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About ETHOS

ETHOS - Towards a European Theory Of Justice and fairness, is a European Commission Horizon 2020 research project that seeks to provide building blocks for the development of an empirically informed European theory of justice and fairness. The project seeks to do so by:

a) refining and deepening the knowledge on the European foundations of justice - both historically based and contemporary envisaged;
b) enhancing awareness of mechanisms that impede the realisation of justice ideals as they are lived in contemporary Europe;
c) advancing the understanding of the process of drawing and re-drawing of the boundaries of justice (fault lines); and
d) providing guidance to politicians, policy makers, advocacies and other stakeholders on how to design and implement policies to reserve inequalities and prevent injustice.

ETHOS does not merely understand justice as an abstract moral ideal, that is universal and worth striving for. Rather, it is understood as a re-enacted and re-constructed ‘lived’ experience. The experience is embedded in firm legal, political, moral, social, economic and cultural institutions that are geared to giving members of society what is their due.

In the ETHOS project, justice is studied as an interdependent relationship between the ideal of justice, and its real manifestation – as set in the highly complex institutions of modern European societies. The relationship between the normative and practical, the formal and informal, is acknowledged and critically assessed through a multi-disciplinary approach.

To enhance the formulation of an empirically-based theory of justice and fairness, ETHOS will explore the normative (ideal) underpinnings of justice and its practical realisation in four heuristically defined domains of justice - social justice, economic justice, political justice, and civil and symbolic justice. These domains are revealed in several spheres:

a) philosophical and political tradition,
b) legal framework,
c) daily (bureaucratic) practice,
d) current public debates, and
e) the accounts of the vulnerable populations in six European countries (the Netherlands, the UK, Hungary, Austria, Portugal and Turkey).

The question of drawing boundaries and redrawing the fault-lines of justice permeates the entire investigation. Alongside Utrecht University in the Netherlands who coordinate the project, five further research institutions cooperate. They are based in Austria (European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy), Hungary (Central European University), Portugal (Centre for Social Studies), Turkey (Boğaziçi University), and the UK (University of Bristol). The research project lasts from January 2017 to December 2019.
Executive Summary

This report is part of WP8 – Policy and Dissemination and acts as a follow-up and evaluation report of the Landscapes of Justice web app. The app was created as part of the overall dissemination strategy for ETHOS to on the one hand communicate (on) justice issues to the wider public, and on the other hand to disseminate project insights. D8.3 gives further insight into the development of the app. The app went online in 2018 and has since given users from the European Union member states, Turkey and beyond the opportunity to visualise their own Landscape of Justice, to compare it to others, and to learn more about justice and human rights as it affects their daily lives.

This report on the one hand serves as a narrative document outlining the development and implementation of the web app, focusing on challenges, lessons learnt and results of having the app online for the past year in several different languages. On the other hand, the report serves as an evaluation of the insights yielded from users’ submissions to the app. The app is not part of the scientific enquiries launched by ETHOS – it is a dissemination tool making it possible to gain insight into perceptions about individual justice experience. While no personal data was gathered, the answers submitted by users are ascribed a numerical value, which was statistically evaluated. Hence, it is possible to gain insight into how users in different countries evaluate justice in their daily lives on a scale from 0 (not favourable to justice) to 100 (very favourable to justice). The app touches on six topics, which each pose four lines of enquiry to the user, encompassing individual, societal, state and capability conceptions.

The insights and impressions yielded from the user data merely serve anecdotal purposes and highlight individual narratives and subjective experiences about justice in the European Union member states, Turkey and beyond. These insights can give an impression of individuals’ perceptions on justice and justice-related topics, and showcase possible future paths for (academic) enquiry. However, the data is not scientific and by no means representative for the state of justice in a particular country.

The inputs yielded from users show that even though the findings are solely anecdotal, there are definite parallels between recent European developments and how users perceive justice in the three spheres. Concretely, there are several interrelated aspects that mirror current developments in Europe pertaining to shifting dynamics in political participation and political representation, perceptions on the role of state institutions in combatting inequalities, and the potential of personal agency in advancing justice claims. There are also interesting insights related to users’ sense of individual privilege versus their sense of societal privilege overall, and on commonly held perceptions on ‘old’ and ‘new’ European member states.

Overall, the insights highlight the importance and status of justice in users’ daily lives and also the relevance of the Landscapes of Justice app as a tool for communication and dissemination on justice and justice-related topics. In addition, the results show that human rights standards, as conceptualised in the app, are indeed a useful means to grasp and make sense of justice perceptions.
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I. Introduction

This document serves as a review of the European Landscapes of Justice web app that was developed in the context of the ETHOS project. The application went online in mid-2018 and has since yielded a considerable amount of individual ‘landscapes of justice’, as well as interesting insights on differing perceptions of justice in the European Union member states, Turkey and beyond. This includes the six ETHOS project countries, as well as countries within and outside the European Union. The app provides visualisations of people’s individual perceptions of justice in their daily life and also extends this depiction to more societal and also political dimensions. Users are offered concise information about the link between justice and their daily lives, as well as about the connection with human rights.

As a dissemination tool, the app does not yield scientific or representative results. As a playful method to engage with the public through science-to-public communication and as a means to disseminate project results, the app has made it possible to gain a glimpse into individual sentiments and to raise critical questions about justice perceptions in an informal manner. ETHOS project results were integrated into the app and disseminated in an innovative and ‘unconventional’ manner likely to attract widespread interest by moving away from classical, academically-focused dissemination efforts. Yet, the tension within the app between acting as a fun game on the one hand, and as a tool to deliver project insights and awareness on the other, has yielded interesting results and raised further questions relevant for communication, dissemination and other inquisitive endeavours beyond ETHOS.

The report at hand is a narrative document outlining the conceptualisation and rationale behind the app, and simultaneously it seeks to present the Landscapes app as a means to communicate and engage with the public and a method to disseminate project results. The statistical data available from app usage, i.e. quantified data on individual and subjective impressions of justice experiences, is evaluated and noteworthy insights and avenues for further enquiry are highlighted.
II. The Process of Conceptualizing the Landscapes of Justice

A. Developing the Landscapes of Justice web app

The European Landscapes of Justice web app has been conceptualized as a science-to-public communication and dissemination tool with two goals: to engage with the public and to share ETHOS topics based on the key concepts of justice as provided in the project. The ETHOS project conceives justice as a continuously re-enacted and re-constructed lived experience, embedded in firm legal, political, moral, social, economic and cultural institutions that are geared to giving members of society what is their due. To this end, Nancy Fraser’s tripartite conceptualisation of justice as (re)distribution, representation and recognition has been drawn upon to provide a framework for conceptualising different spheres of justice that link closely to daily life experiences.

During the course of the ETHOS project, the new and integrated theory of justice and fairness is developed drawing on theoretical and empirical input. However, as this theory is the end output of the project, it was not available for use during the conceptualisation and creation of the Landscapes of Justice app. Hence, to meet the requirement of successfully promoting the yet-to-be-developed theory, the Landscapes app is based on Fraser’s tri-partite approach as proposed in the ETHOS project proposal. The three different spheres of justice, redistribution, recognition and representation, supplemented by Amartya Sen’s conceptualisation of capability, provided the basis for the development of the app. The app was conceived as a playful tool for users to share their experiences of justice on the one hand, and to raise awareness and to disseminate project outputs on the other. In this vein, Fraser’s and Sen’s conceptualisation of justice provided the basis for the four-fold approach of enquiry used in the app. This culminates in the structure of the first part of the game, in which users are provided with a range of questions relating to their perceptions of justice as a lived experience.

Against the backdrop of Fraser’s tri-partite justice conceptualisation, human rights standards, as framed in the Bill of Rights, serve as the theoretical and practical starting point underpinning the app and the relevance of justice to daily life. To give a comprehensive picture on how justice is perceived by the individual as indicated by human rights standards, the concept further includes the ideas of redistribution, recognition and representation. This relates justice and human rights standards both to the self and to those making up the community (i.e. immediate surroundings or society), as well as to the question of whether the state meets its obligations in this regard. Finally, and to round off the enquiry approach, the last component refers to the concept of capability as a link to justice, since enabled capability can be seen as a phenomenon of fulfilled justice ideals.

Taken together, the combination of justice and human rights standards and fulfilment, one’s perception of justice in terms of fairness as compared to one’s immediate surroundings as well as personal capabilities provides a comprehensive picture of a user’s perceived sense of justice compared to basic human values, their personal context, and in their daily life. It also pays attention to the projects’ particular consideration of vulnerable groups, by touching on issues and experiences relevant for all. In other words, the Landscapes of Justice app conceives human rights as a starting point for experiencing justice in daily life, allowing for enquiry in the components of experience relating to the individual, the society, the state, and to capability. Topic-wise,
the enquiry extends to topics in the social, political, economic and legal domains. In a given visualisation, the
criteria of fulfilment or non-fulfilment provide an idea of what the ideal and non-ideal ‘landscape’ would look
like, respectively. At the same time, the individual topic-related inputs given by users yield themselves to
comparison with individual countries, all member states of the European Union and Turkey, as well as with
countries outside the European Union and Turkey (referred to as ‘other’ in the app).

The combination of these approaches to understanding and enquiring forms the structure of the game - the
very heart of the Landscapes of Justice. From the wide range of possible topics to enquire about that showcase
justice as a daily, lived experience, six topics relevant to daily life were chosen to represent the three spheres
of justice: justice as redistribution, representation and recognition, while the capability aspect of justice was
incorporated into the statements shown to the user. The choice of issues mostly followed considerations such
as the relevance for the topic of justice and the comparability thereof throughout Europe. Justice as
redistribution is thereby represented by the two topics of health and housing, justice as representation by the
right to political participation and political representation, and justice as recognition by freedom of expression
and the right to non-discrimination related to sexual orientation. A ‘questionnaire’ of four statements per issue
was developed and submitted to repeated internal evaluation and external testing before the final
questionnaire was released to coding and translating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REDISTRIBUTION</th>
<th>HEALTH</th>
<th>Correlation/visualization</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>standard in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>relation to self</strong></td>
<td>When I am ill or injured, I receive good medical treatment.</td>
<td>Size of object (hospital building)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Sometimes – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>standard in</strong></td>
<td>There is good health care available for everyone in my country.</td>
<td>Detail (number of persons exercising)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Partly – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>relation to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>community</strong></td>
<td>The state invests into a good health care system.</td>
<td>Additional man-made object (emergency helicopter) present/not present</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State obligation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capability</strong></td>
<td>When I experience problems with the healthcare system, I inform the responsible ombudspersons.</td>
<td>Animal(s) (Saint Bernard dog) present/not present</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>standard in</strong></td>
<td>I can afford a flat that I feel comfortable living in.</td>
<td>Size of object (apartment building)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Sometimes – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to community</td>
<td>After paying rent, all people in my country still have enough money available to cover living expenses.</td>
<td>Detail (ice cream vendor and children)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Partly – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to community</td>
<td>I can participate in any demonstration against my government without fear.</td>
<td>Size of object (number of protesters)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Sometimes – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to community</td>
<td>In my country demonstrations take place on all topics, no matter how controversial.</td>
<td>Detail (banners, speaker’s stand)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Partly – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State obligation</td>
<td>The police can be relied on to protect the security of those who are demonstrating.</td>
<td>Additional man-made object (police car) present/not present</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>I know what I can do if I am discriminated against when looking for a flat.</td>
<td>Animal(s) (cats) present/not present</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Overview of statements for health and housing within justice as redistribution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State obligation</th>
<th>I can stand for office myself to represent my interests.</th>
<th>Additional man-made object (coffee cup) present/not present</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>When topics I care about are not tackled enough, I contact the responsible politicians.</td>
<td>Animal(s) (swans) present/not present</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Overview of statements for participation and representation within justice as representation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Correlation/visualization</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to self</td>
<td>Have you ever been offended by casual jokes or comments made to your cost (due to your gender, ethnicity, religion, etc)?</td>
<td>Size of object (speech bubble)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Sometimes – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to community</td>
<td>Can you rank how widespread is offensive language about certain groups of people (persons with disabilities, foreigners, LGBTI etc.) in your country?</td>
<td>Detail (number of persons joining the conversation)</td>
<td>Completely – Mostly – Partly – Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State obligation</td>
<td>Do you believe that the state consequently condemns hate speech against all groups affected by it?</td>
<td>Additional man-made object (street lamp) on/off</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Would you actively call out people for making offensive jokes?</td>
<td>Animal(s) (beagle dog) present/not present</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEXUAL ORIENTATION (DISCRIMINATION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Correlation/visualization</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to self</td>
<td>Do you feel free to hold hands in public with your partner without fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed?</td>
<td>Size of object (trees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights standard in relation to community</td>
<td>In your country are people accepted regardless of their sexual orientation?</td>
<td>Detail (flowers on trees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elaborating and testing the questionnaire, however, was only one task in developing the Landscapes of Justice. Additional features, including the compare function, the button to share results, as well as the comprehensive information platform had to be conceptualized to supplement and round off the app. Hence, a visual concept had to be found that could be implemented to attract users, whilst simultaneously featuring engaging, informative, but also goal-oriented components.

### B. Popularising scientific insights through visualisations

#### I. Visualising justice

One of the major challenges faced in the creation of the app was to bridge the tension between a clearly academic interest and intention, and the nature and workings of a fun, online app.

A questionnaire, no matter how much thought is put into it, will not per se attract users - particularly not users likely to come from a non-academic background. Therefore, the concept for the Landscapes of Justice app included the idea to visually reward the user for every taken and every answer given. Instead of painting fantasy worlds, the project team decided to ground the visuals on a concept that has been a common European heritage throughout European cultural history: the *locus amoenus* or ‘pleasant place’, a literary and art-historical topos that generally refers to an idealised place of safety or comfort. To avoid the impression of a purely rural idyll without relevance for today’s world, the constituting elements of the *locus amoenus*, such as shady trees, grassy meadows and water, were transferred into an urban park surrounded by a modern cityscape. In this vein, they spark recognition in users from both rural and urban areas, and are likely to be recognised as a landscape likely to occur throughout the European Union, Turkey and beyond.

The Landscapes of Justice app shows the perspective view of a park, with trees, a hammock and lanterns in the foreground, bushes, a playground, a café and a pond in the middle, and buildings of the surrounding city in the background (including a housing block and a hospital). When a user first enters the Landscapes app, these components are on a greyscale, and display only the minimum size and detail. This corresponds to the so-called ‘minimal Landscape’. As soon as the user answers statements, the corresponding area of the landscape will become coloured in, and, depending on the answers given, will grow in size and taken on more detail.
The different areal planes of the Landscapes as outlined above (front, middle, back) refer to the three spheres of justice. The cityscape in the background is dedicated to redistributive justice, exemplified by the issues of health and housing. The middle area refers to representative justice, highlighting the right to participation and political representation. Justice as recognition, exemplified by freedom of expression and the right to non-discrimination related to sexual orientation, takes up space in the very foreground of the landscape. Depending on how a user provides responses to the statements given, the respective area will either remain the same as in the minimal landscape (indicating a generally low fulfilment of human rights standards) or change depending to the statements. Thereby, the user’s very click seeks to playfully motivate them further to keep responding to statements, in order to yield their own individual Landscape of Justice, reflecting the (in)justices they perceive in their own world. By the time the user has completed all six topic areas, the whole landscape will have emerged in colour and detail, leading to a subjective feeling of fulfilment when compared to the previously grey, minimal Landscape.

Figures 1, 2, 3: Transition from grey, minimal landscape to coloured and individualized landscape by means of filling out topic areas

Upon having received a glimpse of one’s own Landscape, the project team made an effort to provide users with the ability to compare their own Landscape, guided by the assumption that a user may now wonder what other Landscapes look like compared to theirs. Clicking on the ‘Compare’ tab on top of the screen gives way for comparing each of the six areas in one’s own landscape to the median landscape of any country. In other words, the user can compare components of their own Landscape with median values of Landscapes from any country (each of the EU member states + Turkey), as well as with the median of all EU member state + Turkish responses, and responses from ‘other’ countries. In addition, they can compare their own Landscape to the ideal landscape, where all standards are fulfilled and all vulnerabilities are excluded. The comparison screen consists of a zoomed-in component of one’s own Landscape on the left, and the corresponding comparative Landscape with a drop-down menu on the right. By choosing from this drop-down menu, the user sets the parameters for the comparison. Below the pictures, four buttons appear, corresponding to the four statements within the topic. When clicking on these buttons, the user will see the statement as a reminder. The buttons themselves take on four different colours, depending on the median response given to the statement (ranging from dark green - light green - yellow - red).
Figures 3, 4: Compare mode and comparison of one topic

Playing around by displaying and comparing the answers given by users in different countries gives surprising insights into the life situations of users and might help to correct pre-suppositions. Are there major differences in the perception of justice and fairness? What might be the reason for these differences?

II. Linking to justice awareness

One of the main guiding aspects to creating the Landscapes of Justice web app was to consider the main pillars of justice education. This was done with the intention of providing education, training and information aimed at building a universal culture of justice and human rights. Justice education provides knowledge about justice and protective mechanisms, and also helps build skills that support the promotion, defence and application of justice and human rights in daily life. The project team considered it vital to make the app reflective of these intentions, as the goal was not only to gain insight into individual perceptions or to disseminate results, but also to communicate (on) justice through the app.

Communicating (on) justice in the framework of the Landscapes of Justice web app refers to all areas of justice education: In the field of knowledge and information, the app aims at widely sharing the idea of justice and fairness, as well as highlight the links between societal structures, hegemonic discourse and personal prejudice, stereotypes and stigmatization. This in turn can lead to users’ empowerment relating to their capacity to (legal) action. When it comes to attitudes and skills, users learn the relevance of social inequality structures and misrecognition cultures for their own lives and the lives of others. Consciousness and reflection on their own situation and the situation of others might also leave the user yearning for some sort of solution on how to improve the situation. In this way, the Landscapes of Justice app serves as a tool for justice education, an instrument that is in this case used to contribute to the aim of raising justice awareness.

Based on this rationale, the Landscapes of Justice app features a third component, namely a ‘learn more’ section dedicated to providing further information on the issues touched on, as well as more general issues surrounding them. Should the user feel the desire to learn more about the underlying conceptualisations of justice, the principles of justice, or any of the topics chosen, the ‘learn more’ tab, leading to a Landscape with
more clickable items than in the two tabs before. The topics covered on this information screen are, besides the six areas (health, housing, representation, participation, freedom of expression and sexual orientation) the notions of discrimination, justice in general, justice through (re)distribution, representation and recognition, human rights and human rights education.

Clicking on an item will reveal again a visual representation of the chosen area, as well as an easy-to-read summary on the chosen topic to broaden one’s horizon. The texts were written with the goal of providing easily understandable information on vulnerabilities, on justice and human rights, their relation with each other as well as their influence on one’s daily life. For total immersion, two buttons under the image link to a document with a collection of further links, as well as to a YouTube playlist with interesting videos. The information linked in these two components was selected following the nature of the ETHOS Communication Strategy, which foresees information being made available for users of various backgrounds and levels of understanding. Thus, the links suit many needs, ranging from academic papers (including ETHOS research) to TED talks, to videos, blog posts, and fun quizzes or games on the topics.
Justice

There are different approaches to Justice: for some people justice is primarily a question of a just (re-)distribution of material goods (e.g. wealth and income) and non-material goods (e.g. the right to vote or free access to the labor market).

By focusing on the ‘having’ aspect of justice, critics however miss out on issues of ‘being’ and ‘doing’, as well as issues relating to the standing

Figure 6: Short ‘Learn more’ text for ‘justice’ with two links to a relevant YouTube playlist and other collected materials under the image (below image on the left)

Figure 7: Sample link collection for ‘health’, ranging in difficulty from simple to academic
III. Communication and dissemination

A. The Landscapes of Justice as a Science-to-Public tool

I. Requirements met in developing an easily accessible science-to-public communication tool

The Landscapes of Justice app on the one hand seeks to allow users to concern themselves with and participate in justice-thinking, and on the other hand tries to lead by example in terms of usability and accessibility. It does not serve a scientific purpose but rather seeks to provide a glimpse into individuals’ sentiments and subjective perceptions on justice experiences.

The European Landscapes of Justice tool is targeted towards users from European countries and beyond Europe who have an interest in concerning themselves with the topic of justice and their own perceptions and experiences of it. Additionally, it is geared towards those seeking information on justice as it affects their daily lives. This aspect is particularly noteworthy, as it is likely that justice as a concept must be demystified as a whole before relevance to daily life or to justice can be drawn.

Being unable to predict exactly who would make use of the web app and simultaneously aiming to reach out as far as possible, especially to persons who would rather not take an interest in the results of scientific research, the design and content of the Landscapes app needed to fulfil the requirement to be as universally usable as possible. This was necessary to give everyone, without regard to background, education and language skills, the opportunity to use it. To meet this requirement, the combination of two measures provides for low-barrier access to the web app itself:

Firstly, all information is provided in an easily accessible way, in easy-to-understand language, with easily understandable symbols, and is in parts additionally supported by further resources for all skill levels. The URL ‘myjustice.eu’ was picked to be simple, memorable, but also descriptive of the game and its intention. Particular attention was paid to guiding users through the app. In this vein, pop-up windows appear at certain times throughout the game, advising users about how to proceed. At the very beginning when starting the game, users learn how the game works and are asked to acknowledge the data protection agreement. When reaching the initial empty, grey landscape, users are informed about how the game works and are advised again after answering statements on the first topic. The same holds true for the initial ‘compare’ and ‘learn more’ pages, where users are briefly informed about how to proceed and what to expect.

Secondly, since English has become a European lingua franca but people are nonetheless likely to prefer communicating in their respective mother tongues, the Landscapes app is available in ten European languages, and soon also in Arabic. All usability components as well as all texts and vital information pieces are available in English, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, German, French, Italian, Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish, Russian and Turkish. Providing a Turkish version was particularly important, not only as it is the language of an ETHOS project partner, but also as many migrants in Germany, Austria and the Netherlands are Turkish speakers. Building on the same logic, an Arabic version, dedicated to people who fled or migrated to the European Union from Levantine to Maghreb countries, is still in the pipeline.
The issue of universal usability furthermore comprises the technological aspect of responsiveness, which means being available and running smoothly on various terminal devices including laptops, tablets and smartphones, and also using various browsers. In addition, a barrier-free and machine-readable website was set up to provide access to persons with special needs, especially with visual impairment. The inquisitive, first step of the app is fully available to play using a point system that allows for information about one’s individual justice perceptions.

II. The Landscapes of Justice as a content-dissemination channel

Beyond its role as a science-to-public communication tool, the Landscapes of Justice app was created to disseminate high-quality research outputs, allowing users to dive into the subject matter of justice on various levels. These are accessible in the ‘learn more’ tab of the app, where users can select various justice spheres and are provided with a breadth of written and visual information on each subject. Structured alongside the underlying theory of three different spheres of justice, redistribution, recognition and representation, supplemented by capability, the Landscapes app gives food for thought on multiple levels:

Firstly, the structure of the web app itself, the issues chosen and the statements asking the users to position themselves all offer a starting point to ponder on aspects of redistribution, recognition and representation, on vulnerabilities and capabilities (respectively capability deprivation).
Secondly, the ‘Learn more’ section offers easy-to-read texts on those issues scientifically underpinned with links to studies and papers, and strongly linking justice issues from daily life to more conceptual justice standards. More concretely, the texts seek to explain why the issues chosen for statements were picked, what relevance they have to justice as a concept (with reference to the particular spheres), and how they relate to human rights standards and why this matters.

Thirdly, full immersion into an issue, on various levels of depth, is given by providing a range of further materials. These include a carefully-compiled YouTube playlist per topic (available publicly on the ETHOS YouTube channel), offering all kinds of information and ‘edutainment’, as well as to text-based link collections compiled in Google Docs for easy access (and easy editing). The latter also comprise all sorts of text types from entertaining to academic; each collection combines related external content and results achieved in the framework of the ETHOS project. ETHOS-specific outputs are included as they become available.

Fourth, research findings and outcomes of the ETHOS project are strategically compiled throughout this section, reflective of the multi-layered and multi-faceted approach. In this vein, when selecting a particular topic, users can find ETHOS working papers, ETHOS videos, as well as ETHOS blogs and infographics all relating to the topic in question. Thereby, latest research content is disseminated on different levels of accessibility, serving the interests of academics as well as those of persons deprived of formal education.

B. Communication and social media marketing

The Landscapes of Justice are an entirely digital tool without any ‘real-life’ offspring. Therefore, marketing the Landscapes app focused mainly on the digital sphere supported by some offline activities, as laid down in the ETHOS (Social) Media and Communication Strategy (D8.1). The project team made an effort to showcase the app on all virtual outlets, including Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and Pinterest. A YouTube channel was created to host a collection of videos produced together with ETHOS researchers who were interviewed during the first annual conference in Coimbra, Portugal. All pages are frequented and followed more generally by those who wish to keep updated on latest justice-related topics worldwide, and about project outputs. However, proactive steps were taken to promote the app in relevant groups (especially on Facebook), inviting persons from far beyond the project to participate. These efforts have resonated positively.

Having the Landscapes app at disposal in ten languages at the time of writing, the project team created infographics in all languages (all available publicly on Facebook) to be posted on social media by the ETC team, and to further be shared by project partners in their respective countries. Thereby, partners’ networks to communicate and disseminate the web app and subsequently the ETHOS project and contents were made use of. The ETC project team posted updates on the Landscapes of Justice app, besides a lot of other project-related content, on a regular basis on the ETHOS Facebook and Twitter pages. The channels post one piece of new content daily.

Access rates per country mirror the commitment of the project partners. Countries where the Landscapes have been promoted pro-actively by ETHOS project partners and/or their individual networks show significantly higher access rates compared to countries without any ETHOS connection. Since all language versions have gone online (February 2019) there have been 7576 visits to the app by 6555 unique users as of 17 June 2019.

Besides continuous presence on social media, the Landscapes of Justice have been communicated
• through the ETHOS project website, featuring a prominently placed graphical item on the ETHOS landing page available at www.ethos-europe.eu
• through the ETHOS blog with a particular posting dedicated to the Landscapes app by Livia Perschy on Nov. 15th, 2018 available at https://ethosjustice.wordpress.com/2018/11/15/how-just-is-your-world/
• through the ETHOS newsletters

To supplement the digital tools and to also reach target groups not accessible via the internet, the project team designed and printed an info flyer/bookmark which was disseminated by ETC and partners at conferences, meetings, in schools and libraries, at hotels and even at barber shops to reach out to a non-academic target group. All partners were sent packages of the flyers to disseminate in their own circles. The flyers were intentionally designed in an unconventional format to stick out of the mass of postcard-sized advertising.
IV. Data evaluation

A. Access data and interaction rates

The English version of the Landscapes of Justice was online from April 2018 onwards, followed by the German, Spanish, Italian and barrier-free English versions in June, the French, Portuguese and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian versions in September and the Turkish, Dutch and Russian versions by the beginning of 2019. Access and interaction rates have been monitored for more than one year and show continuous interest in the Landscapes of Justice from the date of publication, reaching a constant level of about 2000 views per month since all language versions went on-line. 90% of the visitors to the Landscapes of Justice are unique users, 10% come back after their first visit to the web app. Almost 90% of all users that click the START button continue with answering the statements.

B. Research questions arising from data evaluation

The purpose of the app is not a scientific enquiry. Rather, the app is a tool and method for engagement with the public and for dissemination of project results. Therefore, the insights yielded are not analysed according to scientific standards and the sample is not representative for insights beyond individuals’ subjective perceptions on their own justice experiences.

The data (responses) gathered from the users are used solely for purposes of comparison within the game. Based on the data entered by users when starting the app (the preferred language and ‘my country’, referring to the country the user lives in), the system creates not only an individual landscape based on the users’ inputs, but also allows for comparison between inputs from users of different countries. For this purpose, the system algorithm generates an aggregated landscape for each country, thus enabling the user to compare her/his perception with the perceptions of others. The basic intention thereof is to entertain the users and to encourage critical reflection on their own positions and perceptions and on those of others, in their or in other countries in Europe and beyond.

Despite the decidedly non-scientific purpose, the heap and the range of answers displayed in the data statistics give way for thought experiments and for interesting insights. The data displays justice in the European Union and Turkey, not as it is, but rather as it is perceived by the users of the web app. Hence, it offers unparalleled raw material for viewing the conditions and sensitivities of users relating to various areas of daily life. Again, bearing in mind that the data do not qualify for a full social science study due to the arbitrariness of the sample, the data still does reflect moods and narratives of individuals in the respective countries that are worth examining.

Similarities and differences in the perception of ‘justice on the ground’ emerge from the answers given to the statements in the six areas of health, housing, political participation and political representation, freedom of speech and sexual orientation. These are grounded in the very diverse history and context of the European continent and beyond. These similarities and differences must be interpreted against the backdrop of current historical, political and economic systems and disruptions, as well as against post-colonial awareness and historical experiences of domination, privilege, vulnerability, minorities, as well as through aspects of contemporary migration, gender, religion, regional aspects.
Methodologically, the data may be grouped and evaluated along these criteria; more broadly, it is interesting to reflect on the different spheres of justice, as well as on the separate topics. In addition, it makes sense to consider the insights yielded from the ETHOS partner countries separately. Finally, another manner of questioning is singling out particular aspects and viewing them from a cross-cutting manner perspective. This will be done in the final part of this section.

C. Understanding the data set

As a tool with the purpose of communication and dissemination, the LoJ seeks to capture subjective experiences about certain topics. **It is vital to note that the statistical data yielded from the Landscapes of Justice app only includes cummulated values and no individual user responses.** The evaluation in this report therefore rests on a statistic displaying cummulated values of user responses, which are split by question and by country. The statistic was updated on a monthly basis to display the most recent cummulated values. From a technical perspective, the speed of the app did not allow for individual values to be saved. As such, no insights are available beyond the overall number of users, and one value per question (6x4) per country. For the purpose of this analysis, these cummulated values were aggregated on a scale from 0-100 to aid evaluation and understanding. The analysis in this report rests on the data yielded up to 17 June 2019.

It is under these limitations that this report must be understood. There exists no statistic that indicates how many users per country played the app and what their individual responses were. No demographic data was collected due to data protection reasons (age, position, gender, nationality, location, individual responses, number of questions answered, etc.). The statistic yielded was intended to not permit for the individual filtering out of users to reconstruct their individual submissions or landscapes.

As previously mentioned, the statistic shows that 6555 unique users visited the app. User responses were recorded from 28 different countries – 27 of which are member states of the European Union, in addition to Turkey. Beyond choosing from one of the EU member states or Turkey, users were also given the option to select ‘other’ from the list, thereby also allowing for participation from outside of EU member states and Turkey.

The numbers yielded show cummulated, subjective opinions of individuals in different countries about certain topics – it is not the intention of this analysis to objectivise these inputs but merely to visualise these snippets of insight and to aggregate them in an overall “landscape”. The categorisation in different countries is merely a tool allowing for grouping and comparison and should under no circumstances be understood as general statements about the actual state of justice in a given country.

For the purpose of evaluation, the aggregated values of cummulated user inputs are available for the following groupings include: for each of the EU member states plus Turkey, for all EU member states, for all EU member states plus Turkey, for all other countries outside the EU and Turkey, and the total of all submissions.

The data yielded hold interesting insights and give a glimpse into the manner users perceive their relative justice situation when measured against the backdrop of human rights. Any results yielded are not to be taken as scientific evidence and serve merely anecdotal purposes.

It makes sense to note that despite making the app available in several languages, there are some countries in which users did not have the chance to play the game in their native language. These countries include for
example Poland, Greece and Bulgaria, in which users likely played the app in English. This renders the group of participants and inputs yielded rather selective, which should be kept in mind when interpreting results from these countries in particular.

D. Minimum and maximum landscape visualisation

The Landscapes of Justice present the user with a visual depiction of his or her submissions. Every user begins the game with a minimum version of the landscape, displayed in grey. Depending on the answers given, the game alters the user’s individual landscape by adding colour and by adding visual components whose appearance is defined by the answers given. Depending on the response given, answers are given a numeric value, which is translated into a visual depiction. In this vein, an answer allocated a high value corresponds to a visual item that is larger, more detailed and featuring additional components. Contrastingly, an answer that is allocated a low value corresponds to a visual item that is smaller, less detailed and with fewer components. For more information on the questions asked and statements posed, see the overall table on page 14 or the topic-specific tables in the following section.

The images below depict a comparison of the minimum landscape and the maximum landscape, in which all questions have been answered with the answer allocated the highest possible numerical value.

[Figures 9 and 10: The minimum and maximum landscapes]

E. Understanding the data results

The section below outlines the results yielded from the user’s submitted data. In order to provide an overview of the submitted data, results will be displayed in text form, in graphs, as well as in images of individual Landscapes of Justice. The findings for the ETHOS partner countries will be dealt with separately. First, the findings yielded for the different justice spheres will be described. While these provide an overall picture of users’ perception of justice in three spheres, the subsequent section on the topics provides more insight into the six topic areas. Finally, the six ETHOS partner countries will be considered in order to gain insight into perceived similarities and differences. The evaluation will conclude with cross-cutting trends and observations.
Due to the scope of this report it is not possible to comment thoroughly on each result for each of the 28 countries + the findings from ‘other’ countries. Rather, particularly high, particularly low, and other noteworthy results of perceptions will be highlighted.

As previously described, the user is shown four questions per topic. For the purpose of this evaluation, each response was extrapolated to a maximum value of 100. This method of aggregation and data presentation was chosen to allow readers to gain an impression of the results at first glance.

On a scale from 0 to 100 it is therefore possible to see how users perceive a particular statement, ranging from not favourable to justice (0) to very favourable to justice (100). Taking together the four lines of enquiry (hereafter: components of enquiry), it is possible to determine to what extent a country’s conditions regarding the topic in question perceived as favourable/not favourable to justice by users who chose that country. Values between 80 and 100 can be considered as conditions perceived as are very favourable to justice. Values between 50 and 80 can be understood as conditions generally perceived as favourable to justice. Values below 50 indicate that conditions are perceived as not favourable to justice. In other words, the closer the score to 100, the more favourable to justice the users’ situation is perceived.

References to these benchmarks will be made throughout the following section to give an overview of trends and aspects worthy of consideration. These benchmarks are also indicated in the graphs as a red (50) and green (80) line.
V. Data Results

A. Spheres of justice

The topics touched on in the game are intentionally devised in a manner that allows them to be grouped into Nancy Fraser’s three spheres of justice. This is to say that the topics of housing and healthcare correspond to the sphere of redistribution; political participation and political representation correspond to the sphere of representation; sexual orientation and freedom of expression correspond to the sphere of recognition.

For this section, it makes sense to refer to the questions for the two corresponding topics per sphere, which can be found accumulated on page 14 and also scattered throughout the following pages.

I. Overall trends

![Overall aggregated scores for the three spheres of justice](image)

Figure 11: Aggregated scores for the three spheres of justice across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total
Overall, the aggregated scores of all countries in the three spheres of justice show that the domain of justice as recognition overall has the highest aggregated score of all user inputs by a small margin, closely followed by the sphere of representation and then redistribution. This indicates that overall, in European Union member states, users consider the conditions in their respective countries as favourable to justice. Conditions that have to do with the topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression score the highest (53.62 for justice as recognition), followed by conditions to do with the topics of political participation and political representation (52.59 for justice as representation), and finally followed by conditions to do with the topics of health and housing (49.35 for justice as redistribution). Strictly speaking, only results over 50 are considered as favourable to justice, meaning that justice as redistribution is on the verge of being considered not favourable when aggregating all user scores across all countries for which data was submitted.

In all three spheres of justice there are several countries that top the respective rankings by a fair margin:

In the domain of justice as redistribution, Ireland, Malta and Sweden score highest with aggregated scores of 87.5 each. In the domain of justice as representation, Ireland, Malta have the highest scores of 87.5, closely followed by Luxemburg and Sweden with scores of 75 each. In the domain of recognition, Ireland and Malta score highest with 87.5 points each, followed by Denmark with 71.8 points.

It is thought-provoking that in terms of aggregated values, scores are overall higher in the European Union member states than they are when Turkey is included in the ranking. In fact, all scores differ significantly depending on whether only EU member states or also other countries are considered, including Turkey. In the spheres of redistribution, representation and recognition Turkey scores 42.5, 31.8 and 41.8, respectively. The difference is most pronounced in the sphere of recognition, encompassing the topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression. At the same time, it is interesting to note that users from ‘other’ countries, i.e. countries outside the EU and Turkey, generally score higher for justice as redistribution and lower than the European Union average for justice as representation and recognition.

It is noteworthy that within the three justice spheres, when it comes to the four distinct components of enquiry, users tend to score their own situation as significantly more just than society’s overall situation. This holds true for all three spheres. When it comes to countries, 16 (representation), 19 (redistribution) and 21 (recognition) countries score above 50 in the first question touching on the individual component. Contrasting, 7 (recognition), 8 (redistribution) and 9 (representation) countries score above 50 in the second question touching on the societal component. There are no scores above 80 (signifying conditions perceived as very favourable to justice).
This shows that users in more countries perceive their own, personal situations in terms of redistribution, representation and recognition as favourable to justice (above 50) rather than as not favourable to justice (below 50). At the same time, users in more countries perceive the societal situation in their country as not favourable to justice rather than as favourable to justice.

Interestingly, users’ assessment of the state component mirrors their self-assessment when it comes to exercising capability, or actively taking a stance and making a change. However, the difference is not as pronounced as the difference between individual vs. societal components. In the three spheres, users in 21 (redistribution), 22 (recognition) and 27 (representation) countries rate the respective state components as favourable towards justice (above 50). It is noteworthy that there are 13 countries that rate their respective state components as very favourable towards justice in the domain of representation (above 80). The same is true for 8 states with scores above 80 for redistributive justice, and 5 states with scores above 80 for recognitive justice.

When it comes to capability, users in 15 (redistribution), 21 (recognition) and 23 (representation) countries give scores above 50, signifying that the capability component in all three spheres is favourable to justice (above 50). In the domains of redistribution and representation, users in 3 states perceive their capability to stand up against injustice as very high (scores above 80, respectively), signifying very favourable conditions for justice in this sphere. At the same time, users in 8 states score the capability component above 80 in the domain recognition.

This goes to say that while users overall tend to feel capable of and willing to address issues in all three spheres, which points to conditions favourable to justice, the scores show that users feel most comfortable in the domains of representation and recognition. Furthermore, the state component is perceived as the most favourable to justice in the domain of representation.

II. Justice as Redistribution

![Aggregated scores: Redistribution](image)
The aggregated EU user score in this sphere is 50.5. When adding aggregated Turkish scores, the score decreases to 48.9. For comparison, users from ‘other’ countries have an aggregated score of 50. The total aggregated score of all user inputs in this sphere is 52.58. The total aggregated score of all user inputs in this sphere is 52.58. The highest aggregated scores in the sphere of redistribution come from Ireland, Malta and Sweden with scores of 87.5 each, followed by the Czech Republic and Denmark (65.62 each) and Spain (64).

When it comes to the lowest aggregated values in the sphere of redistribution, Slovenia (31.25), Hungary (30), and Bulgaria (28.12). This indicates that users from these countries do not perceive conditions relating to housing and health as particularly favourable to justice when considering all four components of enquiry.

When it comes to the aggregated rankings for the four components of enquiry within this sphere, the findings present some surprises. In the question of assessing one’s own situation in terms of justice, 19 of 28 countries score above 50. This generally indicates that in the majority of countries, users assess their individual housing and health situations as being generally favourable to justice, albeit to different extents. In four countries, Ireland, Malta, Sweden and Finland, the score is 75 in users’ assessment of the individual components of enquiry.

These findings change when considering the assessment about society, whereby only 8 countries score above 50, and 15 countries score above the – significantly lower – overall aggregated score of all user inputs of 40. Among countries with particularly low scores in component of enquiry are Hungary (25), Greece (25), Portugal (22.5), Slovenia (12.5) and Bulgaria (12.5). This indicates that in the redistributive sphere, users very clearly assess the societal component in housing and health as less favourable to justice than the individual component.

In 21 countries, users are more likely to perceive the state component as favourable to justice (above 50) in these domains whereas in 7 countries, the score is below 50 ranging from 0 (Slovenia, Romania) to 40.5 (Croatia). In other words, in more than half the countries users perceive the state component towards justice as redistribution as favourable to justice. The countries with the highest scores include Ireland, Malta, Sweden, Denmark, Lithuania and Estonia (100 each). The lowest scores come from Slovenia, Romania (0 each), Greece and Poland (25 each).

There are some differentiated findings when it comes to capability in redistributive justice. Overall, 15 countries score above 50, with 3 countries scoring 100. Contrastingly, in 13 countries, scores are below 50. Overall, taking a stance against injustice in the areas of housing and health is lowest in this sphere when compared to the other two spheres of representation and recognition.
III. Justice as Representation

Figure 14: Aggregated scores per country – justice as representation
The aggregated EU user score in this sphere is 55. When adding aggregated Turkish scores, the score decreases to 52.23. For comparison, users from ‘other’ countries have an aggregated score of 45.81. The total aggregated score of all user inputs in this sphere is 52.58. When it comes to the sphere of representation, the countries with the highest aggregated scores are Ireland and Malta (87.5 each), followed by Luxemburg and Sweden (75 each). The bottom of the list sees Germany (41.62), Belgium (40.68) and Turkey (31.87). It is curious to note that both Germany and Belgium, although ranking in the mid-range in other spheres, both have low scores for justice as representation, indicating that in these countries, the conditions relating to political representation and political participation are perceived as not favourable to justice.

Considering the individual components of enquiry in this sphere, users 16 of 28 countries score their respective countries above 50. Five countries score 75, including Ireland, Malta, Sweden, Luxemburg and Finland. This indicates that the majority of users perceive their individual situations as favourable to justice. There are no scores above 80 in this component. The lowest scores come from Turkey (16.25), Italy (40.25) and Germany (41.75).

When considering the societal component, the scores show that users in 9 of 28 countries consider the societal conditions as favourable to justice (above 50). Three countries score 75: Ireland, Malta and Sweden. In a striking 19 countries, scores are below 50, including Turkey (18.5), Lithuania (25) and Hungary (30).

In 27 of 28 countries (!), users consider the state component as favourable to justice in this sphere. Only in Turkey, users predominantly gave responses that indicate conditions not favourable to justice. However, it should be stated that the difference between the lowest positive score of 50 and the Turkish rating of 45 is rather small. Overall the findings of this component constitute one of the most striking insights yielded from the Landscapes of Justice, whereby according to users, the majority of countries are perceived as having conditions favourable to justice when it comes to the state enabling, safeguarding and guaranteeing political participation and political representation. A striking 10 countries score the full 100 points.

In terms of the capability component, the results are clear: users in 23 countries perceive themselves the capability component as favourable to justice (above 50), with two countries scoring 100: Ireland and Malta, followed by Spain (87.5). Only 5 countries score below 50, indicating that this is not the case. Interestingly, these countries include Belgium (33.5) and Germany (41.5), as well as Cyprus, Slovenia and Lithuania (0 each).
IV. Justice as Recognition

Figure 15: Landscape of justice for justice as representation, aggregated total scores (embedded in a minimal landscape)

Figure 16: Aggregated scores per country – justice as recognition
The aggregated EU user score in this sphere is 57.06. When adding aggregated Turkish scores, the score decreases to 53.75. For comparison, users from ‘other’ countries have an aggregated score of 41.75. The total aggregated score of all user inputs in this sphere is 53.62. The countries with the highest scores in the sphere of recognition and the corresponding topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression are Ireland and Malta with scores close to 90, followed by Denmark (71.87) and France (69.81). In this sphere, the bottom of the list is dominated by Italy and Finland (31.5 each) and Bulgaria (25). It is particularly noteworthy that in the domain of recognition, Finland has very low scores even though in the other two spheres its scores are in the mid-range.

When assessing the individual component, users in a striking 21 countries score above 50 and 3 countries score 75. These are Ireland, Malta and Lithuania. The scores indicate that users in the clear majority of countries perceive that they are recognised in their identities and feel at liberty to express themselves accordingly, indicating conditions favourable to justice. It is noteworthy, however, that there are no scores above 80 here. Interestingly, the lowest scores are held by Luxemburg (31.25), Estonia (37.5), and Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom (41.6 each). Surprisingly, Hungary scores highly here with a score of 65.

When it comes to societal component, the score is higher than 50 in 6 of 28 countries. Again, three countries score 75: Ireland, Malta and Sweden. As was the case in the other two spheres, this score is lower than the individual component score. Here, the lowest scores come from Bulgaria (6.25), Turkey (18.65) and Slovenia (25). It is noteworthy when considering the overall aggregated score of all users in this particular component of enquiry is only 39, being the lowest aggregated score across all components in all three justice spheres.

Users tend to assess the state component in the topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression as generally favourable to justice. In 22 countries, users scored values above 50, indicating that the state’s role in safeguarding justice as recognition is generally perceived as being favourable to justice. There are three countries scoring 100 here: Ireland, Malta and Lithuania. The lowest ranking countries are Finland and Slovenia (0 each), Italy (16.5) and Bulgaria (25).

Finally, when it comes to the capability component, 21 countries score above 50, indicating that in these countries, users perceive their capability as high, indicating conditions favourable to justice in the topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression. There are 6 countries with scores of 100, including Denmark, Sweden and Luxemburg. Countries with scores are below 50 include Lithuania and Finland (0 each), Bulgaria (25) and Poland (37.5).
B. Six topics of enquiry

Keeping in mind that the justice spheres described above are aggregated scores from two topics each, it makes sense to delve deeper into separate topics, questions, and into surprising or noteworthy findings. This section presents an overall view of users’ topic assessments and provides insight about which concrete topics and which particular aspects are considered as being favourable to justice, and which are not.
I. Overall trends

Overall, the clustering according to topics gives a more nuanced view than the view of justice spheres. When it comes to the aggregated scores for each of the six topics of enquiry, the highest aggregated overall score across all countries and all users was achieved in the topic of political participation (64.91), followed by sexual orientation (54.5) and health (51). Interestingly, the lowest overall score stems from the topic of political representation, indicating that compared to the other topics users were asked about, conditions in many countries are perceived as generally not favourable to justice.

It is interesting that when considering the ratings for EU member states and the ratings for EU member states including Turkey, the rating differs: in all cases, the EU member state scores are higher than the score in which

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Pol. Participation</th>
<th>Pol. Representation</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Freedom of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>47.49</td>
<td>65.72</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>55.51</td>
<td>45.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.125</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Aggregated scores for six topics of enquiry for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total

Table 5: Aggregated scores for the six topics of enquiry across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total
the Turkish scores are included. However, it is also curious that users who clicked on ‘other’ countries when starting the game, the scores for the topics of housing and political participation are higher than the scores in the EU, whereas in the other four topics they are lower.

Overall, the topics of political participation, sexual orientation and housing score above 50, indicating conditions favourable to justice in the majority of countries, whereas in the topics of health, political representation and freedom of expression, scores indicate conditions not favourable to justice in the majority of countries. This is interesting, as per sphere, two topics were allocated: for representation, health and housing; for representation, political participation and political representation; for recognition, sexual orientation and freedom of expression. Yet, per sphere, one topic scores (significantly) higher than the other, showcasing the breadth of experiences possible for users within a single sphere. This in turn points to the complexity of the topic matter at hand.

II. Health

Figure 19: Landscape of justice for the topic of health (top left corner), aggregated total scores (embedded in a minimal landscape)
The four questions posed in this domain were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Experience (Individual)</th>
<th>People’s perception on societal fairness (Societal)</th>
<th>State’s responsibility in supporting one’s rights (State)</th>
<th>People as agents of change (Capability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I am ill or injured, I receive good medical treatment. (Completely</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Not at all)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Users’ assessment overall of health and justice in their countries showed that there are five countries with overall scores indicating conditions very favourable to justice (scoring 87.5 each): Ireland, Malta, Sweden, Estonia and Denmark. These countries also top the scores in the four individual components of enquiry within the topic. The lowest ratings come from Slovenia (0), Poland (28.12), Hungary (32.5). In this topic 19 countries score above 50, indicating that they perceive health conditions as being generally favourable to justice. In this topic, there are six countries overall with scores above 80, suggesting conditions clearly favourable to justice.

For comparison, the table below shows the aggregated scores of all four components in this topic for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Society</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>55.18</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td>66.41</td>
<td>45.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.85</td>
<td>44.31</td>
<td>66.43</td>
<td>46.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Aggregated scores for the topic of health across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total
When considering merely the individual component, in 21 countries the score is above 50. In fact, in seven countries, the score is the highest possible 100, including Ireland, Malta, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Estonia and Slovenia. In Bulgaria and Lithuania, scores are the lowest (25 each) although it is noteworthy that also two ETHOS partner countries, Turkey and Hungary, score below 50 with 45 points each. Overall, the societal situation fares significantly worse in comparison, scoring only 44.3 points. People in 14 countries indicate that healthcare for others in society is favourable to justice. Countries that rate lowly here include Slovenia (0), Bulgaria (12.5) and Greece (25). When it comes to the state component, 22 countries score over 50, with high scores coming from a striking 9 countries. Contrastingly, particularly low scores come from Slovenia (0), Romania (0), Greece (25) and Poland (25). Out of all components of enquiry in this topic, the state component is the one with the highest score when taking together all aggregated scores of users: 66.4. When it comes to capability, the result is less clear-cut, only users in 16 countries give scores above 50 to informing responsible ombudspople when confronted with injustice in the healthcare sector. In five countries, the score is 100: Ireland, Malta, Sweden, Estonia and Denmark. Low rankings here come from Slovenia, Luxemburg, Lithuania and Finland (0 each) and Hungary (20).

Overall, the scores in this topic show that users in many countries score their respective countries highly in the state and individual components regarding healthcare, which generally indicate conditions favourable to justice. However, the capability component as well as the situation of others scores below 50 when aggregating all scores of all users, suggesting that in these components of enquiry there is still work to be done to create conditions favourable to justice.
III. Housing

The four questions posed in this domain were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Experience (Individual)</th>
<th>People's perception on societal fairness (Societal)</th>
<th>State's responsibility in supporting one's rights (State)</th>
<th>People as agents of change (Capability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can afford a flat that I feel comfortable living in. (Completely</td>
<td>After paying rent, all people in my country still have enough money available to cover living expenses. (Completely</td>
<td>The state provides good infrastructure in the whole country. (Yes</td>
<td>I know what I can do if I am discriminated against when looking for a flat. (Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Not at all)</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top three countries with the highest scores overall in this category are Ireland, Malta and Sweden, scoring 87.5 each. They also top the rankings for individual questions, although in the capability component, also Spain is among the countries with the highest scores. The lowest scores come from Romania (18.75), Portugal (20), Bulgaria (25) and Turkey (26.25). It is interesting that in this domain, two ETHOS partner countries are among
the lowest scoring. In this topic overall, there are only three countries that score above 80 overall, indicating conditions clearly favourable to justice: Ireland, Malta, Sweden.

For comparison, the table below shows the aggregated scores of all four components in this topic for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Society</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>48.87</td>
<td>38.15</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>46.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>52.66</td>
<td>45.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Aggregated scores for the topic of housing across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total

When turning to the individual component, 18 countries score 50 and above, indicating that users feel they can completely or mostly afford housing they feel comfortable in. The lowest ratings in this sphere are from Romania (12.5), Turkey (17.5), Portugal (30). It is noteworthy that there are two ETHOS partner countries scoring the lowest out of 28 countries. In this component of enquiry, there is no rating above 80. When aggregating user’s scores across all four components of enquiry within this topic, the lowest score overall stems from the societal component (37.4 overall). In this component of enquiry, only seven countries score over 50. Four of them score 75: Ireland, Malta, Sweden and Finland. Countries with particularly low scores include Portugal (10), Bulgaria (12.5), and Turkey (22.5). Again, the same two partner countries score lowly. Also, here
there is no rating above 80. Users’ assessment of the state component in the topic of housing shows that in the majority of countries, conditions are perceived as favourable to justice. In 8 countries, scores are 100 including in the Netherlands. Here, the lowest scores come from Romania, Slovenia and Finland (0 each), Hungary (20) and Italy (22), indicating conditions not favourable to justice. In the capability component, 16 countries score above 50 including Spain, the Czech Republic and Slovenia, indicating they know what to do when discriminated against in this particular sector. Users in seven countries give low scores for this, scoring 0 for Finland, Portugal, Bulgaria, Estonia, Cyprus and Denmark.

Overall, the scores in this topic show that users generally give comparatively high scores when it comes to the state component, scoring an overall rating of 52.66. This indicates that conditions in this component are favourable to justice. However, all other aggregated values are below 50, indicating that in the individual, societal and capability components of enquiry, conditions in these components are not favourable to justice. This is particularly true for the societal component, which scores only 37.44 overall.

IV. Political participation

Figure 23: Landscape of justice for the topic of political participation (middle right), aggregated total scores (embedded in a minimal landscape)
The four questions posed in this domain were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Experience (Individual)</th>
<th>People's perception on societal fairness (Societal)</th>
<th>State's responsibility in supporting one’s rights (State)</th>
<th>People as agents of change (Capability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can participate in any political participation against my government without fear. (Completely</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Not at all)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 6 countries overall, ratings are above 80 indicating conditions very favourable to justice: these countries also top the list: Ireland, Malta, Sweden Luxemburg, Estonia and Slovakia. Also, in individual components of enquiry, the majority of these countries is reflected. Overall, in 23 countries scores show that the perception of political participation is one of being favourable to justice (above 50). Contrastingly, Turkey (27.5) scores lowest in this topic, followed by Slovenia and Lithuania (37.5 each). It is noteworthy that in this topic, the state component differs most when comparing EU scores and scores that include Turkey: the score is different by almost 10 points, indicating Turkey has a particularly low score in this domain.

For comparison, the table below shows the aggregated scores of all four components in this topic for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Society</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>54.25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>58.58</td>
<td>50.89</td>
<td>72.86</td>
<td>73.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>58.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Aggregated scores for the topic of political participation across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total
In a striking 24 of 28 countries, users perceive that the conditions around political participation are favourable to justice, showing ratings above 50. However, there are no ratings above 80 in this line of enquiry, although 10 countries score 75. It is noteworthy that these also include Hungary. In the four remaining countries where political participation conditions are not favourable to justice, ratings range from 43 to 45 for Spain, Italy and Belgium. Only Turkey has the by far lowest score of 10. Also, in the societal component, results show that users in 20 countries overall perceive the situation as favourable to justice, with 6 countries scoring 75. Again, there are no ratings above 80. It is noteworthy that all ETHOS partner countries cluster in the middle with ratings between 50 and 60, with the exception of Turkey (15). Overall, the lowest ratings come from Lithuania (0), Turkey (15) and Slovenia (25). It is interesting to note that in this topic, the difference between individual and societal component scores is the lowest when compared to other topics. When considering the state component that touches on the police’s protection of protesters, 23 countries score above 50 and 14 countries score the full 100 points. This is particularly interesting, as this is the second highest score for this component of enquiry across all six topics (71.5), second only to the state question in political representation (80.6). Even though political participation scores are significantly higher overall than political representation scores, these two state component scores are the ones with the least difference between them. In the capability component, users in 26 countries indicate that they believe in the potential of political participation (in non-institutionalised forms), indicating conditions favourable to justice. In 11 countries, scores are 100. Low rankings here come from Cyprus, Slovenia and Lithuania (0 each).

When aggregating all users’ scores in all four components of enquiry, the scores show that in all four components, scores are above 50, which indicates conditions generally favourable to justice in the majority of countries. However, it is noteworthy that the scores are strikingly high in the state and capability components.
(71.5 and 74.7, respectively), indicating users’ trust in and commitment to political participation. Compared to the scores for political representation below, these findings are strikingly positive.

V. **Political representation**

![Landscape of justice for the topic of political representation](image)

Figure 25: Landscape of justice for the topic of political representation (centre left), aggregated total scores (embedded in a minimal landscape)

The four questions posed in this domain were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Experience (Individual)</th>
<th>People's perception on societal fairness (Societal)</th>
<th>State's responsibility in supporting one's rights (State)</th>
<th>People as agents of change (Capability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My interests and needs are of concern to my city’s politicians. (Completely / Mostly / Sometimes / Not at all)</td>
<td>All people living in my city feel represented by politicians. (Completely / Mostly / Sometimes / Not at all)</td>
<td>I can stand for office myself to represent my interests. (Yes / No)</td>
<td>When topics I care about are not tackled enough, I contact the responsible politicians. (Yes / No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of users’ perception of political representation, 13 countries score above 50 indicating conditions favourable to justice. The top countries include Ireland and Malta, scoring 87.5 each, followed by Sweden and Finland with 75 each. There are only two scores above 80. The lowest ratings in this topic come from Hungary (15), Germany (18.75) and Turkey (22.5). Not only is it interesting that two ETHOS partner countries have the
lowest scores, it is also particularly curious that Germany scores so lowly. When it comes to the aggregated scores from all users overall, this topic scores only 40.8 points, being the topic with the lowest overall score in the entire Landscapes of Justice. However, even though the aggregated score is the lowest, the scores given to the state in this topic are the highest aggregated scores in the entire app (80.6), speaking for the functionality of the state institutions and mechanisms for political representation in the clear majority of countries.

For comparison, the table below shows the aggregated scores of all four components in this topic for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Society</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>81.06</td>
<td>31.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Aggregated scores for the topic of political representation across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total

When it comes to the individual component of enquiry, 14 countries score above 50 and 6 countries score 75, indicating the perception that one’s interests and needs matter to politicians. There are no scores of 80 or above in this line of enquiry. The countries with the highest scores include Ireland, Malta, Sweden, Finland, Slovenia and Luxemburg, positively. The lowest scores stem from three ETHOS partner countries: Hungary (10), Turkey (22.5), and Portugal (25). It is also noteworthy that all six ETHOS partner countries score below 50 (!),
the United Kingdom scoring the highest with 39.5. The scores indicate that only in 9 countries, user score the societal component as manifesting conditions favourable to justice. In a striking 19 countries, ratings are below 50, including in all ETHOS partner countries. The lowest scores overall come from Germany (8.25), Hungary (10), Romania (12.5) and Greece and Poland (18.75 each). Here, the low score of Germany is particularly noteworthy. The results change drastically when considering the state and capability components: one of the highest ratings overall in the Landscapes of Justice was derived from the question of whether users can stand for office and make use of their right to political representation themselves: in 27 of 28 countries, scores are above 50. In 14 countries, the score is 100 and in 18 countries, the score is above 80. This indicates that in almost all countries, the state component of political representation is considered as favourable to justice – in this case referring to the functionality of state institutions. Interestingly, when it comes to the capability component, only 9 countries score above 50 – this is a drastic difference to the state component and indicates that conditions are generally not favourable to justice when it comes to capability. The lowest ratings stem from Sweden, Finland, Slovenia, Cyprus, Estonia, Lithuania, Romania and Germany (0 each).

When aggregating all users’ scores in all four components of enquiry, the scores show that only in the state component of political representation the score is above 50 at 80.6. In the three other components of enquiry, scores indicate that improvement in conditions regarding political representation is needed to become favourable to justice.
VI. Sexual Orientation

Figure 27: Landscape of justice for the topic of sexual orientation (lower right), aggregated total scores (embedded in a minimal landscape)

The four questions posed in this domain were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Experience (Individual)</th>
<th>People’s perception on societal fairness (Societal)</th>
<th>State’s responsibility in supporting one’s rights (State)</th>
<th>People as agents of change (Capability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel free to hold hands in public with your partner without fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed? (Completely</td>
<td>In your country are people accepted regardless of their sexual orientation? (Completely</td>
<td>In case you are assaulted, threatened or harassed, do you know which body you can turn to for help? (Yes</td>
<td>If you were in a same-sex relationship, would you actively hold hands in public despite fear of being assaulted, threatened or harassed? (Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this topic, there are 18 countries that score above 50 and 3 countries with scores above 80: Ireland, Malta and Denmark score 87.5 each. The lowest ratings come from Finland (25), Turkey (30) and Bulgaria (31.25). It is interesting to note that this topic scores significantly higher than the second topic in the sphere of recognition, freedom of expression. The total of all aggregated user scores across all four components of
enquiry amounts to 54.2 points, indicating that sexual orientation is an area with conditions favourable to justice in the majority of countries.

For comparison, the table below shows the aggregated scores of all four components in this topic for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Society</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>59.24</td>
<td>41.73</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>51.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58.93</td>
<td>41.17</td>
<td>65.46</td>
<td>50.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Aggregated scores for the topic of sexual orientation across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total

When considering the individual component, the results are surprisingly positive: when asked about the ability to hold hands in public with a same-sex partner without facing harassment, scores in 24 of 28 countries show that users indeed perceive this is the case with scores over 50. In 8 countries there are scores of 75, indicating the environment is favourable to justice. These countries interestingly include Bulgaria. Hungary fares rather well with 70 points, and three ETHOS partner countries have scores between 65 and 67.5: Portugal, the Netherlands and Austria. The lowest ratings in this component of enquiry stem from Luxemburg and Germany with 37.5 points each. In the societal component, the results differ drastically with only 10 countries scoring
above 50 and only 4 countries boasting 75 points. These countries are Ireland, Malta, Sweden and Lithuania. The lowest scores here come from Turkey and Bulgaria (22.5 each). It is noteworthy that out of all component of enquiry, the societal component has the lowest scores within the topic. The overall aggregated score for this line of enquiry is 41.17, indicating that in the majority of countries the way users perceive and treat same-sex couples is not favourable to justice, contrasting the overall aggregated score of all users of 58.9 for the individual component. The state’s responsibility in offering support in case of rights infringement is perceived in 23 countries, which show scores above 50 indicating conditions generally favourable to justice. Here, 9 countries boast 100 points, including Portugal. Also, Turkey fares well (90). The lowest scores come from Slovenia, Sweden and Finland (0 each) as well as Italy (22) and Croatia (44). In the capability component, 18 countries score above 50 and 7 countries score 100 points. Bulgaria, Estonia, Lithuania and Finland (0 each) have the lowest scores, followed by Turkey (10).

When aggregating all users’ scores in all four components of enquiry, the scores show that in the individual, state and compatibility components, scores are above 50. Only in the societal component the score is below 50. It is particularly interesting that the state component shows the highest score here, as this indicates the state environment in the majority of countries is favourable to justice, in this case exemplified by support offered in case of harassment based on sexual orientation.

VII. Freedom of Expression

Figure 29: Landscape of justice for the topic of freedom of expression (lower left), aggregated total scores (embedded in a minimal landscape)
The four questions posed in this domain were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Experience (Individual)</th>
<th>People's perception on societal fairness (Societal)</th>
<th>State's responsibility in supporting one's rights (State)</th>
<th>People as agents of change (Capability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been offended by casual jokes or comments made to your cost (due to your gender, ethnicity, religion, etc)? (Never / Hardly / Ever so often / All the time)</td>
<td>Can you rank how widespread is offensive language about certain groups of people (persons with disabilities, foreigners, LGBTI etc.) in your country? (Very / Quite / A little / Not at all)</td>
<td>Do you believe that the state consequently condemns hate speech against all groups affected by it? (Yes / No)</td>
<td>Would you actively call out people for making offensive jokes? (Yes / No)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ireland, Malta and Sweden have the highest overall scores in this topic, scoring 87.5 each. The next country is Spain, scoring 65.6. In total, 10 countries score above 50 in this topic, indicating that freedom of expression is a topic where components indicate conditions that are favourable to justice. Compared to the rest of the scores yielded in the Landscapes of Justice, this is rather low. It is noteworthy that all ETHOS partner countries, with the exception of the United Kingdom, score below 50. The lowest scores come from Bulgaria (18.75), Italy (30.5) and Belgium (33).

For comparison, the table below shows the aggregated scores of all four components in this topic for the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Society</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>48.25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>66.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.58</td>
<td>38.70</td>
<td>42.53</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Aggregated scores for the topic of freedom of expression across the EU member states, EU member states + Turkey, other countries, and in total
In this particular topic, the findings are rather nuanced: in the individual component, 14 countries score above 50, indicating that users perceive their situations as favourable to justice judging by their experiences of facing harassment (or in this case, of not having faced harassment). Four countries score 75, Ireland, Malta, Lithuania and Finland. There are no scores above 80 in this line of enquiry. On the other end of the spectrum, Estonia and Luxemburg have the lowest scores of 25 each, indicating users have experience with harassment. When it comes to the societal component, 7 countries score above 50. The lowest scores come from Bulgaria (0) and five countries with scores of 25 each: Luxemburg, Romania, Turkey, Belgium and Slovenia. It is particularly noteworthy that none of the ETHOS partner countries scores above 50 in this line of enquiry, indicating that societal harassment and discrimination is widespread in the majority of countries. Considering the state component, 13 countries score above 50 with 4 countries scoring 100. These countries are Ireland, Malta, Sweden and Lithuania. Here, only the United Kingdom scores above 50 whereas all other ETHOS partner countries score below 50. The lowest scores in this component come from Bulgaria, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Estonia and Finland (0 each), touching on the state condemning hate speech. When it comes to the capability component, 22 countries score above 50. A striking 10 countries score 100, the United Kingdom scores 83. This suggests that in these countries, users assess their capability to take a stance against hate speech as very high, amounting in situation very favourable to justice. In the remaining countries, this is not the case. This includes Hungary and Portugal, scoring 40 each. Other low scores come from Lithuania and Finland (0 each) and Belgium and Slovakia (33 each).

When aggregating all users’ scores in all four components of enquiry, the scores show that in one line of enquiry, the score is above 50: the capability component scores 66.2 overall compared to a low score of 38.7 in the societal component. It is curious to note the difference between societal (38.7) and capability (66.2) components. The low score in the societal sphere indicates that there are only few countries in which offensive
language towards people based on certain traits is not widespread. However, users in a clear majority of countries are ready to stand up and take a stance against it. More users are willing to confront hate speech than they have experienced it themselves. This sheds a positive light on societal developments in the individual, state and capability components.
C. Partner countries

I. Within three spheres of justice

![Aggregated partner country scores per sphere](image)

**Figure 31: Aggregated partner country scores per sphere of justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Redistribution</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>59.62</td>
<td>54.12</td>
<td>59.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>55.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>41.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Kingdom</td>
<td>45.37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>52.53</td>
<td>53.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.81</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.587</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12: Aggregated partner country scores and total scores per sphere of justice**
When it comes to the rankings among the ETHOS partner countries, the following assessment can be made: Depending on the topic in question, different partner countries top the list with the highest scores as compared to other partner countries. It is interesting to note that results are significantly different across the topics and no country can be named a clear ‘winner’ or ‘loser’ in terms of scores, which may be contrary to popular belief.

When it comes to the sphere of redistribution, encompassing the topics of health and housing, the aggregated scores show that Austria has the highest score (59.6), followed by the Netherlands (53.3). The lowest score comes from Hungary (47.5) and Portugal (45).

In the sphere of representation, encompassing political participation and political representation, Austria (54.1) and the United Kingdom (53) show the highest aggregated scores overall. The lowest score – by a significant margin, comes from Turkey (31).

In the sphere of recognition, encompassing sexual orientation and freedom of expression, the highest aggregated score comes from Austria (59.75), followed by the United Kingdom (56.3). Again, the lowest score comes from Turkey (41.8).

Compared to other 22 countries in the Landscapes of Justice, the ETHOS partner countries (Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom, Turkey) are dispersed in the rankings on the three justice spheres. Due to the limited scope of this report, the table below illustrates their respective places in the rankings (out of 28) per justice sphere. 1 is the highest ranking with a score closest to 100, whereas 28 is the lowest ranking with a score closest to 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Redistribution</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>24th</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Kingdom</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Partner country ranking within overall rankings among three spheres of justice

It can be seen from the data that Austria and the Netherlands tend to fare in the higher mid-range. the United Kingdom fares in the mid-range. Hungary, Portugal and Turkey score in the lower mid-range and lower range.

II. Within topics of enquiry

When considering the partner countries’ scores and rankings per topic rather than per sphere, the results are not significantly different. However, the results on who dominates the scoreboard differ. While the ‘winning’ countries in all three spheres are clearly Austria in combination with either the Netherlands or the United Kingdom, these results are different when taking into account the individual topic scores.
Figure 32: Aggregated partner country scores and total scores per topic of enquiry
When it comes to the sphere of redistribution, encompassing the topics of health and housing, Austria fares highest in the topics of health (62.87) and housing (58.5), followed by the Netherlands with scores of 57.5 and 56, respectively. The lowest scores come from Hungary (32.5) in health, and Portugal in housing (20).

In the sphere of representation, encompassing political participation and political representation, Hungary (77.5) and the United Kingdom (73.75) show the highest scores in political participation. In political representation, the highest scores come from the Netherlands (36.62) and Austria (34). The lowest score comes from Turkey in both cases, scoring 27.5 in political participation and 22.5 in political representation.

In the sphere of recognition, encompassing sexual orientation and freedom of expression, the highest score comes from Austria (66.75) and Hungary (60) in sexual orientation, and from the United Kingdom (52.25) and the Netherlands (48.5) in freedom of expression. The lowest scores come from Turkey again in both cases, scoring 30 and 35, respectively.

It is curious that, put into different words, there are no domains in which conditions are exclusively favourable to or exclusively not favourable to justice. As shown by the partner countries, while a country may show favourable conditions in one domain, like Hungary in political participation, it may show particularly non-favourable conditions in others, like Hungary in health. It is interesting to note that Portugal is neither at the top, nor at the bottom with any of its scores. It consistently fares in the lower mid-range.

As mentioned above, while the highest scores in the three spheres of justice were all above 50, indicating conditions generally favourable to justice, the picture changes when considering the topics: while scores are high for political participation, even the highest scores are far below 50 when it comes to political

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Pol. Participation</th>
<th>Pol. Representation</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Freedom of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>62.87</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>67.87</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66.75</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Kingdom</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>73.75</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>56.37</td>
<td>52.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states</td>
<td>51.75</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>68.375</td>
<td>43.25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU member states + Turkey</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>47.49</td>
<td>65.72</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>55.51</td>
<td>45.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>41.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Aggregated partner country scores and total scores per topic of enquiry
representation in the same sphere of justice. This is rather eye-opening and begs the question about perceived justice as enacted through democratic institutions in the ETHOS partner countries.

As is the case in all other assessments, when Turkish submissions are added to the aggregated scores of the EU, the overall score drops in all three spheres. The biggest difference is visible in the topics of political participation and sexual orientation.

III. Individual results

Individual country results consider the scores from all questions in all six topics. Assessments are made in relation to other ETHOS partner countries.

a) Austria

Compared to the other ETHOS partner countries, Austria generally fares well (i.e. the perceived conditions in six topics and three spheres are generally favourable to justice). In the topics of health, housing and sexual orientation, Austria scores higher than other ETHOS partners. Austria comes second behind the Netherlands in political representation, and third after Hungary and the United Kingdom in political participation. It also comes third after the United Kingdom and the Netherlands in freedom of expression. This casts a very positive picture on the country as a whole.
From within the components of enquiry, Austria’s highest results stem from the state component of enquiry in three topics: health, housing, political representation, and sexual orientation. This suggests that the state is perceived as providing and investing into adequate housing and healthcare. In addition, users consider it highly possible to stand for office when feeling mis-represented. The lowest results come from the topic of political representation overall (in the remaining three components of enquiry), as well as from the societal component in housing. Also noteworthy is the component of capability in the topic of freedom of expression: compared to the other three components of enquiry, this score is particularly high, indicating that users are likely to take a stand against hate speech and discrimination. The same is true for capability in the topic of political participation: users strongly believe in the power of protests and political participation to raise awareness for injustices. This reflective of recent political developments that have to do with the rise (and recent fall) of the conservative-right wing government and the reactions against it.

![Aggregated country scores: Austria](image)

**Figure 34: Aggregated country scores for Austria per topic of enquiry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Political participation</th>
<th>Political representation</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
<th>Freedom of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.75</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 15: Aggregated country scores for Austria per topic of enquiry*
According to users’ submissions, Hungary is not perceived as having conditions particularly favourable to justice. Overall and compared to partner countries, it shows the lowest ratings in health, political participation and freedom of expression. However, Hungary has the highest rating in political representation and fares second after Austria in the topic of sexual orientation, tied with the Netherlands.

When considering the individual component, it is noteworthy that compared to other topic scores, scores are high for the individual components in the topics of health (albeit below 50), housing, political participation, sexual orientation, and freedom of expression. This indicates that users feel that their own situation is – in all these topics – higher than their assessment of society, the state, and their own capability. This indicates that those enjoyments users perceive for themselves they do not perceive for society as a whole, indicating polarisation. It is interesting to note that in political participation, the scores for the state and capability components are strikingly high – higher than in any other topic. suggests that users in Hungary rate the state as protecting protesters’ security during protests and feel that political participation in non-institutionalised forms is a vital way to highlight injustice. This may be reflective of the many protests to do with the Hungarian government and Central European University prevalent during the time the app went online.
Figure 36: Aggregated country scores for Hungary per topic of enquiry

Table 16: Aggregated country scores for Hungary per topic of enquiry
c) The Netherlands

The Netherlands consistently score highly in the justice spheres, however when looking at the topics more closely, a more nuanced picture is revealed. While the Netherlands score highest in the generally low-score topic of political representation, the country scores second after Austria in health and housing, as well as second after the United Kingdom in freedom of expression. The scores show the Netherlands are tied in third place in sexual orientation with Hungary.

When looking at the scores within the topic areas, it catches the eye that the scores for the state component of health, housing, political representation and sexual orientation are particularly high compared to other scores, which sheds positive light on Dutch institutions. At the same time, capability scores for health and political representation are very low, suggesting that users are not willing or able to stand up and enforce their rights when faced with injustice in these spheres. In addition, it is noteworthy that contrasting the general pattern of individual scores being higher than societal scores, the Netherlands show that this is not the case when looking at political participation: users perceive both themselves and others are able to participate in protests without fear. Generally, it should be noted that the Netherlands have values of or below 50 in three components of enquiry in freedom of expression, excluding the capability component. This indicates that verbal harassment and offensive language are issues that are currently prevalent in Dutch society.
Figure 38: Aggregated country scores for the Netherlands per topic of enquiry

Table 17: Aggregated country scores for the Netherlands per topic of enquiry
Portugal generally scores in the lower range in all six topics, being on fifth place in political participation, sexual orientation, and freedom of expression. Portugal comes in fourth in the topic of health, and second in political representation. In the topic of housing, it comes in sixth place. It is interesting to note that while in all other partner countries excluding Turkey the two topics within the sphere of redistribution have rather similar scores, they are very far apart in the case of Portugal, with health faring significantly better than housing.

When it comes to the components of enquiry within the different topics, two scores catch the eye: in terms of political participation, the capability component scores 100 points. The same is true for the state component in sexual orientation. Unlike other ratings which reach a maximum score of around 60, these two values show that users are willing to stand up against injustices in protests, and are aware of bodies to which to report harassment based on sexual orientation. Contrastingly, the lowest values are scored in the topic of housing, where the societal component scores extremely lowly, and the capability component has a score of 0. This suggests that users perceive the housing situation in Portugal as not favourable to justice, but at the same time will not stand up against injustice. Also, freedom of expression scores are very low compared to others, in particular the state obligation component. Users do not perceive the state consequently condemns hate speech, perhaps pointing to an ongoing problem with racism embedded into Portugal’s colonial heritage.
Figure 40: Aggregated country scores for Portugal per topic of enquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Political participation</th>
<th>Political representation</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
<th>Freedom of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capability</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Aggregated country scores for Portugal per topic of enquiry
e) Turkey

The Turkish results are perhaps the most varied of all partner countries. Turkey generally scores the lowest in political participation, sexual orientation and freedom of expression. It scores fifth in political representation and housing, and third in health. Also, in the data set featuring all 28 countries, Turkey often scored the lowest, casting doubt over the conditions favourable to justice in the country.

It is striking when looking at the individual components of enquiry that either the capability or state components, or both, are generally high in the topics of housing, political participation, political representation, sexual orientation and freedom of expression. Particularly users’ willingness to stand up against injustice in the form of protests and to actively take a stance against hate speech and injustice in the domain of healthcare are noteworthy. Also, users’ perception of the role of protests to highlight injustice is strikingly high with a score of 90. At the same time, users assess the state obligation as being generally favourable to justice in health and sexual orientation, which is a rather surprising insight. However, it is interesting to note that in the recognitive sphere, users have the highest scores for the individual component (albeit below 50). While societally there are considerable injustices across all topics, with the exception of health, it is refreshing to see that users perceive they can freely express themselves and their identities.
Figure 42: Aggregated country scores for Turkey per topic of enquiry

Table 19: Aggregated country scores for Turkey per topic of enquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Political participation</th>
<th>Political representation</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
<th>Freedom of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) The United Kingdom

Compared to other ETHOS partner countries, the United Kingdom scores in the mid-range and comes in third in the areas of housing, political representation and sexual orientation. In political participation it scores second, and in freedom of expression it scores third. Interestingly, it ranks fifth for health above Hungary. It is interesting to note that unlike the other partner countries, the United Kingdom holds every ranking when looking at all the topics separately, but never comes in sixth place with the lowest score of partner countries.

It is noteworthy that similarly to the scores of the other partner countries, the United Kingdom also shows striking variety in the different components of enquiry. It is noteworthy that capability scores highly in housing, political participation and, most of all, sexual orientation. This indicates that users are happy to stand up against injustice. This is not reflected in the area of health. When it comes to the state component, political participation, political representation, sexual orientation and freedom of expression fare comparatively high in this component as opposed to the redistributive topics of health and housing. At the same time, it is curious that only in the domain of political participation, individual scores are considerably higher than 50, suggesting that users perceive their individual situations as being favourable to justice, generally. However, when considering the recognitive sphere and the topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression, results are below 50 in the individual and societal components of both topics. This begs questions about the direction into which the UK is developing and to what extent Brexit is a part of it.
There are several noteworthy cross-cutting observations that can be made. It is interesting to note differences and similarities between individuals’ perceptions of their own justice situation in different countries sometimes reflect, add to, or even dispel beliefs about fault lines of justice running through Europe. In addition, the observations made can be seen as tying into each other and as mutually reinforcing each other. However, it should be noted again that the results found base on aggregations of subjective and individual experiences and are by no means representative for entire public narratives or the actual state of justice in a given country.

I. The ‘winning’ countries

Overall, it is noteworthy that those countries commonly perceived as being particularly egalitarian in Europe, for example Scandinavian countries, also score highly when it comes to perceptions of justice. Sweden and Denmark generally score highly, in addition to Finland in two out of three justice spheres. They are closely
followed by the Baltic state of Estonia. The high scores are particularly the case in the redistributive sphere and the two topics housing and healthcare, as well as in the representative sphere and the two topics of political participation and political representation. When it comes to the recognitive sphere, the Nordic states score well in sexual orientation and freedom of expression. However, the further East the country lies (Finland and Estonia) the lower the score for the two recognitive topics. This could dispel the myth that all Nordic countries and all Baltic countries are by definition particularly just and egalitarian and point to the importance of historical heritage in determining current perceptions about justice. It should also be noted that Finland does not consider itself a ‘Scandinavian’ country in the first place.

In addition, when looking at the countries following the top ratings for the three spheres, the findings are surprising: in the sphere of redistribution, the Czech Republic and Spain score very highly. In the sphere of representation, Luxembourg and France score highly. In the sphere of recognition, Spain and Romania score very highly. These results may be counter-intuitive and not correspond to commonly held beliefs about the inherently more developed and progressive status of Western industrialised countries and development, but rather they shed promising light on the happenings in these countries.

II. Justice for oneself vs. justice for others

A common feature throughout all answers from the EU and Turkey is the fact that in the clear majority of all countries, users score the individual component of the six topic areas higher than the societal component. This observation is open to interpretation: does this mirror that only privileged users played the game? Or is it rather users who are indeed aware of their own privilege? It is curious that the biggest gap between self-perception and perception of societal fairness is in the sphere of recognition, followed by redistribution and representation. When considering the latter value shows an aggregated total score between 39.9 and 43.15 for all users, it is shown that while users generally perceive conditions favourable to justice in their individual situations, they perceive them as not favourable in the societal dimension. This is particularly true in the recognitive sphere and the corresponding topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression, where the aggregated scores across all users show the difference is more than 13 points. This raises the question about what is needed to extend individual privileges and abilities to the societal level in order to close the gap between the self and the other.

One country result is indeed eye-catching when it comes to the recognitive sphere: in the topics of sexual orientation and freedom of expression, the United Kingdom scores rather lowly, ending in the lower percentile of all countries. This reflects that users perceive the individual and societal components of recognitive justice are not favourable to justice. Indeed, these ratings may be reflective of the recent surge in hate crimes and harassment (often towards Muslims and also towards same-sex couples). According to the British House of Commons Library, police recorded figures indicate that since 2012/13 to 2017/18 there has been a 123% increase in the total number of reported hate crime offences.¹

III. ‘New’ vs. ‘old’ EU members and Turkey

A gap between new and old members can indeed be perceived throughout the areas, particularly among the fields of redistributive justice where one might suspect wealthier countries to be leading. Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia score in the lower percentile for these topics, particularly so in the topic of housing. Croatia, however, mostly scores higher than both Bulgaria and Romania. When considering the oldest EU members, Belgium, France, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands and Germany, the findings are very varied. Despite the commonly held perception that the longer a country has been in the EU the better it fares in developmental terms, the insights yielded from the app show that despite decades of different social, political and economic development, these countries do not score on the top. For example, Italy scores in the lower percentile in all three justice spheres, whereas Cyprus and the Czech Republic enjoy higher scores in all three spheres, despite only joining the EU in 2004. This shows that development in or outside the EU depends on a variety of factors and cannot inherently be assumed to be a linear upwards path to increased growth, prosperity, or justice.

As has been mentioned previously, overall aggregated country scores decrease when Turkey is added to the dataset. This is particularly the case in the domain of justice as representation as well as in justice as recognition. Considering Turkey’s political situation and general social climate, this may not be surprising. However, it is noteworthy that Turkey has generally high scores in the redistributive topic of health.

IV. State obligation

The third statement in each area refers to the state component to creating conditions favourable to justice. This either touches on the direct actions of a state or on services offered by the state. Here, it is noteworthy that in the topics of political participation and political representation, the clear majority of countries score highly in this when looking at the aggregated scores overall. This indicates that the state is particularly effective in providing conditions favourable to justice in the sphere of redistribution and, in particular, the sphere of representation (although results within this sphere are nuanced). Also, in the sphere of recognition the score is high, although the score for the capability component is higher. When adding Turkey to the EU scores, the score significantly decreases.

Generally, these numbers shed positive light on the role of institutions in Europe. The highest overall scores for this line of enquiry come from the topics of housing, political participation and political representation, as well as from sexual orientation. In all cases, the numbers show that state obligations and actions are considered as favourable to justice in these topics. However, the score for freedom of expression is lower (49), indicating that states should take a stronger role in combatting hate speech and other societal problems to do with recognition that arise. This may be reflective of the rising societal inequalities observed in European countries, as well as contemporary migration flows and political developments towards right-wing, populist narratives. However, at the same time, users in the clear majority of countries state that they are aware of which bodies to turn to in the case of harassment based on sexual orientation, which indicates that in this sphere, the effectiveness of the state in contributing to conditions favourable to justice seems to be increasing, reflecting promising institutional flexibility and adaptation on matters related to recognition.
V. User capability and standing up for justice

One of the most interesting results stems from the scores on the capability component of all six topics, that is to say the scores on users’ relative perception about whether they are willing and capable to take a stance in the case of injustices. Results show that in the topic of political participation and freedom of expression, users score their countries the highest. This may be indicative of a strong and growing commitment to democracy and self-expression, whereas in domains that lie in the scope of responsibility of the (welfare) state, users feel that they have less capability to make a change. However, the scores show a positive development particularly in freedom of expression, where the high score indicates that although verbal harassment seems to be widespread, users are particularly keen on speaking up and taking a stance against it in the clear majority of countries. This may be directly correlated to the high ratings for capability in political participation and low ratings for capability in (institutionalised) political representation, indicating that protests and political participation may (again) be an up-and-coming manner to speak up and act against injustices.

VI. Between political participation and representation

It is noteworthy that although there are clear differences in topic scores across the three justice spheres, the difference between the political participation scores and the political representation scores is by far the largest. Where political participation generally scores above 50 in all four components of enquiry across all aggregated total scores, the scores for political representation show scores between 31 and 46. Considering these scores, this may indicate an increased perception that public protests, political participation and assemblies are considered effective tools to combat injustice, rather than institutionalised political actors. This is particularly evident when looking the capability scores for both: while users in the majority of countries clearly believe protests are an adequate way of highlighting and combating injustice, the score for contacting politicians in case of feeling important topics are unjustly tackled only has a score of 31, overall. Most importantly, when taking into account the previous finding (IV) on the positive light shed on institutions, this may be indicative of the changing role of institutions as being administrative forces who provide frameworks for justice, rather than forces of concrete interest representation.

Finally, when considering the newest transnational protest movements, including Fridays for Future which tackles climate change, this may indicate that governments are not assessed as taking this topic seriously enough. However, this sentiment may equally be shared when it comes to other issues such as infringements of civic space, the rise of right-wing parties and sentiment, as well as the refugee influx. Here, it is noteworthy that particularly Germany scores strikingly low scores in political representation, whereas the score is significantly higher in political participation. Germany in particular has experienced right-wing sentiment stemming in part from the refugee influx, which may be reflected in users’ assessment they are not adequately represented.
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