International development and human rights institutions are at a crossroads: over the last seventy years, INGOs, with the ostensible role of challenging the status quo to promote social change, have become associated with upholding it. They have developed professional staff, funding strategies and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms oriented around supporting formal national and local NGOs. Yet, over the last decade, the civil society landscape has dramatically shifted. The growth of youth populations has given rise to more informal networks and social movements that do not fit the traditional profile of groups INGOs typically support. These new actors challenge the effectiveness and legitimacy of age-old institutions and put formal INGOs in a tenuous position.

In a 2014 open letter to formal civil society actors, CIVICUS, a leading organization that promotes and monitors global civil society, writes:

"Sadly, those of us who work in civil society organisations nationally and globally have come to be identified as part of the problem. We are the poor cousins of the global jet set."

Practitioners from dozens of similar INGOs echo this concern, as they actively grapple with how to move the large, bureaucratic structures of their institutions to become more responsive to a growing constellation of social movements and the youth that drive them. They recognize that their collective ability to achieve the SDGs by 2030 is contingent on answering these questions. A confluence of larger, societal trends have ushered in this institutional existential crisis: the youth bulge that has made this generation of youth the largest voting bloc in history, unprecedented economic inequality, the democratization of access to information and communication through new technologies and a decline in civil liberties that have correlated with a rise in radicalization and closing of democratic space.

"The growth of youth populations has given rise to more informal networks and social movements that do not fit the traditional profile of groups INGOs typically support. These new actors challenge the effectiveness and legitimacy of age-old institutions and put formal INGOs in a tenuous position."
YOUTH: MORE DISENGAGED THAN EVER?

Youth are bearing the brunt of growing socioeconomic inequality, with high unemployment rates and lower opportunities for access and mobility. This is not only a phenomenon in primarily Global South countries, where youth outstrip other demographics, but also in the aging countries of the Global North, where youth unemployment rates and lack of social mobility have become major political issues.¹¹

Meanwhile, youth civic participation, with the exception of volunteering, has fallen in every measured indicator: voting, joining a political group and boycotting.¹² In Europe, for example, only 13% of youth surveyed in the 2012 Eurobarometer believe that joining a political party is an effective way to channel their views.¹³ Youth’s growing mistrust in government’s ability to respond adequately to societal needs, as seen in both their low participation in voting processes and engagement with traditional medial and news outlets has begun to extend to formal civil society institutions as well.¹⁴ INGOs have depoliticized their agendas in order to appeal to funders—large and small donors, including individuals, foundations and governments, and not to the communities they purport to serve. Reliant on government relationships and funding, youth perceive INGOs as extensions of, or closely aligned with, the same government agendas that have disillusioned them.

This does not mean that youth are less interested in social and political involvement. Despite perceived disengagement, this report tells a different story. Youth are at the helm of the new forces driving social change: dynamic networks, movements, enterprises and other initiatives. They are invested in making purposeful contributions to society but in different ways than their predecessors.¹⁶ As youth identify less with institutions that have given older generations more social and political belonging, they turn to more self-organized networks for support and recognition, based on new conceptions of membership, identity and commitment.¹⁶ For example, interest in political issues has remained stable in Europe for the past decade.¹⁷ However, having less money to give in uncertain economies, youth prefer to donate time, skills and effort instead.¹⁸
A CALL FOR NEW GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

International development practitioners share justifiable worry about the seeming decline in youth participation when the cultivation of new “global leadership” is needed more than ever. As leadership scholar and veteran activist Marshall Ganz asserts, “The need for leadership (a need often not met) is evident when encounters with the uncertain demand adaptive, heuristic, or innovative response: ...new threats loom, a sudden opportunity appears, social conditions change, new technology changes the rules, and so on.”

Ratifying the SDGs in 2015, with a fifteen year horizon, renewed the international community’s focus on not just on the future of global development but also on the leaders positioned to drive it. For many INGOs, their mission and funding, and by extension, their existence, is tied to their ability to make gains in the 180 determined targets.

The argument for youth leadership is the right one. Ganz affirms, “Young people often come of age with a critical eye, an evaluation of their parent’s generation, and a hopeful heart, almost a biological necessity.” Current uncertainties around economic stability, hegemony, ubiquitous threats of violence—both from the state and independent actors—means practitioners must build new paradigms around youth’s current experiences. International institutions struggle to stay visible and relevant due to increasingly complex geopolitics, unstable domestic politics and shrinking aid budgets from many of the target countries in this study. Without young people’s investment in global development, organizations fear they will not be able to garner the visibility and thus the funding to execute the sizable action needed to achieve the Global Goals.

Central to this challenge is the question of how to close the seeming leadership gap between global leaders and the way youth are leading in their communities to foster the type of leadership youth will respond to. Despite progress, the sector continues to perceive youth participation in outmoded ways. INGOs recognize the necessity of youth to develop as “global citizens” that can inherit and bring new solutions to today’s global challenges. Yet, they struggle to recognize, measure and create strategies adequately responsive to the new ways youth are already involved. If INGOs want to create a new pipeline of leaders that can take on the SDGs, they must look to current youth leaders to understand the new concept of global citizenship for the Millennial generation.

Changing Conceptions of Global Citizenship

As conceptions of institutions’ role in civil society change, the standard notions of “global citizenship” also come into question. The rise in the number of social movements in the last decade, three times that of the preceding three decades, suggests that youth increasingly stand up to traditional authority figures and reject representative modes of leadership. Through movements and other extra-institutional groups, youth seek more direct involvement in reshaping the social and political systems they call into question.
The concept of “global citizen” is used in different contexts. More broadly, people use it to refer to someone who is informed and engaged in issues outside of one’s own country or culture and generally has had experiences abroad.\textsuperscript{22} In global development, it generally connotes inhabitants of the Global North working to alleviate the poverty of those in the Global South.

Scholars talk about notions of citizenship from older generations as “passive” or as related to one’s legal status. In “Changing Citizenship in the Digital Age,” W. Lance Bennett, refers to the “dutiful citizen” as one who participates in civil society out of a sense of obligation.\textsuperscript{22} These citizens join traditional political parties, trade associations or charity-based organizations as “card-carrying” members and constituents. Formal associations of this nature outline a set of beliefs and serve as an orderly social structure that creates belonging, community and identity. It is from these beliefs and structures that such citizens have traditionally come to view voting as a core democratic act in their civic involvement and obtain news and information from mass media.\textsuperscript{24} In comparison with Millennials, those born between 1980-2000, members of older generations are far more likely to be members of established political parties and consistently have higher voter turnout than youth under thirty, by large margins.\textsuperscript{25}

The dutiful citizen’s relationship to institutions lends itself to a more centralized membership model, where professionalized staff or volunteers are responsible for recruiting members, organizing all activities, fundraising and deciding what tactics to use. Leaders are elected or appointed, given titles and operate within a clear hierarchical structure. This means that, over the course of decades, NGOs have developed “clear ideas about what constitutes effective engagement” and uses
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those strategies to engage a formal membership. By contrast, the “actualizing citizen,” distinct from the dutiful citizen, joins groups that speak to their identity and values rather than doing so out of a sense of duty. Actualizing citizens are more skeptical about their power to affect change through elections or traditional political processes alone. Citizenship is not a legal status but rather a way to assert one’s individual rights. They feel less obligated to government or established institutions, which may seem distant and inauthentic. Instead, they tend to work in looser, more networked ways, centered on community action. They do not center voting as a core democratic activity, but focus their civic involvement on volunteerism, transnational activism and personal consumer practices. This trend is reflected in declining levels of youth participation across all established civic indicators, excepting volunteerism, which has seen an increase.

FROM DIRECTIVE TO DEMOCRATIZED

As citizens’ relationship to institutions have changed, the ways they participate in social change have shifted from a more centralized, directive model to more autonomous, loosely networked one. Civil society institutions’ (CSIs’) continuing focus on dutiful citizenship lags behind the trend towards the more personalized, peer-influenced actualizing citizenship profile. For example, one of Amnesty International’s most well-known public campaigns is “Write for Rights,” where members send in letters in support of releasing specific prisoners of conscience to political authorities in order to call for their freedom or better treatment. This organization-based “call to action” occurs annually and has a specific focus and direction from Amnesty International’s Secretariat. Amnesty International’s campaign approach focuses on a conception of the dutiful citizen assumed to...
have buy-in by virtue of organizational membership, and who will participate in sending letters on behalf of a broad range of non-issue specific prisoners of conscience. It is a one-way, directed and more organizationally-centered relationship.

The rise of digital media has challenged broadcast information channels, top-down platforms designed for one-way communication. Social media platforms democratize both access to information and voice. Pew Research Global found that Millennials are more likely to be social media users compared to those thirty-five years and older. The study found that the gap in social media use between millennials and those over thirty-five is significant in thirty of forty countries surveyed. This gap is prevalent in both Global North and Global South countries.

Social media acts as a democratized space that lowers barriers to initial participation, where more people can take part without “official” membership. What used to be created by resourced institutions and physical spaces can now be created with a few clicks, anywhere in the world. People play a more active role in documenting and creating news, editorializing and connecting with others of similar views. This has created new avenues to make social, cultural and political contributions, formerly limited to the actions people were invited to take by centrally managed organizations.

The Current “Architecture for Participation”

More democratization of action has begun to create a new “architecture of participation” where people now have more ways to engage in civil society than ever before. Digital tools make barriers to participation much lower, where simply a smartphone or Internet access allows one to engage. New media allows people to see and hear about the real life experiences of their peers,

### The Changing Citizenry: The Traditional Civic Education Ideal of the Dutiful Citizen versus the Emerging Youth Experience of Self-Actualizing Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUALIZING CITIZEN</th>
<th>DUTIFUL CITIZEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diminished sense of government obligation— higher sense of individual purpose</td>
<td>Obligation to participate in government centered activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting is less meaningful than other, more personally defined acts such as consumerism, community volunteering, or transnational activism</td>
<td>Voting is the core democratic act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust of media and politicians is reinforced by negative mass media environment</td>
<td>Becomes informed about issues and government by following mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favors loose networks of community action— often established or sustained through friendships and thin social ties maintained by interactive information technologies</td>
<td>Joins civil society organizations and/or expresses interests through parties that typically employ one-way conventional communication to mobilize supporters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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which attracts them to more direct and authentic experiences in other aspects of their life. Digital natives prefer to give time, skills and effort over money to a cause because the impact is often clearer and more immediate. Donating can feel like a remote action if managed by a large institution, where it is hard to track funds. Crowdfunding creates more personalized choices on projects where people can see the results—whether helping to launch a new product, support a sick family member or help a child pay for school.

“Suddenly the engagement approaches CSIs have perfected over the course of decades seem less authentic, more fabricated and less attractive than what youth could find online, where there is more personalized choice.”

Suddenly the engagement approaches CSIs have perfected over the course of decades seem less authentic, more fabricated and less attractive than what youth could find online, where there is more personalized choice. CSIs can only create so many actions for people to take with their limited paid staff and cannot compete with the infinite entry points created by new media.

While some youth do not wait for an invitation to get involved given the increased access points made available by new digital tools, many youth still need pathways to guide their leadership development. The space that youth are given to be involved in and have ownership of informs the level of commitment the majority will ultimately have. Strategic capacity, as Ganz defines it, creates the conditions for innovation and leadership. “Development of effective strategy is more likely to occur [when participants] are highly motivated, enjoy access to diverse sources of salient knowledge, and employ deliberative practices committed to learning,” he writes. Motivation, combined with voluntary opportunities to be more committed to the outcomes, creates more effective action. Entities that have more finite resources, greater restrictions and directive agendas that do not allow its members to work strategically, tend to temper creativity.

CSIs recognize the need for youth to bring new ideas and innovative solutions to the table, but creating the right conditions for them to take creative action is fundamental to realizing this potential.

Using the sector data of 425 international, national and local civic groups in our six target countries—Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States—and data from eighty-five Emerging Catalysts, we examined the strengths and gaps in civil society sector architecture for participation of youth.

To do this, we first looked at the types of roles youth are playing in each group and then examined the range of activities in which youth are participating. Note that the majority of the initiatives mapped are formal organizations, with staff and budgets. Using the sector data of 425 international, national and local civic groups in our six target countries—Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States—and data from eighty-five Emerging Catalysts, we examined the strengths and gaps in civil society sector architecture for participation of youth.

THE YOUTH INVOLVEMENT FRAMEWORK

The Youth Involvement Framework explains the role youth serve in organized institutions. Adapted from Advocates for Youth, a leading youth-focused advocacy organization, the five indicators represent different approaches to involving youth in an organization’s work: No Engagement, Youth as Assets, Youth as Recipients, Youth as Partners and Youth as Leaders.
## THE YOUTH INVOLVEMENT FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVOLVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO ENGAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>Water Aid is a global charity, with operations throughout the Global South and Australia, Canada, the United States and Japan, that creates access to clean water. Focused largely on service delivery, the general public is given two ways to support their work: by donating and through advocacy. Anyone can sign up on their website for action alerts, but there is no specific youth engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOUTH AS ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>Based in Berlin, the GandhiServe Foundation conducts research and implements education programs to promote the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. Through their “Gandhi Bridge of Understanding” program, foundation staff organize painting events for youth ages ten to eighteen in India and Germany. Youth from both countries are also encouraged to write letters to each other and reflect on their experiences with the project and new understandings of peace and nonviolence. Their art is then displayed in venues throughout Germany, the United States and the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOUTH AS RECIPIENTS</strong></td>
<td>Jeun’ESS, the youth initiative created by the French platform “Say Yess,” promotes a new vision for a fairer, more equitable society through a Social and Solidarity Economy (ESS). Jeun’ESS works to build awareness amongst youth in order to create stronger backing for ESS by providing employment support and offering a digital toolkit for youth to build skills to recruit others, hold events and/or contribute to a magazine. The initiative is run by professional staff who create various volunteer opportunities for Jeun’ESS members, remaining largely separate from Say Yess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOUTH AS PARTNERS</strong></td>
<td>The Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR) supports a youth network that is run and led by youth, who are volunteers, advocates and community workers in their respective communities. The youth network reaches out to refugee youth and runs its own workshops and strategy sessions and develops projects by and with refugee youth. CCR recognizes the youth network leaders as critical and unique partners in advancing their overall mission. CCR supports the youth network’s priorities, supports their programs as needed and fully integrates them into their broader work so there is continuity amongst all of CCR’s efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YOUTH AS LEADERS</strong></td>
<td>The Black Youth Project 100 (BYP100) is a national network of city-based chapters throughout the United States, led by black youth dedicated to “creating justice and freedom for all black people.” They have their own mission, and each chapter determines its own local strategies. Chapters work in partnership with other organizations that are part of the broader Movement for Black Lives as it strategically makes sense for their agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, opportunities that allow youth to have ownership and autonomy in their work build youth commitment over time, often leading to the retention of these leaders over their lifetimes. When mapping the sector in terms of involvement, we place each of these approaches on an “engagement ladder” or “commitment curve,” where time (x axis) and investment in youth + level of effort of youth (y axis) equates the degree of commitment and retention to social change work. The spectrum reflects the degree of commitment each type of involvement builds, with no engagement obviously creating the least amount of commitment over time and youth involved as leaders creating the most. However based on our mapping, we can see that the sector overall has not invested in ways that reflect this value for youth as partners and leaders.

We applied the Youth Involvement Framework across the sector map to all 425 institutions in order to understand overall trends and institutional perceptions of youth. Across the sector, we found youth were involved in the following ways:

At 30% involvement of youth as leaders, the sector has made great strides. However, the same percentage of CSIs either have no engagement with youth or involve youth as assets. Another 25% involve youth as recipients. Only 14% work with youth as partners, which is often more difficult as it takes more effort to create shared infrastructure or priorities.

Deepening our analysis, we distinguished “youth-focused” organizations, groups in which youth are explicitly part of their mission, from other groups. Here we saw a slightly different picture of youth involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVOLVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ENGAGED</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS ASSETS</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS RECIPIENTS</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS PARTNERS</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS LEADERS</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations oriented toward youth have a higher likelihood of working with youth as leaders (45%) in comparison to the sector overall (30%). With this exception, interestingly, focusing specifically with and
for youth does not change the overall orientation of the landscape. In all other categories, these organizations are generally on par with the overall sector. The percentage of youth as recipients (23%) and youth as assets (18%) are within two percentage points of the overall sector groupings. Youth-focused organizations also involve youth slightly less as partners (11%) than the sector overall (14%), but one factor for this could be that youth organizations are working more directly with youth, rather than as partners.

We then analyzed youth involvement in organizations classified as INGOs, which represent small and large players in global development and human rights that have headquarters in at least one of the study’s six target countries. This group is significant because it includes the major humanitarian organizations that retain the largest portion resources in the global development sector (as opposed to nationally-based Global South organizations or grassroots groups).41 INGOs’ youth involvement approaches were examined based on how they involved domestic youth audiences in the country of their international headquarters, not how they are engaging beneficiaries abroad:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INGOs</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ENGAGED</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS ASSETS</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS RECIPIENTS</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS PARTNERS</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS LEADERS</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In stark contrast with youth-focused organizations, INGOs involve youth as recipients (43%) almost as much as they engage youth as leaders (45%). They work with youth as leaders only half as much as the sector average (30%). They involve youth as assets largely on par with the sector and youth-focused organizations’ average (19%). This analysis reveals how INGOs have much more centralized and formal operations, even in comparison to CSIs more broadly, as involving youth as recipients usually means highly managed or controlled structures. The relative lack of leadership opportunities begins to reveal a clearer picture of the infrastructure to support youth pathways to leadership in global development and advocacy.

To further contextualize the sector and INGOs’ involvement, we looked at how the largely informal, networked initiatives, which include formal networks, grassroots groups, campaigns, and digital platforms, involve youth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMAL NETWORKED INITIATIVES</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ENGAGED</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS ASSETS</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS RECIPIENTS</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS PARTNERS</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS LEADERS</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the numbers are almost reversed from INGOs and the sector with a small percentage of youth engaged as assets (18% and 4% respectively). Networks engage youth as partners 16% more than INGOs and 9% more than the sector average. They engage youth as recipients over three times less than INGOs and about half as much as the sector. For many of the networks classified as not engaged, they have no specific youth engagement but are not exclusionary. With networks, grassroots groups, campaigns and platforms creating more opportunity for youth to engage as leaders and partners, we see a continued emphasis on building leadership and incorporating youth voice.

Finally, to get a sense of how those considered exemplary youth leaders in the sector are involved, we examined Emerging Catalysts data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING CATALYSTS</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT ENGAGED</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS ASSETS</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS RECIPIENTS</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS PARTNERS</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS LEADERS</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intuitively, youth who both see themselves as leaders and have been validated as leaders are not involved in initiatives work with youth as assets in comparison with youth involved in 18% of youth-focused organizations and 16% of overall CSIs. Emerging Catalysts are involved as partners almost three times more than the 11.6% of youth-focused organizations and double the 14.6% of overall organizations. With 21% of Emerging Catalysts involved as recipients, in a similar range as youth-focused groups and CSIs overall, we can glean that, while not the majority, these initiatives can provide effective on-ramps for youth leadership development. Finally, while Emerging Catalysts and youth-focused initiatives are both oriented towards youth empowerment, the fact that they fell into the same percentage range (46% to 48%) as networked initiatives, as opposed to data sets with more centralized organizations, aligns with the literature that infers youth's preference to more networked, decentralized structures. This also starts to highlight the gaps in infrastructure that INGOs and the sector overall may need to close in order to enable more youth leadership.

**YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL CIVIL SOCIETY**

Participation is defined by the way that resources are organized and used to attain results. Understanding the way these roles play out through participation approaches—actions, activities and programs—helps create a clearer analysis of how youth access, participate and grow in the sector.

We determined to what extent organizations were investing in youth over time by categorizing organizations based on the primary participation opportunities they made available to youth. We analyzed the range of activities that youth participate in along the full spectrum of initiatives in the map—organizations, networks, platforms, etc. We identified a spectrum of nineteen activities and classified them with individual scores into five categories. Consistent with the commitment curve used in the Youth Involvement Framework, activity scores fall on a scale of 0 to 5.5, where 0 is no engagement and 5.5 is the highest level of investment in individual youth and requires the most effort from youth.

For example, advocacy and campaigning (2.3) asks for broad-based, low commitment actions (e.g., signing a petition, calling an elected official, showing up to an event). It is a low level of investment in each individual participant and requires a low-to-medium level of effort due to the directive nature of most of the associated actions. Meanwhile, when organizations provide direct funding (5.4) to youth-led initiatives, it is a high level of investment and requires substantive action, therefore building a commitment because youth are both enabled to lead and accountable for following through.

**youth involvement by country**

Looking at Youth Involvement by country, we can see differences in attitudes across geographies:

Australia, France and Germany had the highest percentage of institutions that had no youth engagement, each around 17% where the United Kingdom had the lowest percentage at 6%.

Germany and the United States engaged the most youth as assets with just under 20% on average while Canada and France had the lowest percentages at 4% and 8%, respectively.

Canada and France had the highest engagement of youth as recipients at 36% while the United Kingdom had the lowest percentage at 18%.

The United Kingdom had the highest percentage of institutions that engaged youth as partners at 25%, almost nine points ahead of the next country (the United States), while Canada had the lowest engagement at 6%.

Canadian institutions engaged the highest percentage of youth as leaders at 43%, at least eight points ahead of all other countries with Germany at the lowest of 26%.

Interestingly, the majority of involvement across every country (with the exception of France) was by way of youth as leaders. However, similar to the overall data, an average of 27% of CSIs within each country have no engagement with youth or involve youth as assets.
YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL CIVIL SOCIETY: DATA ANALYSIS

**Key**

5.5 = Community Organizing & Movement Building
5.4 = Direct Funding
5.3 = Leadership development
5.2 = Leadership opportunities
5.1 = Research & Policy Development
4.3 = Creating Capacity, Tools & Resources
4.2 = Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity
4.1 = Incubator/Accelerator
3.3 = Training & Skills
3.2 = Donor
3.1 = Fundraising
2.3 = Advocacy/Campaigning
2.2 = Immersion/Experiential
2.1 = Volunteerism
1.4 = Events/Workshops/Conference
1.3 = Media/Content Creation/Storytelling
1.2 = Education/Awareness Raising
1.1 = Service Delivery/Aid
0 = No Engagement
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While there are some distinctions from country to country, participation tends to cluster around similar activities. The data clusters around the most common types of participation and begins to reveal trends in how the sector is investing in youth participation. From most to least, the top five avenues for participation across the sector, with 38% of activities spread across the other categories, are (as pictured in the graph):

1. Advocacy and Campaigning (tied) 2.3
2. No Engagement (tied) 0.0
3. Creating Capacity, Tools and Resources 4.3
4. Movement-Building and Community-Organizing 5.5
5. Coalition-Building, Network Development and Solidarity 4.2

Given the current perceptions of global citizenship, it makes sense that the sector would be heavily invested in advocacy and campaigning. Advocacy reflects a citizen-government/institution relationship as a theory of political change. Campaigns usually mobilize participants around a targeted official or person in power. Over the last decade, digital campaigning has become more pervasive, used by virtual organizations.
like GetUp.org in Australia and SumofUs.org based globally. Older, larger NGOs like Greenpeace and the American Civil Liberties Union also use digital tools to mobilize their constituencies at key moments. While some groups like Avaaz and MoveOn have created ways for everyday citizens to create their own petitions, most groups still develop their own campaigns that they then disseminate to the masses. These types of actions create short-term wins but struggle to maintain continuity to a cause. It should also be noted that while volunteerism is the only civic engagement indicator that has increased in the past decade, it represents only 6% of the activities sponsored by CSIs. This is an example of how the sector may be missing opportunities to engage with youth.

Emerging Catalysts’ top three participation activities were advocacy and campaigning (20%) as well as coalition-building, network development and solidarity and movement-building and community-organizing (both 15.3%). Aside from no engagement this aligns with CSIs’ top activities. One conclusion that could be drawn from this is that youth leaders are taking the opportunities most available to them to participate. Most of their activities correlate with CSIs’ most invested in activities. However, some interesting contrasts also emerged.

Looking at INGO specific data, we gain a clearer understanding of the infrastructure available to support youth pathways to global leadership. 21% of INGOs focus on advocacy and campaigning, with no engagement coming in close second with 20%. Here again we see the CSIs meant to uphold international civil society infrastructure and engagement failing to invest deeply in youth. Overwhelmingly, INGOs invest little in individual youth leaders and require a low level of effort from youth who wish to participate.

Emerging Catalysts participation data reflects a drive towards volunteerism. Because our respondents skew towards international work, though, service delivery and aid (international volunteer experience) was the fourth largest activity (14%) as opposed to 2% of the activities invested in by CSIs. It also seems to correlate with youth’s desire for authentic experiences. Slightly less stark but also telling is that youth leaders are participating in immersion experiences three times more than CSI opportunities. Where CSIs invested a relatively high amount of resources in training and skills development (7.5%, sixth in activity ranking), Emerging Catalysts noted engaging in this activity three times less (2.4%, eleventh in activity ranking). What this disparity could mean is that youth leaders simply did not recognize training as a primary activity they were engaged in and that training is a part of other activities in which they participate. For example, advocacy or community organizing training as part of those activities. Another factor influencing this difference is that the type of trainings CSIs offer do not speak to the needs and wants of youth they seek to target. These needs are reflected in the heavy concentration of Emerging Catalysts engaged as recipients (generally category 3 and 4 activities).

Overall, the sector still has major gaps in its participation architecture for youth to build leadership over time. It appears to invest in youth with different levels of commitment—the highly committed who largely find their own pathways to leadership or the low level commitments that help CSIs advance their agendas. Gaps in investment in activities that create the continuity youth need to develop strategic action shows that the sector tends to see youth as implementers of predetermined agendas or only recognize the few who distinguish themselves as leaders. There is heavy investment in one or two activities each in categories 3 through 5. For example, there is a gap in category 4 and 5 activities regarding programs that connect youth with funding (1.2% CSI investment), help them incubate or accelerate new ideas (0.24%) and conduct their own research for policy development (1.2%). Activities in the middle and top of the spectrum can help youth access the skills and capacities that enable motivation and resources for leadership. Connective architecture that leads youth through a continuum of actions will create pathways for them to further their commitment and ultimately grow their leadership.

If we compare youth involvement and participation activities, we can see that typically...
organizations that engage youth as leaders trend towards having much higher scored activities available for youth to participate in. Conversely, organizations that engage youth as assets cluster towards lower scored participation strategies. Therefore, if organizations can start with a perspective of youth as leaders or partners and adopt participation strategies that invest in youth and require sustained effort over time, the sector can position itself to build youth commitment to sustainable development long-term.

This is perhaps easiest to see when broken down by country. For example:

**Canadian CSIs**, which lead our target countries in involving youth as leaders (43%), invest significantly in capacity-building (15%) and leadership development (15%). In fact, they invest over 10% more in leadership development than any other country.

In the **United States**, CSIs have the highest percentage of youth involved as assets (20%). Participation approaches reflect this with greater investment in media and content creation (6%) and advocacy and campaigning (21%).

**France**, which has the most CSIs involving youth as recipients (36%), invests the highest concentration of resources in volunteerism (14%), 8% higher than the average for this activity across countries (6%).

Across country-specific data, we can see that Canada’s institutions orient around long-term investment in youth and have infrastructure equipped to develop leaders over time, fostering skills and growth. Institutions in Germany and the United States seem to aim for quantity over quality, providing less opportunities for youth to find their own voices and leadership beyond perhaps one-off programs or activities. The strengths and gaps in country specific architectures of participation clarifies consistent trends across the sector in addition to country specific interventions. For example, while we may want to bolster more of Canada’s development infrastructure, we need to support more programs focused on skills development and leadership in France.
section five

HOW YOUTH ARE RESHAPING THE CIVIL SOCIETY LANDSCAPE
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The current context of the civil society sector informs the backdrop in which youth serve as major players in reshaping it. This section helps us shed light on the nature of youth leadership today, largely in global development, and how it can be leveraged to inspire more leadership for greater impact.

The Local-Global Divide

GEOGRAPHIC ORIENTATION

When trying to identify youth leaders, INGOs must first know where to look. In the sector map, we analyzed each entity according to the geographic focus of their work using four classifications:

1. GLOBALLY-ORIENTED:
Based in one country but specifically focuses on issues outside of their region, largely in the Global North.

2. NATIONAL:
Focuses on issues within one country.

3. LOCAL:
Focuses on issues within one community, town or city.

4. LOCAL-GLOBAL:
Groups work in local or national communities and networks but have a clear connection, understanding or mission to groups working on a similar issue around the world.

INGOs tend to segment their international beneficiaries (usually located in the Global South) and their domestic constituencies (informed citizens concerned with global development issues in the Global South who live in the country of their central operations). As we see in the participation data, INGOs invest substantial funds in raising awareness in attempt to mobilize a broad-based domestic constituency of committed youth advocates with a “global” orientation. However, our data suggests that they are potentially targeting the wrong groups.

The primary breakdown of mapped CSIs by geographic focus is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSIs GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>42.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL</td>
<td>45.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL-GLOBAL</td>
<td>9.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the data skews towards global organizations, there still remains a total of 57.3% of groups that are not globally oriented. This correlates with the independent analysis of the Emerging Catalysts data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMERGING CATALYSTS GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhize’s call for Emerging Catalysts asked for youth who considered themselves “global leaders,” yet 60% still described themselves as working on domestic issues. While INGOs have a certain conception of the globally-conscious domestic constituency of youth, data begins to suggest that the majority of active, interested youth work in localized contexts and through different channels.

THE DOMESTIC-INTERNATIONAL OVERLAP OF ISSUES

INGOs tend to organize their work and funds in two overlapping siloes: issue focus and geography. This can be seen in the way that many INGOs are organized, where there are offices of regional expertise (East Africa, Latin America,
Southeast Asia) and technical issue expertise (gender, environment, education). Organizations tend to work either internationally or domestically because they see and define issues and contexts differently. World Vision runs “food security” programs where Feeding America focuses on “hunger.”

Transparency International, which works all over the world, talks about democracy and governance in terms of “corruption,” whereas League of Young Voters in the United Kingdom talks about it as ensuring young people vote. The nuance between each of these issues is real and should be examined closely, but the connection between them is also apparent despite different geographic orientations.

To better understand this divide, we used the SDGs as a guide to classify the main issue focus of the CSIs in our dataset into ten issue classifications that encompass both domestic and international concerns. We then examined the divide between what type of organization focused on what issue. Eight of the issue areas had a higher percentage of domestic organizations’ focus than global organizations. This holds true to the data, where there are more domestic groups mapped than international. However, two issues had a disproportionate focus from global organizations: poverty alleviation and partnerships for sustainable development. The first refers to institutions that do not have one specific focus but work on a range global development issues (9.8% of CSIs mapped). And the second refers to groups specifically focused on promoting the SDGs or strengthening global development advocacy and related infrastructure (9.3% of CSIs mapped).

This shows a bifurcated understanding of issues considered those of the Global North and those of the Global South—with CSIs in the Global North identifying poverty alleviation and sustainable development as issues that impact the Global South, or, more broadly, global development as opposed to local or national development.

This division between global and domestic efforts shows the clear divide between these two spheres despite the overlap in issues. Geographical focus certainly influences the way in which issues are framed, tackled and funded. This may be technically correct, but it may also be a contributing factor to the disconnect between local and global and, by extension, between engaged and disengaged global citizens. As youth trend toward seeing their domestic work connected to global issues, this potentially harmful orientation could decrease connectivity and negatively impact the sector’s architecture for participation. If non-global and global are disconnected and siloed from each other’s efforts, the sector may be using its scarce resources inefficiently, especially when it comes to engagement with youth, who are inherently making these connections outside of organizations’ program platforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE FOCUS*</th>
<th>GLOBAL</th>
<th>NON-GLOBAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE ACTION AND ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>75.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRACY, GOVERNANCE &amp; CIVIL SOCIETY</td>
<td>26.42%</td>
<td>71.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC JUSTICE</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD SECURITY &amp; SUSTAINABILITY</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER &amp; LGBTI EQUALITY</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>61.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTICE &amp; PEACE</td>
<td>38.37%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERSHIPS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>86.11%</td>
<td>73.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POVERTY ALLEVIATION</td>
<td>81.58%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For more in-depth data on the classification of these issues, see Appendix D.
Across interviews, Emerging Catalysts indicated a commitment to one specific issue and understanding how it manifested at the local level. As they became more deeply involved with their issue, they sought to connect their local work with broader networks of other actors working on manifestations of similar issues in different places. This could be done in order to multiply impact as part of an issue-based strategic initiative or campaign; to share knowledge and best practices with each other; to convene with like-minded organizers for emotional support and solidarity or some combination thereof.

In examining the perspectives and contexts in which youth leaders do their work, we found that 33.8% of Emerging Catalysts work with an explicitly global orientation. The majority of Emerging Catalysts are working on what they define as local or national initiatives. However, upon closer analysis, we found trends in working within broader networks, coalitions and digital spaces which complicated conceptions of local, national and globally-based work. While some youth have access to participate in INGOs, these opportunities predominantly engage youth through advocacy and campaigning, with priorities focused on either global advocacy or aid to the Global South. In the absence of traditional infrastructure to connect their local efforts with others, youth create their own networks and infrastructure to connect efforts across contexts. The International Youth Alliance for Family Planning is a prime example of a youth-led network seeking to connect local actions to a global network of support.

**HOW YOUTH ARE CONNECTING LOCAL AND GLOBAL ISSUES**

In the absence of traditional infrastructure to connect their local efforts with others, youth create their own networks and infrastructure to connect efforts across contexts.

**EMERGING CATALYST: BURCU BOZKART**

When Burcu co-founded the International Youth Alliance for Family Planning (IYAFP), she was seeking to create an international network of support for young leaders. In many ways, Burcu and her co-founders were starting from scratch because there was no existing infrastructure to support a youth-led translocal network. *IYAFP bridges the gap between respecting the autonomy of local leaders to determine tactics and priorities and connecting local efforts to a global network in order to increase impact and access to resources.* However, working translocally has not been particularly easy because many funding sources and partner organizations look for either local or global impact and are not oriented around work that may do both.

Burcu has seen funding and investment in area-specific infrastructure and projects. IYAFP is seeking to remedy these disjointed initiatives and increase translocal impact through one network. They recognize that leaders are working on reproductive health by changing context-specific perceptions, local laws, infrastructure deficits but are united in their ultimate visions—for women to have access to the care and resources they need to plan the families they want. To date, Burcu has worked to engage and connect over 1000 youth leading sexual and reproductive health work in their local communities, increasing their capacity and access to a support network critical to increasing their impact.
Flourishing young leaders are the best indicators of how to invest in participatory leadership and citizenship. Some youth leaders distinguish themselves as such either because of or regardless of participation opportunities. We look to them to further illuminate how we can embrace evolving notions of global citizenship. Examining the Emerging Catalysts’ journeys to leadership exposes common trends and elements that contributed to their ability to distinguish their work and impact their communities. The following section explores different leadership archetypes, unpacking how individuals representing each became leaders, how they are currently working and why their work is a driving force in reshaping the global civil society landscape as a result.

IDENTIFYING YOUTH LEADERS: SEVEN ARCHETYPES

We wanted to better understand what youth leadership looks like in practice. Seven archetypes surface from Emerging Catalyst data. Characterized by how they demonstrate their leadership, each archetype embodies the different profiles of Emerging Catalysts. As a result we got a fuller picture of who we mean by “youth leader.” It is important to acknowledge the fluidity of these archetypes, as young leaders may move from one archetype to another as they develop in their work and experience, or they may overlap. The seven categories of engagement we identified include the following:

- Average age of Emerging Catalysts was 24.
- 51% of Emerging Catalysts speak English as a first language. 24% speak English as a second language.
# The Seven Archetypes of Youth Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Resham</strong> works with Women2Win in the United Kingdom, helping to secure more representation of women in Parliament. Her work is rooted in established political organizations and made possible by full-time employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alex</strong> seeks out opportunities to volunteer abroad and provide direct service delivery to refugee communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Entrepreneurs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Arno</strong> is the co-founder of Coolar, a venture that develops cooling systems that enable doctors and health professionals throughout the Global South to preserve lifesaving medicine and vaccines in a reliable and eco-friendly way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Advocates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Linh</strong> co-founded The Verb—a digital news platform—to make global policy issues accessible to communities around the world and increase awareness and advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Movement Builders or “Organizers”</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gurjinder</strong> leads the Labour Campaign to End Homeless, working to mobilize his community and put pressure on local politicians in the United Kingdom to prioritize homelessness as an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Activists</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jesse</strong> is the founder of Powerline, a mobile app and web communications platform designed to strengthen relationships and accountability between constituents and their elected officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspirants</strong></td>
<td><strong>Minh Quang</strong>, who lives in the United Kingdom, launched the short-term volunteer effort Imperfection Project in his hometown in Vietnam, which has increased his interest in growing his leadership through longer-term opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Archetype**

- **Professionals**: who build interest in the world and experience as leaders through working in established organizations and businesses that relate to the issues they care about.

- **Volunteers**: who tend to work alongside traditional organizations or INGOs, providing direct service to at-risk communities.

- **Social Entrepreneurs**: who start their own enterprises with an international development focus, often in countries in which they do not have a personal connection.

- **Global Advocates**: who focus on international advocacy in order to create change on global issues that they see manifested in their local context.

- **Local Movement Builders or “Organizers”**: who work on issues that directly affect their community or country. Usually these issues are framed as local issues but they often have relevance and potential connection to global issues.

- **Digital Activists**: include young people who are social media influencers. They share content, launch digital petitions or campaigns and encourage and mobilize others to take online actions to support specific causes and issues. This group includes both citizen journalists documenting global and local events and youth leaders who use digital platforms as a main source of communication, action, organizing and amplification.

- **Aspirants**: describe young people who are still formulating their role in social change. They want to be more civically engaged, start their own ventures and have an interest in politics, but have yet to identify a sustained way to participate, whether through a career or as a volunteer. They engage through media, awareness-raising or one-off volunteer opportunities which increases their interest in deeper engagement in the future.
Where Youth Leaders Come From

Pathways to Activation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archetype</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>21.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Advocate</td>
<td>18.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirant</td>
<td>14.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Activist</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Entrepreneur</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>18.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Movement Builder</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the biggest distinctions between archetypes is the way in which they engage with formal institutions. Professionals, volunteers and aspirants rely typically on the infrastructure and programs created by existing CSIs for participation opportunities. Global advocates can be associated with traditional institutions—participating in directive global advocacy campaigns. Though often global advocates create new structures and pathways to connect their local issues to global systems. Meanwhile, digital activists, organizers and social entrepreneurs participate more autonomously, through informal or network-based structures: Digital activists develop and use multiple entry points through new technologies; local movement builders build participation through decentralized networks and social entrepreneurs root their work in innovative solutions outside of pre-existing infrastructure.

While many youth do work through current formal infrastructure to build commitment, others either work in informal spaces. The digital activist, local movement builder and social entrepreneur archetypes, 25% of the overall archetypes, structure their work differently and participate in more innovative ways, having to create their own spaces. They exemplify some of the attributes of the actualizing citizen. But understanding the formal or informal spaces in which each leader archetype operates is informed by how they came into their leadership.

Where Youth Leaders Come From

Pathways to Activation

There is a moment or influence for every leader that first motivated them to speak out or take action. INGOs can learn how to engage youth leaders by understanding these “pathways to activation.” Our Emerging Catalyst data illuminated common themes for how youth initially become engaged in social change work. We classified these pathways to activation into five categories:
### THE FIVE PATHWAYS TO ACTIVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHETYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARENTAL INFLUENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ainsley</strong> originally got involved in reforestation projects in Canada because both of her parents participated in similar projects when they were young. This care for the earth was infused in Ainsley’s values growing up and encouraged her to focus her energy on environmental advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a leading factor that shapes the way some young people get involved. Parents’ experiences and perspectives shape how youth understand their role as catalysts from an early age and often create opportunities for youth to take action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIASPORA COMMUNITIES &amp; FAMILIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rexy</strong> felt increasingly distanced from his Filipino culture and community when immigrating and assimilating in the United States. This experience inspired him to create Kaya Collaborative, aimed at connecting Filipinos across the diaspora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground youth experience in an inherently global perspective. Having personal connection to another country or culture inspires young people to engage with global challenges, whether related to their own or their family’s migration experience, their country of origin or other issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAVEL &amp; EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yanis</strong> became involved after learning about social, economic and ecological issues in school. Though Yanis is a member of the Algerian diaspora, he credits his academic analysis for activating his curiosity and efforts in student organizing in France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities expose young people to issues beyond their immediate context. Often youth from the Global North come into contact with development issues in the Global South for the first time through these opportunities. Either rooted in academic discourse, volunteer work or cultural exchange, this pathway creates access to new experiences, perspectives and alternate realities that often inspire youth to continue engagement with an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>Zoe</strong> traveled to Kenya from the United Kingdom through the Changing Worlds program during her gap year before university. This experience inspired her to co-founded Nakuru Children’s Project, which raises funds to improve education and reduce poverty for children in Nakuru, Kenya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly describes opportunities created by formal organizations within the human rights and international development sector that build expertise, professional skills, networking space and deeper understanding for how the sector operates, opening doors to a career.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONAL STRUGGLE WITH INEQUALITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bianey</strong> got involved in LGBTQ organizing with her community in the United States after experiencing targeted harassment and violence due to her transgender identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refers to leaders who begin to take action because of personal encounters with structural inequality that have directly affected them or someone close to them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth-centered opportunities and lived experiences activated Emerging Catalysts in different ways. This reinforces the importance of creating diverse entry points to participation, given that different types of exposure influence youth in different ways. Human rights and international development (33.8%) is the leading pathway into their work, followed by travel and education (27.5%). These pathways rely on access to existing programs, financial resources or both. It is often young people from more privileged backgrounds who can afford to take advantage of traditional opportunities for support and development as their families can pay for international trips or support unpaid internships and academic exposure.

The sector is flush with opportunities for youth to engage in these types of managed programs, as shown by the high level of youth as recipients. This data reflects current sector infrastructure, set up to support youth in these ways. Additionally, youth with access to these pathways are more likely to identify as global leaders, therefore increasingly the likelihood they would apply to take part in opportunities like the Emerging Catalyst Network.

Youth who had slightly more informal pathways to leadership—parental influence, diaspora communities and families and personal experiences with inequality—often have less access to these types of opportunities. These youth leaders’ pathways can be less direct for a few different reasons:
Kristina was the first in her family to go to university, where she became dedicated to using her education to benefit others from marginalized backgrounds. However, as she accessed more prestigious educational spaces, she noticed a growing disconnect between her and her socially conscious peers from more privileged backgrounds. Many of her peers theoretically understood class privilege, but she noticed that the pathways available to them to take action—internships, awareness-using campaigns, fellowships, discussions of poverty on different continents—were different from those accessible to her and impactful on creating sustainable change. Without exposure or personal experience to the same challenges, she sees an increasing divide between the way her privileged peers take action on social issues and her approaches.

Kristina is dedicated to creating structural change through grassroots action rooted in the struggles of marginalized communities, largely working at the intersection of refugees and victims of sexual assault. She primarily works with others from underprivileged backgrounds. These leaders are able to speak to the entrenched problems of their communities while her more privileged peers cannot speak with the same kind of direct experience and do not have the direct access. However, Kristina criticized that the prestigious, well-paying NGO jobs are only made available her privileged peers because of their degrees, English language proficiencies and professional skills. Kristina expressed a deep frustration because this dichotomy creates a chasm between these two groups with the similar goals but different vantage points rather than greater synergy, and her fellow organizers only continue to get left out of the critical conversations.

**The Rise of Participatory Citizenship**

**PEER-DRIVEN NETWORKS AND COLLABORATIVE SOLUTIONS**

Autonomous, individualized actions are replacing large, managed organizations. Youth-led initiatives are employing more fluid and decentralized, networked structures that contain multiple access points, participation and leadership opportunities. Through our organizational mapping and surveys, we found that 30.6% of youth sought to increase...
participation through coalition-building, network development, community-organizing or movement-building. Comparatively, only 22.6% of CSIs engage youth participants through these decentralized opportunities.

Today, every young person with a laptop or smartphone has unprecedented freedom to define themselves and be creative while being both generators and users of media. Wendell explains that “this has given rise to the rapid formation of large-scale networks.” Individuals are able to connect in loosely organized networks and engage in actions through a more conversational context that emphasizes authenticity and personal stakeholdership. Networks validate and recognize youth’s experiences and identities in similar ways that formal institutions have historically created belonging and community. With tools for greater self-expression and access to many different networks at once, young people can also simultaneously define themselves in multiple ways. Something as simple as a hashtag, a label used to identify posts about a specific topic on social media, can now unite people around the world who otherwise would only have access to their immediate, local networks. Emerging Catalysts were consistently excited about times they were able to learn from and work with their peers in overlapping ways. Their leadership is characterized by efforts to build peer networks as well as work through informal collaborations and coalitions to respond to immediate needs, share resources, coordinate together on aligned issues and amplify impact. This is not done simply out of principle, but also to ensure survival, as limited access to support and resources from traditional civil society forces youth-led movements to find new ways to achieve common goals. Rather than wait for institutions to catch up, youth themselves are leading the way, filling the gaps where governments and civil society institutions have left off and defining new approaches to social change—often with the support of readily available digital tools.

**EMERGING CATALYST: LINH DO**

*Australia / CLIMATE ACTION & ENVIRONMENT*

Through her work founding The Verb, Linh has worked to create a digital platform to make global climate change policies and work more accessible to the public through articles and blog posts. A lot of The Verb’s success is rooted in their ability to engage and represent a variety of perspectives on the platform.

When reflecting on the diversity of their network, Linh said, “It’s really interesting to see the cross section of people we’ve brought together. There are definitely people in [our network] who hate one another. But for us it is really cool that we are able to play this convener role and have this one platform that simultaneously represented the World Bank and someone who has been to every WTO protest.” The Verb values engaging diverse perspectives not only on their platform and across their network but also among their staff. Through a decentralized and nonhierarchical approach, Linh has been able to build an organization focused on coaching, empowerment and scaling through distributed leadership.

Though she is the editor-in-chief, she has built a culture at The Verb that decreases hierarchy by creating collective ownership so that she and her staff can have open and honest conversations while addressing their breadth of opinions, ideas, and concerns. This has increased their ability to learn from one another and strengthen The Verb overall.
TECHNOLOGY’S ROLE

Digital platforms help bring people into a conversation who might otherwise not be present. In particular, it helps marginalized communities connect and interact in digital spaces, where they may not have the physical space. This allows minorities to create more solidarity, better define themselves through stories and conversations, which can become a staging ground for collective action—both to respond to a recent event or for longer-term strategic capacity. “Black Twitter,” is a virtual community of African-American Twitter users “who have created a virtual community that participates in continuous real-time conversations... [and are] proving adept at bringing about a wide range of sociopolitical changes.”49

Primarily in the United States but also taking hold in other countries, this community has given voice to the black community. They are able to talk about issues in their lives and rally behind injustices when they occur. Communities like Black Twitter are often credited for honing the narrative that has successfully elevated the issue of police brutality against black communities to the general public in the US and beyond and giving rise to the prominent Movement for Black Lives.

We must emphasize however that new technologies are not the reason for the emergence of new modalities of citizenship. Digital platforms are neutral tools that do not innately facilitate social change. They bring people information and expose them to more culture and likeminded individuals, they have the ability to mobilize large groups of people at unprecedented rates. But, this does not inevitably mean people will work together to take collective action. New tools must be met in combination with peer-driven networks, effective collaboration and strong relationships. Intentional strategy and usually offline contact are necessary imperatives for any social change making. What digital tools can do is increase participation and deepen commitment over time, enable decentralization, facilitate established relationships and deepen connections in grassroots communities. Gurjinder found a pathway to get involved through Twitter, but his leadership and continued action occurs largely offline, where he deepens his relationships,

“ The Internet has changed the world. I was following people on Twitter and found out about political rallies in London.”

Gurjinder grew up in a low income neighborhood in West Midlands, where few opportunities to get involved in his local area existed. Gurjinder joined Twitter a few years ago and began following politicians and politically active leaders, which opened up new insights on how to contribute to pressing problems his community faces. Eventually, Gurjinder took the train to his first union rally in London and became immediately hooked. Reflecting on this, he said “The Internet has changed the world. I was following people on Twitter and found out about political rallies in London.” Social media served as an access point available to Gurjinder, who may not have otherwise found a pathway to become involved. His participation has grown since the one-off rally. Gurjinder now holds union membership and leadership roles in the the Young Fabians. Most significantly, he is leading an advocacy campaign to transform politicians into Parliamentary champions in the fight against local homelessness. His approach is multi-pronged: not only is he focusing on political advocacy, but he is also building a community dedicated to direct service so that they can alleviate the impact of homelessness both in the short and long term.
convenes unlikely stakeholders and strengthens his activated network, dedicated to ending homelessness.

Digital platforms help bring people into a conversation who might otherwise not be present. In particular, it helps marginalized communities connect and interact in digital spaces, where they may not have the physical space. This allows minorities to create more solidarity, better define themselves through stories and conversations, which can become a staging ground for on- and offline collective action—both to respond to a recent event or for longer-term strategic capacity. “Black Twitter,” is a virtual community of African-American Twitter users “who have created a virtual community that participates in continuous real-time conversations... [and are] proving adept at bringing about a wide range of sociopolitical changes.”45 Primarily in the United States but also taking hold in other countries, this community has given voice to the black community. They are able to talk about issues in their lives and rally behind injustices when they occur. Communities like Black Twitter are often credited for honing the narrative that has successfully elevated the issue of police brutality against black communities to the general public in the US and beyond and giving rise to the hundreds of communities organizing around the country for the prominent Movement for Black Lives.46

Key to the success of Black Twitter is that it has been self-generated by members of the community itself. Users feel ownership and commitment because Black Twitter speaks directly to their own experiences. Since growing from its grassroots beginnings, members of the loose network can now get their message out to more traditional media platforms, like CNN and get support from institutions, like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The network formed organically and out of a common need to talk about their lives, where few other spaces existed. User-generated, this development of this type of platform would not have been possible had an institution tried to create it because its disparate, grassroots nature underlies its structure. The need for exchange with people of similar yet different experiences combined with deep-rooted relationships keep networks going. Because institutions, with their centralized structures, cannot originate such multifarious networks, they must instead find ways to identify and support.
REJECTING POLITICS WHILE EMBRACING THE POLITICAL

Loosely organized forms of participation create a greater freedom to express multiple identities in different spaces, with a greater fluidity and exposure to ideas, social structures, and relationships. For youth, these are political questions as considering identity defines their relation to and engagement with society. Affinity groups that proliferate in digital spaces are a means of inclusion and finding belonging as well as an opportunity to engage with like-minded citizens. What is distinct with identity-informed participation, however, is the prevalence of intersectionality—understanding that identities are constantly in flux and contextual and that multiplicities of identity can co-exist simultaneously. For example, in the European Union, youth are trending towards an embrace of multiple citizenships and see themselves as both European and national citizens, both having shared importance. Civic engagement becomes a component of identity expression as youth involve themselves in issues and causes that they can personally relate to, as opposed to those that are ideology-based.

Youth embody the idea that “the personal is political” as evidenced by their work to address how issues and identities impact themselves and their communities on a social and relational level. Their nuanced understanding of power and social justice enables them to identify and dismantle barriers that would otherwise keep members of their community from participating. Unprecedented access to information has increased their awareness of the many inequalities that drive exclusion—race, class, gender, ethnicity, and sexuality, among others—which in turn has driven them to create inclusive and accessible opportunities and spaces in order to foster participation and grow leadership across their networks.

For example, one American Emerging Catalyst recognized the lack of transgender representation at their D.C.-based community organizing meetings for racial justice. Where CSIs would typically separate LGBTI equality and racial justice into separate issues, this youth leader saw how these issues intersect and argued that their local movement-building efforts would not foster the diverse participation they needed to be successful and truly representational of their community. Now, all participants state their preferred gender pronouns—identifying their preference for “she/her,” “he/him” or “they/them” when being spoken about—in order to embody practices that reflect their understanding of diverse gender identities and to be explicit about their priority for creating a space that is inclusive for all. They continue to listen to trans community members for additional best practices to both create accessible space for black activists with many identities and to use this diversity to strengthen their work overall.

Through seemingly small practices like this that challenge and redefine social norms, youth leaders participate in everyday political actions that open up more space for others. While their work goes beyond these social practices, by making them a priority, youth leaders create the necessary foundation to build strong, participatory communities.

THE RISE OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Not all networks are created equal, and not all networks necessarily lead to social action. What networks one decides to join makes a difference in their effectiveness to foment change. Strong networks—defined by strong, collaborative relationships—build the necessary motivation and commitment to catalyze collective action. Weak networks facilitate access to new information and new skills. “Successful social movements know how to do both,” Ganz asserts. Social movements have risen in visibility over the last decade. From the Obama presidential campaign in the United States, the Green or “Twitter” Revolution in Iran, Arab Awakening (formerly known as the Arab Spring), Occupy Wall Street, Spain’s Los Indignados and its birthing of the Podemos political party, the Movement for Black
social movements, helping build intergenerational alliances by reinspiring older generations and creating access to established knowledge. Youth participating in social movements engage deeply with the communities they represent, developing sustainable solutions based on community priorities and rooted in grassroots power.

Some practitioners contest the value of the social movement, seeing it as disruptive, but that is precisely why social movements can also be so effective. They contribute to civil society’s overall strategic capacity to make the cultural, economic, political and behavioral changes needed to adapt to uncertain times. Successful social movements innately require active participation by a diverse citizenry of at least 3.5% of the population. This happens through the development of broad-based, decentralized, yet organized and coordinated leadership capacity, built on deep, trustful relationships. People find a moral calling, collective identity, belonging and ownership with their participation in social movements, which can only happen when the movement has clear goals and common purpose. But the required diversity and numbers needed to succeed means that leaders at all levels of the movement must be empowered with the capacity to recruit and train others to take collective action with them.

“Only through movement-building can committed, participatory leadership be developed and sustained at scale.”

Only through movement-building can committed, participatory leadership be developed and sustained at scale.53

These “leaderful” operations—decentralized and fluid—offer multiple access points with increased opportunities to engage in active participation for social change. This organic, networked inclusiveness can be positive, but it has also created deeper disconnect between youth and formal institutions, as they only feel more isolated or alienated from managed opportunities. Inherently informal, social movements operate outside of institutional structures, offering extra-institutional pathways for action. While this type of pressure on institutions is essential and healthy for civil societies, if it goes unsupported or alienated for too long, it could either be co-opted, alienated or simply dissipate, sometimes resulting in more disengaged citizens.

RETHINKING IMPACT
Formal and Informal Spaces

Social movements offer space for youth to reimagine ways in which life can be lived through issue-specific, democratic, non-hierarchical and co-creative participation. More specifically, youth usually channel their energy through grassroots organizations that collectively contribute to a broader movement ecosystem. Often without formal legal status and sparsely resourced, grassroots organizations work most intimately with disenfranchised communities whose rights are most urgently threatened by inaction. Uncertain about their positions in society, unestablished in their professions and, therefore, most confronted by injustice, youth join the frontlines of grassroots struggles as part of some of the most marginalized communities. From problem identification to defining strategies and shared outcomes, grassroots organizing builds permanent infrastructure within communities,

EMERGING CATALYST:
EVAN WEBER

United States / CLIMATE ACTION & ENVIRONMENT

With his work at US Climate Plan, Evan supports networks and bottom-up campaigns building power and putting pressure on governments for climate action. They focus on developing and connecting grassroots leaders for a locally-driven climate change movement.
and is an essential strategy for building self-sufficient communities and supporting local development. Youth seek to challenge and change the status quo, using collective action to address these obstacles not only locally but also at the national and international levels. They participate in bottom-up decision making, and they work to create solutions that reflect their vision for a better, more just world. Given access to decentralized networks and the increased autonomy and leadership that comes with participation in movements, youth flock to these modes of engagement. Working in these new ways, they have come to recognize that traditional means of measuring impact do not align with their programmatic priorities or reflect their values. From a movement framework, “action refers to the work of mobilizing and deploying resources to achieve outcomes. It is the bottom line of the relational, motivational and strategic work.” However, formal CSIs have yet to find adequate ways to listen to and incorporate new modalities and non-traditional ways of both organizing and measuring impact into their programs.

Grassroots organizations, networks and social movements represent informal groups that often go unrecognized by INGOs and other donors. Yet, they are the most connected to the communities they seek to impact and pose to create the most sustainable solutions. As participatory leaders, youth are positioned to be innovators and bridge-builders.

DIFFERENT WAYS OF WORKING

Today’s youth leaders practice citizenship beyond the traditional notions of civics. Working autonomously yet collectively, the “new global citizen” is motivated to exercise their voice and rights, understands how to bring diverse people and resources together and uses collective action to bring together their communities—local, national, global and digital. We have framed youth’s new global citizenship and civic participation as “participatory citizenship.” Transcending age-old conceptions of place and issue, young global leaders work intersectionality, through grassroots networks and see people and information as the most important resources.

In a world where media caters to different identities and needs, youth are increasingly off-put by traditional and highly managed governmental and organizational structures that fail to represent them fully. In the face of civil society infrastructure that would have them fulfill the role of the dutiful citizen, youth are forging new models of participation. Looking at the driving factors of youth-driven civil society, participatory leadership can be characterized by five prevailing traits: collective, intersectional, networked, resourceful and grassroots-based.
section six

TRANSLOCAL IS THE NEW GLOBAL
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The Emergent Translocal Infrastructure

As participatory leadership reshapes civil society, a new type of global infrastructure has begun to emerge. The concept of translocal—neither explicitly digital, global, national or local in scope or sense of location but rather a hybrid of all four—blurs distinctions between spaces and issues. It focuses on building local-to-local connections that reflect globalization, migration patterns and the mediation of digital technologies across regions and borders. Increased access to information and network creation facilitated by digital technologies offer opportunities to provide supranational and global contexts to local initiatives.

Translocal infrastructure, initially a term applied to global migration patterns, describes a confluence of many local networks and social movements that have developed supranational connections and ultimately an interconnected global architecture of participation. These initiatives are connected to each other across various networks and platforms and supported by organizations across localities and national borders. As previously mentioned, CSIs still broadly use global, national and local divides in their approaches. We found that organizations were skewed either towards a global orientation or a national-and-local orientation, with only 9% of all institutions creating translocal infrastructure to connect local actions with a global network.

Which Issues Are Connected?

Translocal connections are important because they have the potential to vastly improve global development outcomes. First, translocal suggests a more efficient use of resources, where local groups can focus on developing contextualized capacities while drawing on shared global knowledge, skills and structures. Second, with more structural support, local groups have more freedom to work autonomously and creatively to identify and support the grassroots solutions that can take root in communities. Finally, local-global exchange suggests a more decentralized, networked approach. This means fewer prescribed solutions from top-down organizations who intrinsically champion a few approaches and more opportunity for diffuse ownership, which

EMERGING CATALYST: DAVID LAWLESS
Canada / CLIMATE ACTION AND ENVIRONMENT

David Lawless is an environmentalist, who originally became engaged in his local community. Because of his work, David was accepted into Global Changemakers, an organization that connects local leaders around the world to each other and to needed resources that make their work more impactful. Access to this network of youth leaders has helped David gain more clarity about his personal role and his organization’s niche within a broader, global context while also strengthening his connections more specifically to the global environmental movement. David’s success has been integrally linked to his ability to benefit from existing infrastructure at the national and global level that seeks to connect and engage environmental and climate change leaders.
creates greater diversity within the sector and more opportunity to test. Analogous to participatory citizenship traits, translocal embodies these concepts at a structural level.

Using the local-global as translocal, we broke down the geographic orientations into global, translocal and national/local. The data indicates an uneven landscape composed of a few strong translocal movements amidst a constellation of siloed resources. Where the majority of issue areas did not have more than 5.8% mapped organizations working translocally, the issue of climate action and environment had 31.3% of organizations working in local-to-global contexts (with the most balanced spread of domestic and global organizations at 44% and 25% respectively). Recent successes in the global climate movement, namely the mobilization of millions of people around the world on the September 21, 2014 People’s Climate March and 2015 Paris Agreement, brings these numbers into light. Climate change has been recognized as a global imperative with local implications, in no small part to youth-led initiatives, and the movement has developed with this decentralized structure.

Local activists maintain their autonomy, with context-specific aims and unified overarching goals. For example, a network of grassroots environmental justice organizers interdependently share information, resources and best practices to run campaigns that call on local institutions, such as universities or foundations, to divest from local fossil fuel companies. Their Fossil Fuel Divestment Student Network recognizes their niche contribution to a broader movement and works in tandem with other renewable energy advocates and climate justice groups in the United States and globally. Multiple local successes create a snowball effect that builds outward and scales—and is made possible through support and infrastructure provided by broad-based climate justice organizations like 350.org. These initiatives are connected to each other across various networks and platforms and supported by organizations across localities and national borders. Multiple local successes create a snowball effect that builds outward and scales—and is made possible through support and infrastructure provided by broad-based climate justice organizations like 350.org. A commitment to cause—with space created for diversity of tactics and approaches, combined with resources from organizations with scale—creates opportunity for global impact fueled by local action.

Overall issue focus by geographic orientation

Global: 40.84%
Translocal: 10.82%
National & Local: 48.24%
Economic justice, food security and sustainability and democracy, governance and civil society form a second tier of issues with seemingly burgeoning translocal infrastructure, with 12.2%, 12.5% and 17% translocal organizations respectively—not quite as developed as that of climate action. A combination of formal and informal networks highlight this composition. Increased global awareness around growing income inequality, illuminated through the emergence of global social movements like Occupy and its pervasive “We are the 99%” messaging of the 2011, suggest more people are starting to connect the dots between their bank accounts and corrupt global economic systems. A small number of INGOs have also formed the Act Alliance, a multi-tiered coalition of formal civil society groups, organizing around inequality
at national and global levels. With an ever-connected food system, people are also starting to organize more around common issues around food access, also linked closely to the climate movement. La Via Campesina is a notable translocal network of self-described “peasants” that works on a range of issues at the intersection of food and farming, gender equality, youth and environment and represents 200 million farmers. Finally, the broad category of democracy, governance and civil society largely suggests growing exchange of skills and information across countries.

How Issue Focus Gets Divided

Looking at the issue areas with negligible translocal infrastructure also tells an interesting story. Even within organizations, different programs and offices may work entirely separately from each other without coordination or interaction, despite clear intersections and overlaps that would be better addressed through collaboration. This yields a narrow-minded viewpoint and a reticence to engage issues in a multi-layered, cross-disciplinary manner that in turn frustrates collaboration and effectively addressing deeply entrenched problems.

Our sector interviews revealed INGOs’ increasing investment in the issues of gender and in health. Fifty-five percent of the health organizations that we mapped have more of a non-global focus—such as non communicable diseases and health insurance; while 40% work at the global level on international health issues such as AIDS and maternal mortality. While there is certainly nuance in health specific to local and national contexts, only 5% of health organizations connect local efforts to the global context. As one of the largest, if not the largest aid investments, health is a top priority, yet its global infrastructure does not lend itself to widespread grassroots support. We are driven to question if we are creating effective global solutions or if non-global and global health initiatives are replicating each other’s efforts and working in silos.

Broken down by country, we can see similar trends and clusters in issue focus:
For example, most countries have a large percentage of justice and peace focused organizations, focused on immigration, racial justice and reducing violence. However, when comparing the affinity for justice and peace with the trends in geographic orientation for justice and peace organizations, we see that only 5.8% of CSIs build translocal infrastructure to connect local and national efforts to a global network. This absence of translocal capacity combined with similar issue focuses across our target countries suggests that the sector is missing out on the opportunity to build core infrastructure that could maximize global capacity and local impact.

The development of translocal infrastructure appears to still be in nascent stages, and our findings do not suggest an inevitability that other issue areas will follow. But they can serve as initial data for further examination of organizational structures and geographical orientation so that the sector can perhaps build infrastructure in more intentional ways that will enable participatory leadership.
section seven

THE SECTOR’S STRUGGLE TO ADJUST

Key Institutional Barriers
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While we mapped the civil society sector more broadly, we turn our analysis to global development institutions, most focused on the question of developing youth’s global leadership. INGOs tend to understand, at least in part, the way youth have influenced civil society’s new realities. Yet, they have struggled to adapt. We have shown a clear disconnect between the current participation opportunities institutionally available to youth and the ways in which youth actually participate. In analyzing the literature organizational map and youth and practitioner interviews, we found prevalent barriers that calcify this disconnect and reinforce each other, creating a feedback loop that the sector must disrupt in order to effectively support catalytic youth and the nontraditional initiatives they champion.

**Disconnection between the Professionals and the Organizers**

The international development system, from local communities to national offices to headquarters—from bottom-to-top—is oriented around the relationships between formalized organizations with similar operational structures. Standardized operations make it easier for donors and large implementers to track progress and funding. However, these professionalized spaces create structural barriers to direct contact with grassroots communities. For example, INGOs are structured to recruit staff who fit a specific profile—typically highly educated and trained within a traditional global development framework that stresses aid from the Global North to the Global South. These individuals possess language proficiency and important formal skills such as reporting, program design, accounting and decision-making power over resource distribution but may or may not be a part of communities within their portfolio. Even when they are based in country-specific offices or community-specific initiatives, they are trained to work with other formal or professionalized groups. As a result, the majority of youth and other nontraditional leaders with alternative structures—often unregistered, without a bank account or without tax deductible status—are either excluded from consideration of support since they do not have the professionalized structures needed to obtain and manage funding or INGOs may not offer the types of support they need like rapid response grants, core operating funds, mentoring or coaching.

As INGO leaders do not often possess local knowledge, they try to outsource this to smaller, local NGOs which they assume are voices for the community—though in reality they often focus on advocacy to the government rather than organizing the community. This exclusion from the system makes it difficult for INGOs to meaningfully connect with the communities or organizers working outside of formal structures, as they tend not to have direct connections to the communities impacted by inequality and local manifestations of problems that the sustainable global development goals seek to tackle. This presents challenges in creating strategies that are not only mindful of local contexts, but have buy-in at all levels.

This tension becomes especially apparent when INGOs try to identify and reach out to emerging community leaders. Identifying the most effective potential leaders in a community requires building relationships, deep inquiry into local dynamics and priorities as well as understanding the nuance of leadership within diverse contexts.

“Identifying the most effective potential leaders in a community requires building relationships, deep inquiry into local dynamics and priorities as well as understanding the nuance of leadership within diverse contexts.”
INGOs often do not have the ability nor the infrastructure to discern this kind of leadership, since it requires long-term commitment and investment that lie outside of short-term funding cycles, metrics and deliverables to funders within specific time periods. Without established roots in local communities and an emphasis on outreach to non-traditionally defined leaders, INGOs continue to struggle to identify emerging participatory leaders, who are not always the most visible or the most professionally skilled, but understand the needs of the community and are driving change. Instead, they return to the same one or two community leaders who are the most public-facing, outspoken or familiar with working with CSIs. In so doing, they fail to capture the full spectrum of leadership and risk alienating leaders working at the margins.

**It All Comes Down to Funding**

While the SDGs are explicitly geared towards all nations, most conversations within INGO circles and most resources allocated tend to divide across countries that are “donors” and “recipients.” Funding tends to be risk-averse, slow-flowing and offered to established organizations. Bilateral and multilateral donors—with those based in the United States and European Union as the top two overall—have the most influence over the UN’s development agenda and finance other large multilaterals like the World Bank. Other private donors, 82% of which are based in North America and Western Europe, also provide the majority of their human rights funding to large advocacy organizations, such as Amnesty International or Global Citizen. Yet, NGOs still feel a paucity of resources, receiving only 1% of all development assistance funds.

“Grassroots organizations only receive 2% of available human rights funding and .02% of all development assistance funds.”

**The Domestic-International Divide**

With resource constraints, INGOs feel increasingly drawn to participatory models of engaging youth domestically yet run up against operational barriers that are not positioned to support the grassroots directly. Funders create restrictive earmarks that mean INGOs’ work can only focus internationally, even if they see the benefit of facilitating strong, translocal connections. Disconnected from domestic work and without the capacities or resources to look for the domestic youth who do not show explicit interest in global work means organizations have to work harder with less support.

INGOs also tend to have large communications departments, still geared towards engaging more traditional media outlets. Or, they often use social media platforms to try to connect with youth,
but their lack of relationships means that the quantity of “likes” may not equate to the quality or reach of the community they may actually want to reach. These days, with so many media outlets and platforms competing for each person’s attention, awareness tends to be enough. A compelling action or way to engage with issues youth care about with their peers or counterparts in other countries. The only way to change this dynamic is to move from a broadcast model of communications to an interactive, two-way communication that facilitates storytelling and seeks out inspiring young participatory citizens, whose work may connect to a cross-cutting global issue. Prioritizing facilitation of citizen-citizen relationships, both within their headquartered country and between their Global North base and Global South operations, will help to build the needed bridges between the arbitrary domestic-international divide. However, to do this, it means both a change in external funding patterns of large INGOs as well as internal restructuring of staff, resources and approaches.

Change the Future by Having Youth at the Table

Throughout interviews with sector leaders, practitioners had a lot to say about the difficulties with collaboration. Most poignantly, one informant said, “my organization is coming to realize we cannot win on our own.” This is an organizational culture shift away from aggressive ownership and branding and towards collaboration. One informant described this progression as “embracing the ethos of the web” in reference to the variety of collaboration, enabled by and hosted on today’s digital tools.

This collaboration has not only been successful across traditional organizations, but these NGOs are also beginning to collaborate with youth-led initiatives. For example one leading international advocacy organization, in grappling with how to keep their brand off of their work, has put supporting youth leadership from behind as a core principle to their youth programming. They build off of existing youth networks, rather than creating their own, helping them further connect and grow. As another example, World Merit is focused on engaging young leaders, whether or not they participate in World Merit’s own campaigns. The organization is incentivized to support and elevate youth’s work, seeing youth’s success as part of fulfilling on their mission. Again, this shift away from branding and towards collaboration signals that organizations are beginning to value the outcomes and the power of partnerships over taking credit for the work, but there is still the risk that youth participation is merely symbolic, with youth solely as recipients of these programs. In practice, INGOs still face pervasive fears from donor-strapped executives of losing relevance and therefore funding if not given credit.
section eight

Moving Forward: A Blueprint for the Sector
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New Challenges Need New Approaches

Civil society is more than INGOs. Yet, formal institutions largely orient their support around formalized groups. International development and human rights professionals generally acknowledge the institutional barriers to addressing pressing global challenges like growing economic inequality and catastrophic climate change, yet struggle to break out of bureaucratic silos and funding cycles to ensure ongoing impact. Meanwhile, decentralized networks and social movements grow in numbers and influence, reshaping the civil society landscape and challenging INGOs’ relevance and authority. A recent analysis uses the global humanitarian organization Oxfam to illustrate the challenge facing formal CSIs:

Too small to be agents of economic transformation; too big and bureaucratic to be social movements; banned from politics because of their charitable status and structurally removed from the societies they’re trying to change, Oxfam and the others end up sitting uncomfortably in the middle as the real action takes place around them—doing what they can to save lives, speak out and build on small successes in the process. But what if that intermediary position were seen as a positive and used to retool these organizations as bridges and connectors?

As “intermediaries,” INGOs must reinforce participatory leadership and create better architecture to accelerate participation from new actors and leaders. For decades, INGOs have defined “global leadership” through a lens of dutiful citizenship, directly tied to membership in political and civic associations. Today, global leadership is defined by civic participation, driven by distributed, collective action of localized networks. Youth leaders are at the helm of the informal groups challenging the current structures of the international system. While youth are the ones leading change, they still struggle to sustain these catalytic and innovative efforts without necessary resources, training and connective infrastructure. To effectively foster the next generation of global leadership and civic engagement, INGOs must embrace the current ways that citizens—especially youth—participate in civic change. Individually, this means INGOs reorient their strategies and operations; collectively, they must contribute to reshaping current global development structures and shift larger donors’ approaches along the way.

The New Global Citizen

Fostering Youth Leadership in a Changing Civic Landscape through Collective Civic Participation

As we have seen, current participation opportunities do not lend to long-term investment in youth nor do they create effective pathways to help youth grow and deepen civic participation. And current civil society infrastructure overwhelmingly fails to consider and provide support for the translocal context that youth leaders are working in by connecting local issues across global contexts.

However, youth are addressing civil society gaps by leading in ways that are: participatory, intersectional, networked, resourceful and grassroots-based. Through the experiences of our Emerging Catalysts, we can see patterns in how youth are responding to the modalities of participation available to them: digital tools enabled Gurjinder’s pathway to participation, Linh created a decentralized network to build youth participation, David sought out translocal infrastructure and Burcu created a network to develop and sustain youth leadership.
Youth’s orientation towards decentralized, participatory leadership has unprecedented potential to root and sustain global development outcomes in locally activated communities. But this cannot happen without the formal sector playing the critical intermediary role to strategically develop translocal infrastructure that makes these networks collectively more impactful. Our research has worked to prove the imperative of sector change as well as the concepts for how to change. However, as we know, the gap between theory and practice can be wide.

“It is time the sector sees agency-creation as its central role, creating the enabling conditions by which youth can define the realm of the possible.”

We have defined the new global citizenship as participatory civic leadership. This new paradigm of global leadership requires new frameworks to orient structures and practice for sustainable global development. The civil society sector tends to define its goals based on “probable outcomes in constraining conditions,” which are more easily predicted and measured, notes Marshall Ganz.74 “Agency, however, is more about grasping at possibility than conforming to probability.” It is time the sector sees agency-creation as its central role, creating the enabling conditions by which youth can define the realm of the possible.

**The Collective Civic Participation Framework**

Building off of the five key characteristics of participatory leadership—collective, intersectional, networked, resourceful and grassroots-based—INGOs develop a model of operation that can answer the call of changing times. This means embracing new conceptions of civic space as transcendent of place and issue, the need to work collaboratively and collectively and diverse participation as the foundation of strong civil societies.

The Collective Civic Participation Framework (CCPF) is a blueprint for INGO practitioners to foster participatory global leadership in emergent generations and to create the necessary architecture of participation that enables leaders to build translocal, networked communities working against injustice. The CCPF is based on an underlying premise that youth are primary drivers of change at the grassroots level and that global institutions must fundamentally shift approaches to successfully leverage the power and potential of the collective action of networks and social movements reshaping the civic landscape.

**GOALS FOR ADOPTING THE COLLECTIVE CIVIC PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORK:**

1. A generative pipeline for global participatory leadership, grounded in grassroots networks, that scales capacity for collective action around iterative, innovative solutions.

2. Strong, translocal architecture for participation that enables dynamic networks and movements to build multiple pathways for diverse communities to get involved.

3. Sustainable, decentralized funding sources that directly fund youth or fund reliable, intermediary organizations whose mission is to build strategic capacity and connective infrastructure that accelerates community-generated action.

The CCPF is composed of three core principles that should guide the restructuring and implementation of INGOs’ work towards greater prioritization of informal, youth-driven networks and movements. True to its name, CCPF emphasizes building connective, translocal
infrastructure that enables local networks to access to global resources and to act collectively; valuing and fostering participatory leadership and centering the grassroots in their work and greater collaboration amongst formal actors, particularly large INGOs with the majority of resources. In addition to these three principles, we offer an actionable strategy in “Going Beyond the Research” for how INGOs can begin to implement these recommendations more directly.

**THE 3 CORE PRINCIPLES OF THE COLLECTIVE CIVIC PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORK**

1. Develop a holistic architecture of participation by shifting institutional structures and resources to identify participatory leaders and help them proliferate systemic solutions, rooted in the grassroots.

International development and human rights groups are heavily resourced, connected to people and positions of power and have a bird’s-eye view of the sector that can be leveraged to support and connect youth leaders in their local communities. In order to optimize their roles as connectors and facilitators, INGOs must reorganize their infrastructure—breaking down silos, decreasing bureaucracy and decentralize access to help create infrastructure that informal initiatives can rely on. INGOs should embrace the role of connecting and enabling grassroots strategic capacities to their own planning, implementing and impact assessment processes. This may require more up-front investment in new infrastructure to support participatory leadership. If implemented correctly, over time there will be fewer resource demands because communities will have achieved greater self-sufficiency.

2. Align across organizations to collaborate, share resources and build collective capacity throughout the sector.

Time and again, we heard “resource scarcity” or “shrinking” as the prevailing constraint. By facing this challenge together, INGOs can reject resource competition by demanding that donors fund collaborative partnerships where different groups can leverage their complementary strengths. This maximizes impact and helps avoid the potential pitfalls and waste of resources that can result from duplication of efforts and lack of coordination on similar initiatives. Through collaboration, we can strengthen existing infrastructure and ensure sustainability over the long-term.

3. Redefine impact and value to measure participatory leadership, collective action and strong networks at all levels.

INGOs looking for youth to participate in their initiatives in order to develop loyalty will create more positive sentiment around their work by seeing communities’ progress as their own. Measuring the success of youth-driven, community-oriented initiatives requires a long view and a context-specific understanding of impact. Recognize that solutions should derive from communities themselves and INGOs are positioned best as enablers and promoters of these solutions.

Valuing community development—dialogue, social cohesion, shared goals, solidarity and new social norms—as the foundation of progress, institutions can begin to co-create benchmarks and definitions of progress and ultimately change donor behavior. While tangible impact is critical, oftentimes it is the hidden or unseen kernels of progress embedded in culture and behavior change that lay the foundations of lasting progress. Instead of shorter-term objectives dictated by top-down strategies, institutions must work to define and develop new metrics and values that more accurately reflect the importance of fostering networks, communication, skills and strategy development and movements within grassroots contexts and in a way that reflects the goals of beneficiaries.
The Principles in Practice

The following concepts further explain and deepen our understanding of the Collective Civic Participation Framework’s core principles. We offer these actionable recommendations to organizations and donors when working with young people and which can also extend to grassroots communities and movements.

1. Develop a holistic architecture of participation by shifting institutional structures and resources to identify participatory leaders and help them proliferate systemic solutions, rooted in the grassroots.

Identify diverse, participatory leaders at all levels and enable them to build an architecture of participation for stronger movements. Gone are the days when young people carry their “membership” cards to different organizations. Youth have some of the most direct connections to their communities, the most exposure to injustices and are thus better situated to identify solutions. However, INGOs do not always have the connections or means to identify the right leaders due to barriers regarding infrastructure, language and education, cultural competency and professionalization. Create stronger ties to communities and mobilize existing leadership, commitment and passion to enable networked, peer-driven recruitment.

INGOs have the positioning to strengthen these networks that, without support, can either remain loose without ever inspiring collective action or diffuse all together. Key to this is looking for homegrown solutions or initiatives based on “enabling conditions” rather than the problems. If organizations can help bring together the loose networks that enable skills, information and personal story sharing, with those that are built on deeper relationships, they can foster the social movements that create sustained pathways to leadership. As mentioned, social movements inherently create multi-layered leadership because their success is premised on relationships and nonhierarchical ownership that must be built by many diverse leaders in tandem to train new leaders, who can do the same. As they identify and recruit more leaders, they create an architecture of participation.

Convene and facilitate rather than dictate. Support from INGOs is critical to build, maintain and scale infrastructure that will achieve long-term outcomes and help leaders develop the agency and capacity to support others. Facilitate convenings based on community requests and specific needs that will help deepen relationships and exchange information so that networks and movements can continue to grow organically. Find and scale existing networks to avoid duplication and ensure coordination with other formal groups. In the absence of existing networks, engage community leaders to identify needs and priorities before building new opportunities and infrastructure.

No organization can acquire all of the knowledge and best practices communities need. INGOs are positioned to see what many different local groups are doing and should use this post to find connections and facilitate knowledge sharing, even between groups of different geographies and seemingly different issue priorities. Leaders already seek connections with others and INGOs can help them more easily forge them. For example, the Heinrich Boell Foundation in Germany sponsors activist exchanges between American and German racial justice activists so they can learn from each other’s work and gain new perspectives that ultimately strengthens their own approaches.
Flatten hierarchies, decentralize operations and connect grassroots networks transnationally to build connections between youth leaders in the Global North and Global South. Decentralize central operations to facilitate stronger connections to local knowledge, capacities and narratives. For example, many organizations are moving to a “hubs” model or moving their operations to the Global South to forge stronger south-south relationships. But beyond South-South connections, youth in the Global North’s participation is contingent on connecting their work to those in the Global South and helping them build translocal alliances. North-South movements can draw knowledge and power from each other’s experiences.

INGOs must work to flatten hierarchies around program and campaign implementation, as youth leaders will work harder, more efficiently and more innovatively when they are in an environment where they can contribute as peers. Practice co-ownership by focusing on achieving shared goals without prioritizing branding or taking credit for involvement. Co-create campaigns with youth as partners and leaders, helping them define their own priorities, and use resources and connections to develop rapid response platforms for actions as well as to access to traditional media outlets and influencers.

Build citizen-citizen organizing as a grounding for citizen-government advocacy. Let community priorities drive the advocacy agenda. Part of working in more informal spaces is recognizing the importance of relationships amongst the grassroots as an end and not just a means to influence government.

Strong relationships between civil society leaders at all levels help create vested priorities and unity that, once they take shape, create a powerful citizen force for multifaceted, systemic change.

INGOs can play a role in connecting advocacy agendas between groups and assisting national and regional agenda development. However, narrative development—creating space for shared stories and experiences amongst the community—and shifting cultural norms are as much, if not more important, as policy and political shift. Without strong social ties, people become over-reliant on government leaders to be the sole source of solutions rather than recognizing their own leadership. By supporting social movement capacity, INGOs help youth leaders develop their own grassroots-based solutions that may but often does not involve government. Peer organizing helps to surface alternative social and political norms. For example, the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) took decades to repeal. This policy change was only made possible after relentless grassroots organizing to create a public majority that recognized “love is love” and gay marriage is a civil right. Increasingly unashamed and motivated, everyday people in the United States took to social media, the streets, schools, places of worship to stand up for the rights of their LGBTI sons, daughters, sisters, nephews.

INGOs continue to see civil society development as the relationship between citizen and government and use advocacy as a tool to achieve policy advances, which are more measurable outcomes than cultural or perception change. However, this approach divorces policies from systemic barriers and the communities they impact, thereby obstructing progress. Policy advocacy, when not community-led, makes pressing issues more abstract and less authentic, particularly for marginalized youth leaders, who regularly face these “global” issues—migrant rights, health access, poverty—in tangible ways. Citizen-citizen organizing grounds advocacy in community relationships, thereby increasing citizen-government accountability and ensuring long term mobilization to enact change.

Coaching and training: not sexy, but critical. Engage youth as the partners and leaders that they are through coaching and trainings to deepen their foundational commitment and work towards concrete, self-determined goals. Coaching and mentorship enables leaders to learn from experience and adapt these learnings to their current needs. Engaged coaching can help groups avoid duplication of others’ mistakes and connect to needed resources. Recognizing that groups are constantly evolving, coaching helps groups focus on not just short-term outcomes but
building strong foundations and new capacities over time. Training opportunities help build a foundation of participatory leadership skills so that leaders are better equipped to build commitment and leadership in others. This should be coupled with spaces for reflection on personal theories of change and opportunities for individual growth, which includes facilitating and funding critical conferences and convenings in the field.

Invest in technology as essential but not a silver bullet. Recognize the potential that technology has to inform and improve the work of movements and networks and support better collaboration as well as its limitations. Technology can help youth leaders directly contribute to the global conversation and can build and sustain momentum for initiatives and actions, but it cannot supplant real relationships and face-to-face time. CSIs should use technology as a tool (not as a strategy) that complements and facilitates the core infrastructure development that all groups need to succeed. CSIs can help groups gain access to current technologies, iterate or build new tools when the right technology does not exist, develop better support networks to help integrate technology into community-led initiatives and share best practices.

Restructure funding for more direct support for youth-led initiatives to grow over the long-term. Create more flexible, transparent and accessible grants for youth-led initiatives at different stages of development, which may include the following categories: new/emerging networks, sustaining existing networks and bringing networks to scale. Rapid-response funding for quickly changing contexts and circumstances (i.e., migrants caught off the coast of Australia, the Orlando shooting or other newsworthy events). Organizations should have funds readily available to support engagement and ensure efforts to stay relevant. Core operating costs. Current funding structures enable programmatic funding but often neglect basic operations and funds needed to scale. Fund core operating needs of new youth initiatives, including overhead, trainings, convenings, travel costs, mentorship and coaching opportunities and living wages while providing them with opportunities to connect with others doing similar work around the world. These global connections will help youth leaders return to inspire and recruit others in their community. INGOs should also find ways to make cash flow loans for grants that have already been made, but have not been disbursed, so that they can build a stronger base of youth leaders.

Offer support and consider youth and community-specific needs for project and funding proposals. Prioritize community-based participation and the capacity needed to grow it over flashy, one-off solutions. Increase transparency, clarify and simplify systems and offer specific support to guide youth leaders through formal funding processes and project proposals, which can otherwise exclude innovative and community-driven initiatives through their requirements. Include learning cohorts and communities of practice amongst grantees as component of grant making.

2. Align across organizations to collaborate and share resources

Share capacities and find opportunities for partnership. Work across organizations and in collaboration with donors. Convene for strategy and alignment amongst groups of all sizes and structures doing the on-the-ground work and share relationships and leads concerning potential donors and recipient organizations. Focusing on an ethic of leading collaboratively, with less emphasis on branding and taking credit within coalitions and cohorts.

Advocate to donors to fund more directly and to fund joint initiatives. By leading the shift towards collaboration, INGOs put pressure on donors to value and fund collaboration. Begin by establishing umbrella organizations, coalition hubs or “labs” that can take the lead in delegating and sharing resources and expertise and manage operational and reporting requirements. This may include
management of large grants with multiple entities within a coalition, administrative responsibilities and fiscal reporting for partner organizations and networks. If INGOs can find small ways to prove the impact of direct funding, they can work together to ultimately change current stifling and siloed funding mechanisms, geared towards solving negative conditions rather than enabling the positive ones to flourish. As donors see grantees building collaborative infrastructure, it is more likely they will feel pressure to realign. INGOs should work together to fund initiatives more directly and help donors do the same. While, individually, they can begin to fund more directly, they can also work together to fund more directly so movements do not get piecemeal support but rather more holistic support provided by multiple organizations. Key to this is relinquishing control of organizational brand in exchange for shared mission and outcome. With more decentralized and nimble infrastructure, INGOs can find new ways to distribute funds and increase participation.

Succeed and fail together—it is more economical this way. Through cross-organizational collaboration, INGOs can mitigate risk, with each organization inputting fewer resources than if each organization were to try new interventions on their own. Together we can build shared sector knowledge and infrastructure, increasing the capacity for innovation and sustainability.

Connect current conversations to global goals, not the other way around. See local issues as part of broader, global issues but allow local narratives to drive the conversation. This makes issues more real and imperative for people. Youth civic participation is fluid and issue or goal oriented, which means INGOs must work with them to deepen their leadership and commitments to the causes they care about and help them classify and narrate their work according to their own contexts. Amplifying their stories, connecting them to others with similar stories begins to create a stronger, more relatable, translocal conversation rather than a “global” one, driven by dissociated global institutions that will never be able to speak with the same diversity and therefore the same power. While the SDGs remain the same, they become more accessible when framed in an intersectional way. This is a bottom-up rather than top-down approach to agenda setting.
Embrace informal and emerging initiatives, movements and networks for what they are and where they are. Informal and decentralized organizing—exemplified by the rise of broad-based social movements—is reshaping the civil society landscape. CSIs must begin to recognize and value these types of groups as legitimate civil society players and work to build partnerships outside of the current formal NGO-to-NGO dynamics. Find value in and learn from scrappy, resourceful and more fluid ways of work that may not have the structures that we are accustomed to, but work more nimbly and can more easily bring in new participants. Recognize and nurture grassroots organizations and youth-led initiatives at different stages of development and invest in laying a strong foundation for initiatives to create impact and scale. Prioritize funding and support to participation-oriented youth initiatives that are part of emerging movements. These have greater potential to ensure lasting, systemic change because they can create multiple entry points for youth to engage in social change work and offer sustained opportunities to learn, grow and get more engaged over time.

Emphasize long-term strategies while ensuring tangible impact. Current funding cycles incentivize short-term gains at the expense of long-term transformational change. Develop infrastructure and strategies that provide significant upfront support (coaching, incubation, funding core costs) with ongoing support (networks, connections, rapid response funding) so that leaders are able to motivate more potential leaders. Support efforts to scale and test new ideas in the field. Develop the means to identify innovation in grassroots networks.

Self-care shouldn’t be a myth. Centering self-care ensures engagement and retention of youth leaders for years to come. Leadership sustainability is just as important as leadership development, if we are to create an effective community of global leaders. INGOs should open doors and create pathways so that youth leaders can access more opportunities to sustain their
work and leadership for the long-term, rather than imposing even greater requirements on top of what their ambitious work already demands. Building in breaks and spaces for reflection in programming helps leaders become more strategic so they do not waste valuable energy and allows them to embrace the individual practice of social justice—not just the collective struggle.

In addition to adopting these initial immediate and short-term changes, Rhize is committed to iterating longer-term recommendations. By engaging key stakeholders, we are aiming to test what a new strategy of support could look like. To do this, we must take on a more collaborative approach so that organizations are incentivized to work together and contribute common assets, more quickly respond to needs and serve as connectors and capacity builders while enabling actors driving these new realities.

The CCPF was developed as a blueprint for formal institutions to begin to make this shift and develop new, translocal architecture for participation that will create more onramps for civic action from everyday people.

“For INGOs to actualize this framework, we must work with the networks and movements embodying the new global leadership—participatory civic citizenship—to iteratively test the Collective Civic Participation Framework.”

For INGOs to actualize this framework, we must work with the networks and movements embodying the new global leadership—participatory civic citizenship—to iteratively test the CCPF. Through the Emerging Catalysts Project, Rhize built a coalition of close to thirty organizations and donors that share a commitment to adapting their work to this changing landscape. Organizations across the sector recognize a need to adopt the CCPF, but each faces similar yet unique challenges in realizing these principles in their work.

In Appendix E, we outline one way to create a Global Citizenship Lab, a hub of learning, testing and exchange for organizations and donors to iteratively implement the CCPF. This is one strategy that enables INGOs to define and clarify their role in serving as effective intermediaries between high-level advocacy and grassroots initiatives and movements. Working together, INGOs mitigate risk, coordinate resources and build shared sector knowledge and infrastructure for campaign and movement support.

Going Beyond the Research: Testing the Collective Civic Participation Framework

We hope that this research serves as a launching point to turn the Collective Civic Participation Framework into widely-adopted practice across the sector. To do this, we believe the sector needs to create an intentional space where we can act together to deliver on these recommendations and develop an ongoing pipeline of global leadership. Our research illuminates the discordance between international development organizations and the informal networks and movements reshaping the civil society landscape. To close this gap, formal institutions must reorient infrastructure, resources and metrics to bolster the informal
section nine

CONCLUSION

Photo: Rhize
Youth are championing a shift towards a more inclusive model of “global citizenship” that has the potential to develop new leadership and stronger, more connected civil societies. To effectively foster the next generation of global leadership and civic engagement, INGOs must embrace the increasingly less traditional ways that citizens—especially youth—participate in change and even possibly rethink and reshape current global development structures. Gone are the days when young people will engage with civil society simply by becoming card-carrying members or brand champions. Fewer will become members of Oxfam or the Red Cross, yet more young people will take leadership on issues of poverty and health in innovative ways. However, this does not mean that CSIs are no longer needed. Rather, they have the resources and ability to anchor groups charting new paths and build and sustain critical infrastructure needed for social movements and initiatives to be successful.

“Youth’s participatory leadership is reshaping the civic landscape by engaging youth outside of traditional institutions—through grassroots networks and social movements—and creating new, translocal infrastructure that democratizes the global development sector.”

Youth recognize there are tangible ways that organizations could strengthen and support their work. They are seeking expertise, best practices, networking and capacity building to improve their skill set and develop their leadership. Formalized civil society still has a ways to go to build the infrastructure needed to support these innovative leaders and must shift vantage point from top-down directors of change to that of support providers. The global development sector must leverage their capacity and shift to new modalities of engagement before they lose relevance.

The strategy offered in Collective Civic Participation Framework emphasizes resilience, flexibility, an openness to innovation, adaptation and informal participation—all while breaking down hierarchies in order to engage, develop and retain youth leaders. Through efforts to understand and respond to youth-led movements and their needs, as we have outlined in the CCPF, organizations can adapt their approaches and infrastructure to become more flexible, nimble and impactful at all levels of civil society—from local initiatives to campaigns at the international level—building participation and strengthening civil society at the same time.
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## Appendix A: Emerging Catalysts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>OVERALL APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adam Everill</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emma Colenbrander</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Service Delivery/Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jacob Lindsay</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Immersion/Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linh Do</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Creating Capacity, Tools &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rosie Thomas</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Creating Capacity, Tools &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ainsley Munroe</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aniqah Zowmi</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Immersion/Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brock Warner</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>David Lawless</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Advocacy/Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Joannes Paulus Yimbesalu</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Service Delivery/Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kavita Dogra</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Education/Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maegan McConnell</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Advocacy/Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Natalie Daley</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education/Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Oladipupo Ajroba</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Service Delivery/Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sarah Anderson</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Education/Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sebastián Vielmas</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Amélie Jézabel</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Creating Capacity, Tools &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Angel Versetti</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Training &amp; Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Isma Benboulerbah</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Advocacy/Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Johan Reboul</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Advocacy/Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sarah Gogel</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, and Civil Society</td>
<td>Immersion/Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Stéphanie David</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Advocacy/Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Thomas Bedouet</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yanis Lammari</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arno Zimmermann</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Service Delivery/Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kassandra Kate Ramey</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Advocacy/Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Kim Schmitz</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Service Delivery/Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kristina Lunz</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mirja Hitzemann</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pauline Geyer</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Thomas Scheele</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Tiaji Maynell Sio</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Vincent-Immanuel Herr</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Alex McDonald</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cem Yildiz</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Media / Content Creation / Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Dang Minh Quang</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Gurjinder Dahiwal</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Poverty Alleviation</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Jasvir Singh</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Marta Balint</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Media / Content Creation / Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Natasha Lipman</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Media / Content Creation / Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Resham Kotecha</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Vanessa Worrell</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Zoe Kellend</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Poverty Alleviation</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Aaron Carr</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Economic Justice</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Alejandro Sorto</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Alexandra Thiss</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Education / Awareness Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ameen Amin</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Andrew Amezquita</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Poverty Alleviation</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Andrew Leon Hanna</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Leadership, Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Anjali Shankar</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Arpan Dahal</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Blaney Garcia</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Biola Jeje</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Brisa Muñoz</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Immersion/Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Burcu Bozkurt</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>OVERALL APPROACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Caitlin Kawaguchi</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Christopher J. Suggs</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Immersive / Experiential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Dylan Amlin</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Eliana Fernandez</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Emeka Ukaga</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Media / Content Creation / Storytelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Emily Mayer</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Evan Weber</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Climate Action and Environment</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Ileri Jaiyeoba</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Irene Pedruelo</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Jesse Chen</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Creating Capacity, Tools &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Kanchan Amatya</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Poverty Alleviation</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Leslie Martinez</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Education / Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>M. Baylen Campbell</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Creating Capacity, Tools &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Maggie Moore</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Natasha Lipman</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Martese Mason</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Economic Justice</td>
<td>Training &amp; Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Mentor Dida</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Creating Capacity, Tools &amp; Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Milan Taylor</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Nadya Okamoto</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Prospero Herrera</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Raluca Besliuu</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Education / Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Rexy Josh Dodaro</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Partnerships for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Rohullah Najibi</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Sabrina McDaniel</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Sarah Worley</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Economic Justice</td>
<td>Service Delivery / Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Savannah Badalich</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Gender and LGBTI Equality</td>
<td>Community Organizing &amp; Movement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Steve McFarland</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Tevahn Brown</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Education / Awareness Raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Timothy Hirschel-Burns</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Justice and Peace</td>
<td>Coalition-building, Network Development, Solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Toora Arsa</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Democracy, Governance, Civil Society</td>
<td>Advocacy / Campaigning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Sector Advisory Team

The following individuals contributed to the research and findings of the report by helping to collect more data, recruiting Emerging Catalysts, providing feedback on findings and analysis and helping to shape recommendations and actionable strategy. Their support of this group was critical to ensure we garnered diverse perspectives and experiences, including a few who are not listed formally below.

ALICIA BLÁZQUEZ FERNÁNDEZ
Senior Campaigns Manager, ONE

ASHOK REGMI
International Youth Foundation

DAR VANDERBECK
Chief Innovation Officer, CARE USA

DAVID RAY
Vice President, Policy & Advocacy, CARE

EMMANUELLE BOMO
Associate Program Officer

GLOBAL POLICY AND ADVOCACY
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

GABRIELA JAEGGER
Co-Founder at Global Changemakers

JASON CLARK
Engineers Without Borders Canada / Ingénieurs sans frontières Canada

JEAN MANNEY
US Director at Restless Development

JEFFERY HUFFINES
UN Representative (NY), CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation

JENNIFER LENTFER

KATHERINE HERMANS
Director at Global Changemakers

MARGIE LAUTER
Regional Advocacy & Global Partnerships Coordinator, CARE

MARLOU HERMSEN
General Manager, World Merit

MICHAEL SILBERMAN
Global Director at Mobilisation Lab, Greenpeace

PAMELA PUCHALSKI

PIERS BRADFORD
Managing Director, Project Everyone

RACHELE TARDI
Senior Program Manager, Open Society Foundations

RYOTA JONEN
World Movement for Democracy

SARAH THOMPSON
Executive Director, Christian Peacemaker Teams

SIMON MOSS
Co-founder at Global Citizen

TOM ALLEN
Special Projects Lead at Greenpeace
Appendix C: Glossary

**COLLECTIVE CIVIC PARTICIPATION:** A strategy proposed by Rhize based on our research on contemporary youth civic participation, designed for civil society organizations to respond and adapt the emergence of social movements citizenship as a major avenue of political participation.

**COLLECTIVE CIVIC PARTICIPATION FRAMEWORK:** A strategy proposed by Rhize based on our research on contemporary youth civic participation, designed for civil society organizations to respond and adapt to the emergence of social movements citizenship as a major avenue of political participation.

**CSIS:** Formalized and professionalized civil society organizations and institutions, including non-governmental organizations at all levels of society (international to local).

**CIVIL SOCIETY SECTOR (OR “THE SECTOR”):** A catch-all term generally referring to funded operations—foundations, certain government programs that engage citizens directly (but not service delivery), formal civil society organizations, can include loose networks and groups—engaged in supporting people and communities outside of government.

**DIGITAL NATIVE:** A person who had access to digital technology from an early age in a way that using technology is intrinsic to everyday life.

**EMERGING CATALYST:** A youth leader from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Australia or Canada who applied to or was recommended to join the Emerging Catalyst Youth Network.

**EMERGING CATALYST YOUTH NETWORK:** A network of eighty-five youth leaders or Emerging Catalysts who participated in the research and recommendations process and continue to share information and opportunities.

**GLOBAL GOALS:** Another term for the Sustainable Development Goals.

**GLOBAL NORTH:** A term used to describe countries, largely located in the Northern or Western Hemispheres that are socially and economically developed, typically with a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of over $10,000 per capita. These include the six target countries in this study—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Australia and Canada.

**GLOBAL SOUTHERN STATES:** A term used to describe countries, largely located in the Southern Hemisphere that are socially and economically depressed, typically with a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of under $10,000 per capita.

**GLOBAL YOUTH LEADERSHIP:** Traditionally, global youth leadership refers to young people who are formally engaged with organizations or institutions that assert influence within or through the international system of decision makers, donors and policy makers or work in issues explicitly outside of one’s country. This report offers up a different definition of this conception of leadership.

**INGOS:** An international non-governmental organization that operates independently from states and international governmental organisations, working internationally.

**NGOS:** A non-governmental organization that operates independently from states and international governmental organisations. For the sake of this report, NGOs largely refer to domestically focused organizations.

**MILLENNIAL:** A person born between the years of 1980 and 2000, broadly speaking.

**PARTICIPATION APPROACH:** The primary opportunity available for a person to become involved in an organization. This is determined explicitly by an organization's programming.

**SECTOR ADVISORY TEAM:** A coalition of representatives from formal civil society organizations brought together because of their work in youth engagement, international development or global development advocacy. They were recruited by Rhize, based on their knowledge and experience, to advise and input into the research process.

**SECTOR INFORMANT:** An individual who, based on their experience and professional role, informed this research regarding the current state of civil society from either an organizational or independent perspective.

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS (SDGS):** A set of 169 targets across seventeen global development goals produced by the UN which focus on critical issues that must be addressed in order to “end poverty, protect the planet and ensure prosperity for all” by 2030.

**TRANSLOCAL:** An issue or idea that has a specific local impact but also connects with similar issues or ideas across a broader context or in different localities. This term derives from more scientific studies of migration and geography.
YOUTH: For the purposes of this report, someone who falls within the age range of fifteen to thirty years.

YOUTH BULGE: Describing the global trend of exponential increase in proportion of youth populations to other demographic groups within countries and globally. With over half of the world’s population under the age of thirty, the youth bulge has been credited with creating challenges for economic development and mobility, particularly in the Global South.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT FRAMEWORK: A tool used to categorize the relationship between a traditional organization and the youth they do or do not engage. Through the international system of decision world’s population under the age of 30, the Youth Bulge has been credited with creating challenges for economic development and mobility, particularly in the Global South.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT FRAMEWORK: A tool used to categorize the relationship between a traditional organization and the youth they do or do not engage.

YOUTH LEADER: A passionate and driven young person who has taken initiative to catalyze social change and take on the responsibility to lead others to also get involved in social change.

YOUTH PARTICIPATION APPROACH: The primary opportunity or activity available for youth to participate or become involved in an organization. This is determined explicitly by an organization's programming.

YOUTH ADVISORY TEAM: A select group of the Emerging Catalysts Network who participated in independent, one-on-one interviews.
Appendix D: Organizational Mapping Fields

This section delineates the data classifications used to analyze the sector map of 425 civil society groups across six target countries—Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States. We also specify specific data classifications for the Emerging Catalysts survey analysis. To view the data maps, please visit: www.rhize.org/sectormap:

Overall Data Classifications

Main Issue Focus

We classified both Emerging Catalysts and sector institutions—international development, youth development and leading national institutions—by their main issue of focus, which looks at their cause or main area of interest. We used the seventeen SDGs as a guide to creating ten issue categories that encompass the main focus of all mapped organizations.

While many youth and organizations can be categorized into multiple categories, we picked the most relevant issue for that civil society actor in order to be able to assess more nuance in the dataset overall. For example, one catalyst works at the intersection of health and gender and LGBTI equality. However, given that their work most closely aligns with health-centered advocacy, we categorized them as health.

Climate Action and Environment: Issues related to the improvement of the environment or tackling climate change, including climate justice, environmental sustainability, clean oceans and air, renewable energy, land protection, access to water;

Education: Relates to institutions specifically focused on improving the formal education system, including education equity, access, quality and affordability;

Food Security and Sustainability: Issues linked to access to healthy and sustainable food. This includes food justice, sustainable farming practices, responsible and sustainable food systems and nutrition;

Gender and LGBTI Equality: Efforts focused on empowering gender minorities and achieving justice and access for people of all genders and sexualities, including female empowerment, LGBTI equality, fair pay, equal recognition under the law and anti-discrimination;

Health: Issues that relate to the physical health of individuals, including maternal health, disease reduction, access to healthcare and medicines, quality and affordable healthcare, wellness and disease prevention;

Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Focuses on improvement of the international development system, achieving the SDGs, coordination between international institutions, global advocacy and agenda setting, global poverty advocacy and constituency development;

Poverty Alleviation: A broader category that largely refers to international work or work in the Global South that focuses on direct service and development aid for the purposes of poverty reduction, broadly defined. This is usually used to classify institutions that focus on “sustainable development” more broadly and from multiple issue standpoints;

(Social) Justice and Peace: Refers to issues around human rights, societal inclusion of marginalized or stigmatized groups and violence prevention. This includes: anti-discrimination based on race, religion, ethnicity; migration, immigration, statelessness and refugees and anti-violence, reconciliation, criminal and juvenile justice, legal system reforms, peace and nonviolence;

Democracy, Governance & Civil Society: Relates to issues focused on stronger democracies, more accountable and transparent government and stronger capacities of civil society and civil society actors. This includes leadership development, civic education and civic technology;

Economic Justice: Focused largely on issues related to tackling economic inequities, particularly at the systems level. This includes fair labor, homelessness, entrepreneurship, access to capital for marginalized communities, economic growth, responsible consumption and building more accountable financial systems;
CLASSIFICATIONS OF ORGANIZATION-TYPE

**EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION:** Formal center of learning, whether academic, cultural, historic

**FOUNDATION:** Private donor with the main function if giving grants

**GOVERNMENT/INTERGOVERNMENTAL:** Program or entity directly associated with a governmental institution

**INGO:** International non-governmental organization with a mission focused on issues outside of the country of its main operational-base or headquarters

**NETWORK:** An organized network of people or organizations located in different places, whether physically or virtually

**NGO-NATIONAL:** Non-governmental organization with a mission focused on issues that take place within its borders

**PLATFORM:** A digital tool that creates a way for people to tell or amplify their stories, share information or mobilize across geographic localities

**CAMPAIGN:** An organized group pushing for a specific political or social objective, geared towards collective action and is time-bound

**EVENT:** A conference or other type of gathering that happens over a short period of time

**PUBLICATION:** A magazine, website or other type of media with the primary purpose of creating new content

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT FRAMEWORK

Classifies how youth are involved in their work in terms of the role they play and the opportunities for leadership development that accompany these roles:

**GLOBAL:** Based in one country but specifically focuses on issues outside of their

**NO ENGAGEMENT:** An organization has no youth-specific engagement opportunities, though youth may still engage as members of the general public.

**YOUTH AS ASSETS:** Institutions recognize a need to help young people but do not involve youth in the design of programs for this purpose, instead relying on non-youth, volunteers or professional staff. They provide opportunities for youth to learn and get exposure to new ideas, cultures and issues. While these programs certainly prove beneficial, young people are given little opportunity to step into leadership roles beyond a specific program and have little autonomy to determine how their voice, images or stories are used by the organization.

**YOUTH AS RECIPIENTS:** Organizations understand the importance of creating opportunities for youth to participate in decision-making by providing symbolic opportunities for leadership. This can mean that a young person is asked to join an advisory board or youth council, but largely as a professional development opportunity and not as substantive contributors to any strategy or meeting. Youth may also take part in training, educational or networking opportunities with little input into the agenda or what would be most useful for them to get out of the experience.

**YOUTH AS PARTNERS:** Youth are included as significant contributors to organizational and project decisionmaking and are seen as important partners that bring unique skills, perspectives and leadership to design and build initiatives. Youth often run their own groups but are integrated into the initiative’s broader strategy as equal contributors either as part of the wider organization or in partnership with greater networks and constituencies.

**YOUTH AS LEADERS:** Organizations see youth as already leading. They follow the work of youth-led initiatives and when requested, provide support for youth leadership, expertise and access to institutions or other resources.

GEORGIC FOCUS

Geographic focus classifies each initiative based on scale and orientation of their work:

**GLOBAL:** Based in one country but specifically focuses on issues outside of their region, largely in the Global North

**NATIONAL:** Focuses on issues within one country

**LOCAL:** Focuses on issues within one community, town or city

**TRANSLOCAL:** Campaigns, networks organizations or other activities that focuses its work on local impact but also a clear connection, understanding or mission that contextualizes their work within a global context mission focused on issues outside of the country of its main operational-base or headquarters
PARTICIPATION APPROACH

These activities are ways that people can participate in social change and/or through an organization. Each activity is classified into five overall categories of participation:

GLOBAL: Based in one country but specifically focuses on issues outside of

CATEGORY 1: Activities focus on breadth of participation over depth. They require little time (up to a few minutes) and do not require a follow-on action.

CATEGORY 2: Activities require more time (anywhere from a few minutes to a few months) but do not necessarily lead to ownership of the work or more commitment beyond activities predetermined by institutions. These activities tend to be oriented around volunteering or one-off experiences without additional ways to stay involved once the activity is complete.

CATEGORY 3: Activities require more commitment, ownership and time in order to take part. These activities help to build capacities and skills of the participant and give the participant a degree of autonomy and responsibility.

CATEGORY 4: Activities relate to participants as owners and contributors to their work and require long-term commitment beyond a few activities. These activities help participants develop capacities they can apply to a broader mission, under which they take ongoing actions.

CATEGORY 5: Activities focus explicitly on building and developing leaders that work with explicit purpose to a cause or mission, have ownership over their work and will continue to take action and build new capacities for the sector, expertise and access to institutions or other resources.

Specific activities are numbered according to the degree of commitment it builds with the people taking action, based on the level of investment required by an organization + level of effort by the participant over the time it takes the participant.

0.0 LITTLE/NO ENGAGEMENT: Does not appear to be any youth engagement or way for youth to participate.

1.1 SERVICE DELIVERY/AID: Providing direct services for the alleviation of specific material.

1.2 EDUCATION/AWARENESS RAISING: Educates public/beneficiaries about specific issues without any specific action attached to it, simply for groups to “be more aware” of a cause.

1.3 MEDIA/CONTENT CREATION/STORYTELLING: Asks participants to share or create media/tell a story without any tangible action attached to it.

1.4 EVENTS/WORKSHOPS/CONFERENCE: Primary way of engagement is through a one-off event or opportunity without clear follow up.

2.1 VOLUNTEERISM: Community-service or practice of “aid delivery,” usually a one-off experience (whether a few hours or a few months).

2.2 IMMERSION/EXPERIENTIAL: An opportunity to “experience” a different culture/issue by going to the place and engaging directly with a community/different group of people.

2.3 ADVOCACY/CAMPAIGNING: Asks beneficiaries/public to join them in advocating or campaigning for specific causes/actions but does not invite them to create their own actions; advocacy is to specific targets such as government officials.

3.1 FUNDRAISING: When public/beneficiaries are actively engaged in raising money for the organization/cause.

3.2 DONOR: Giving money to a cause/issue/group.

3.3 TRAINING AND SKILLS: Providing individuals or groups with specific skills but without a clear ask/directive attached to it; usually a pre-determined training for a specific skill.

4.1 INCUBATOR/ACCELERATOR: A program that works to build the capacity of an existing group/individual with a lot of potential that provides capacity/skills/mentorship/resources to ensure their success.

4.2 COALITION-BUILDING, NETWORK DEVELOPMENT AND SOLIDARITY: Bringing together individuals or groups for better coordination, learning and feeling more a part of a community.

4.3 CREATING CAPACITY, TOOLS AND RESOURCES: The provision of critical tools and resources that help bolster an individual or group’s capacity/ability to fulfill on their potential/mission so that they can build on existing resources/knowledge.

5.1 RESEARCH AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT: For public/beneficiaries this means development of research/policy; for youth participation it means youth-led research/policy development for a specific cause.

5.2 LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES: Providing opportunities/spaces for leaders to exercise their leadership.

5.3 LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT: Training individuals/groups specifically in leadership or augmenting their leadership capacity in a way that allows individuals to fulfill on their own goals.
5.4 DIRECT FUNDING: Provision of funding directly to groups/individuals in a way that they can use towards their mission/achievement of a specific goal (and not cut through red tape or go through an intermediary/create bureaucracy).

5.5 COMMUNITY-ORGANIZING AND MOVEMENT-BUILDING: Directly supporting/facilitating/sparking the capacity development of a broader network/movement.

Emerging Catalyst Data

We also classified the Emerging Catalysts within these additional categories:

YOUNG ARCHETYPES

We analyzed the capacities in which Emerging Catalysts are practicing leadership and classified them into seven predominant categories:

PROFESSIONALS who build interest in the world and experience as leaders through working in established organizations and businesses that relate to the issues they care about.

VOLUNTEERS who tend to work alongside traditional organizations or INGOs, providing direct service to at-risk communities.

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS who start their own enterprises with an international development focus, often in countries in which they do not have a personal connection.

GLOBAL ADVOCATES who focus on international advocacy in order to create change on global issues that they see manifested in their local context.

LOCAL MOVEMENT BUILDERS OR “ORGANIZERS” who work on issues that directly affect their community or country. Usually these issues are framed as local issues but they often have relevance and potential connection to global issues.

DIGITAL ACTIVISTS include young people who are social media influencers. They share content, launch digital petitions or campaigns and encourage and mobilize others to take online actions to support specific causes and issues. This group includes both citizen journalists documenting global and local events and youth leaders who use digital platforms as a main source of communication, action organizing and amplification.

ASPIRANTS describe young people who are still formulating their role in social change. They want to be more civically engaged, start their own ventures and have an interest in politics, but have yet to identify a sustained way to participate, whether through a career or as a volunteer. They engage through media, awareness-raising or one-off volunteer opportunities which increases their interest in deeper engagement in the future.

YOUTH PATHWAYS

These pathways characterize the ways in which Emerging Catalysts initially became involved in social change work:

PARENTAL INFLUENCE is a leading factor that shapes the way some young people get involved. Parents’ experiences and perspectives shape how youth understand their role as catalysts from an early age and often create opportunities for youth to take action.

DIASPORA COMMUNITIES AND FAMILIES ground youth experience in an inherently global perspective. Having personal connection to another country or culture inspires young people to engage with global challenges, whether related to their own or their family’s migration experience, their country of origin or other issues.

TRAVEL AND EDUCATION opportunities expose young people to issues beyond their immediate context. Often youth from the Global North come into contact with development issues in the Global South for the first time through these opportunities. Either rooted in academic discourse, volunteer work or cultural exchange, this pathway creates access to new experiences, perspectives and alternate realities that often inspire youth to continue engagement with an issue.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT explicitly describes opportunities created by formal organizations within the human rights and international development sector that build expertise, professional skills, networking space and deeper understanding for how the sector operates, opening doors to a career.

PERSONAL STRUGGLE WITH INEQUALITY refers to leaders who begin to take action because of personal encounters with structural inequality that have directly affected them or someone close to them.
Appendix E: Key Elements of the Global Citizenship Lab

The Global Citizenship Lab will discover and illuminate best practices in movement-building, campaigning and digital strategies that will better situate CSIs to carry out their missions as guardians and promoters of civil society. Using the CCPF as a guide, members will work together to bolster innovative campaign and movement work and strengthen networks. Together, we will create common infrastructure that closes the formal-informal gap in the following ways:

1. DEVELOP AND RESEARCH BEST PRACTICES FOR CCPF IMPLEMENTATION: Organizational members of the Lab will convene digitally and periodically in-person to share their work and learnings in implementing elements of the CCPF. As CSIs adapt CCPF principles, they have a place to learn from one another and break out of inefficient silos. For example, one CSI may develop a new metrics structure for rapid response campaigning. Another may share how they have reorganized their advocacy, communications and fundraising teams to better connect and support local movements for better access to and quality of girls’ education.

In addition to sharing best practices, the Lab may conduct specific research to help better inform the work of its members. Members of the academic community will also be invited to participate, evaluate programs and even conduct associated research, which can contribute to the honing of best practice and strengthen current evidence in the field.

2. PILOT CCPF INITIATIVES AND DEVELOP A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE: CSIs will test and iterate the implementation of CCPF by piloting support of campaigns, movements and other promising initiatives and/or the integration of CCPF principles into their current programs. This includes innovating new technologies as well as mechanisms to better access existing technologies. Organizations may singularly pilot projects or find common causes and build collaborative projects with other groups. Through a community of practice, they can learn from and influence each other, connect and recognize common priorities and test new approaches.

Pilots inform new support models and begin to create a more coordinated, collaborative civil society architecture of participation. Each new pilot contributes to a deeper understanding of the CCPF. For example, a few organizations may identify a common need for an SMS technology that alerts their grassroots networks to funding opportunities. One organization may pilot a rapid response fund that quickly disburses funds to emergent campaigns. Another CSI may iterate a series of interventions that strengthen a global network of reproductive health activists over a twelve-month period.

3. SHARE CAPACITIES AND ASSETS: Different CSIs bring unique experiences and capacities to their work. The Lab will create a space where organizations can offer up connections to a climate change network or the capacity to connect with local governments or a rapid response mechanism or use of a new technology. As different institutions find ways to support each other through existing capacities, they breakdown the silos that stifle their work. CSIs coordination also creates donor incentive to fund more collaborative approaches that use resources more effectively and with less risk. This orientation towards shared capacities begins to situate organizations more as facilitators and connectors in service of grassroots work rather than the programmers or implementers.

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP INNOVATION FUND

In addition to a space for exchange, we recommend creating a Global Citizenship Fund, which will allow the Lab to support movements and campaigns outside of the specific needs of organizations. Funds may go to movements in the form of challenge grants, rapid response support at key moments of mobilization or towards critical capacity support. Knowledge accumulated from this support will also be absorbed back into the Lab and inform members’ work.

STRUCTURE & MEMBERSHIP

Organizations, foundations, academic institutions, individuals and other non-governmental groups may become members of the Lab with an annual fee that will go to core operations and coordination. Funds for the Global Citizenship Fund will be raised separately, given the resource restrictions for many member groups. The Lab will be coordinated by Rhize and governed collectively by its members and a rotating steering committee that is representative of its membership.