

Youth political participation in contemporary world: literature review

Научный руководитель – Zaslavskaya Maria Igor

Galstyan Marina Karen

Graduate (master)

Ереванский государственный университет, Ереван, Армения

E-mail: galstyanmarina@gmail.com

Current discourse on youth political participation

In the discourse about the interrelations of youth and political participation, a dominant narrative is the one about the passive and disinterested young people who care little about political processes. The aim of this analysis is to explore these claims and to present contemporary understanding of young people's political participation, specify the main forms of participation and motivating factors, as well as show the main trends and challenges concerning youth political participation today.

Defining youth

Sociologists, youth workers and policy-makers have their own different notions of what constitutes young people and many of these understandings differ from the ways that young people see themselves (Cieslik and Simpson 2013: 3). Youth research offers at least three approaches to conceptualise youth: as a generation, as a life stage and as a social group.

Perhaps one of the most common understandings of youth is presented in Macmillan Dictionary: Youth is the time of life when one is young, and often means the time between <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Childhood> and <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adult> (Macmillan Dictionary, 2013). It is also defined as “the appearance, freshness, spirit, etc., characteristics of one who is young” (dictionary.com, 2019). At the same time, its definitions of a specific age range varies, as youth is not defined <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chronology> as a stage that can be tied to specific age ranges; nor can its end point be linked to specific activities (Furlong 2013: pp. 2-3).

The youth sector generally uses the age-based classifications, either following the UN or EU guidelines. UN defines “youth” as representatives of the 15-24 age groups, while the European Union uses the 15-29 age range. Taking into consideration these classifications, today's youth, 15-29 years old people, are mainly born in 1990s, and they are called digital natives or Y generation. This generation has high level of internet dependency. Z generation of 2000s were born in the era of Internet and social media. Alfa generation (born in 2010s) is less studied generation and the social theorists are still to explore their characteristics (Council of Europe 2018).

These different conceptualisations of youth are closely interconnected and could be discussed in the same ‘space’ of dependency or independence of youth from different aspects of life, groups or persons. When we consider young people as holders of certain social roles and statuses, we must pay attention to the fact that they are somewhat dependent on the social groups and institutions in which they play their roles. During the twentieth century young people's lives were heavily conditioned by class, race and gender processes which set limits to what they might possibly become through adulthood. In the contemporary society, characterised by the

fast development of information technology and widespread use of internet, young people have access to information about opportunities which allow them to make independent decisions about their own lives, education, work, and political participation without being dependent on the views of social groups in which they are belong to involved. The period of youth is characterised by the **transition from 'dependency to independence'**.

From this point of view, political participation could be discussed as a **catalyst** for young people's independence - political participation promotes young people's independence and autonomy. At the same time, the more independence young people have, the more likely they are to participate in politics and exercise their political rights. Thus participation is both, dependent on independence, and promoted by it.

Defining youth participation and political participation

One of the main differences between traditional and modern societies is high level of participation of citizens in politics and existence of open political system (Huntington 1996). This is a complex of a range of complicated, autonomous, adaptive and agreed institutions which promote and strengthen civic engagement in the process of modernisation. Therefore, the goals and objectives of modernization of the society can not be achieved without political modernization. In order to achieve this, changes should first be done at institutional level, meaning that norms and values that will lead people in their political behaviour should be established. Secondly, it is necessary to create a political system based on political pluralism and competitiveness, which would represent and coordinate the interests of different social groups. If the government is not able to create political system which complies with the above-mentioned requirements, the citizens will find other, not institutional ways to pursue their goals (appeal actions, "direct actions").

Participation itself is a changing concept, which has evolved over time due to developments of social science and civic processes. The main understanding of participation is rooted within the context of democracy and governance. In political theories, participation is narrowly limited to the process of people's voting in the elections (Forbrig 2005).

However, there are many forms and types of political participation which surpass the formal act of voting, and there are many unconventional ways of political engagement which are carried out with the intent to influence the institutions and society (EU-CoE youth partnership, Glossary on youth - Political Participation 2019).

There are **many theoretical approaches and conceptualisations of youth participation.**

- **Participation as a rights-based practice.** Based on the CRC, young people are viewed as holders of rights, including the right to participate in politics and decision-making
- **Participation as a mechanism of empowerment of young people.** This approach proposes a more progressive view of participation as a way of giving young people a voice in a society, addressing political marginalisation of youth and changing power relations between generations
- **Participation as a guarantee of efficiency in policy, practice and services.** This approach is based on the understanding that young people are best aware of their own needs and also have new ideas. Thus, youth participation is considered as a way in which young people can 'enlighten' the policy makers to be more informed and aware of young people's

reality, in order to ‘rejuvenate’ the political system and develop better policies and services.

· **Participation as an instrument of young people’s development.** By engaging in decision making, young people, are learning about the political processes in society, but are also developing necessary skills, such as self-esteem, confidence, negotiation skills, a sense of autonomy etc. Thus participation is considered a tool for individual development of a young person as a citizen (Farthing, 2012).

Critical approach to participation is also widely discussed in literature, according to which participation is a new way to manage and control people. Within the critical approach, youth participation is defined as function, mean, tool, mechanism of the society towards social control of young people. M. Foucault’s theoretical ideas about discursive practices and governance practices were also significant for development of this approach (Foucault 1972). This concept is criticised because it considers young people as passive objects of adults’ influence.

Defining youth political participation

Conceptualisation of the phenomenon of youth political activism in political processes was conducted within the framework of different disciplines: Structural functionalism (T. Parsons, R. Merton and others), Behaviourism (G. Laswell and Ch. Mariam), System approach (G. Almond, N. Luman, K. Doich), Institutionalism and neoinstitutionalism (P. Hall, R. Taylor and others), Conflictological (R. Darendorf, L. Kozer and others). Modern theorists reflected on how the processes of modernisation of society also affect the forms of youth political participation (R. Inglehart, O’Donnel, R. Dahl, J. Habermas).

Different approaches, debates and critiques of the concept of political participation have resulted in development of more inclusive and progressive understandings of the concept and their promotion by various institutions at the European level.

Taking into considerations different understandings and theoretical approaches to political participation, we can conclude that it is any activity that shapes, affects, or involves the political sphere. Political participation cannot be narrowed to the conventional forms of participation in elections or referendums, or being members of political parties. Unconventional forms like signing petitions, organising demonstrations or strikes have, for some time, been considered legal forms of political participation, as are supporting boycotts or expressing political opinions via badges, T-shirts, stickers or letters to media and online postings. Beside these legal forms of political participation some activities carried out with the intention of influencing society and/or the political sphere are considered illegal. These could involve actions such as vandalism or acts of terrorism, as well as civil disobedience or resistance (EU-CoE youth partnership, Glossary on youth 2019).

The different forms of youth political participation

The gap between the society and political institutions has been fluctuating as a result of reforms improving the quality of education and economic development. A number of processes had an important impact on increasing the level of political participation, and one of them was

institutional complexity. The considerable expansion of democratic politics has been accompanied by a significant broadening of political participation and citizens' ability to influence political processes (Forbrig 2005).

In Europe, student social movements in 1960s had significant influence on youth political participation, giving young people and wider society an option to engage in political processes through different means (Forbrig 2005).

There are different approaches to differentiation of formats of political participation.

The most common classification of the forms of political participation is differentiation between traditional/conventional and non-conventional forms. Traditional or institutional forms of participation are elections, membership to political parties, and non-traditional or unconventional forms of participation are petitions, demonstrations, and movements.

Within the context of conventional political participation, political and civic education is considered as a means of understanding of democracy and critical assessment. Through political education, young people learn how the political system functions, how decisions are made and how they can participate in decision making processes. At the same time young people should have an opportunity to question, criticise the system and processes and follow the whole process of discussion, solution, further development of their ideas and raised issues. Yet, according to research by Harvard University and the University of Melbourne, of all the age groups, young people have least trust in democracy. Considering this trend, the research indicates that the participatory processes should be entirely transformed in order to implement the full participation, and combine the online and offline forms of participation, including not only decision-making process but also a follow-up.

Youth research generally focuses on three basic forms of political participation (Chisholm & Kovacheva 2002):

- involvement in institutional politics (elections, campaigns and membership);
- protest activities (demonstrations and new social movements);
- civic engagement (associative life, community participation, voluntary work).

In literature, we can also note the following classification:

- Youth Political Participation: Groups of young people, who meet on a regular basis, with the aim of raising awareness, or challenging policies and/or practices, at a local, national or international level (Eden and Roker (2002).
- Modern participation: representative participation and direct participation with all their variants, such as NGO based structures, co-management, youth parliaments, school councils, youth hearings, demonstrations etc (Forbrig 2005).
- Postmodern or emergent and future forms of participation include various types of expressive, emotional, aesthetic, casual virtual and digital participation (Forbrig 2005).
- Pro-active, problem-solving approach to youth participation perceiving it as the active involvement of young people in the social transformation of their societies (Kovacheva 2000).

Siurala (Kovacheva 2005) defines these types of participation as “postmodern” types, including expressive, emotional, aesthetic, casual, virtual and digital participation.

Some of these new forms of political participation are presented below:

- Hacking and ddos attacks: A form of protest aiming to force down online servers and make online service temporarily unavailable (see case of Mastercard and Wikileaks)
- Clicktivism and slacktivism: Voluntary or invitation-based clicks on certain links, in order to express agreement with certain statements; Online campaigning: Special online platforms invite users to start their own causes and gain interest for them through sharing links in their social networks (e.g. avaaz.org).
- Crowdsourcing and crowdfunding: Using the crowd to gain ideas, input, feedback and financial support to realise projects and transform ideas into reality
- Liquid Democracy/Liquid Feedback: a new form of online participation tool which allows collaborative decision-making by giving each individual an opportunity to vote on all issues directly, or delegate their votes to a chosen representative.
- Barcamp: Online conference system where the program and sessions are developed by the participants themselves. This method combines the Open Space Technology with effective use of internet-based tools (Pleyers and Karbach 2014).

The changing nature and pathways of political participation have opened new and interesting horizons and perspectives for the youth studies, policies and practice, and this will remain to be an important topic of interest for the researchers, policy-makers and youth workers.

Tendencies in youth political participation

The global society is fast-changing, which has an effect on the youth political participation as well: forms of participation, goals, intensiveness and other characteristics are changed over the time as well. Although it is difficult to identify long-term trends, there are certain characteristics of youth political participation which can be noted:

- Non-traditional forms of political participation have become more common among young people, including protests and social movements
- Research shows that for many young people, political participation starts at the local or regional level. This is where young people get a chance to see the direct impact of their involvement and participate in a small-scale democracy.
- Boundaries between online and offline communication are disrupted, which has an impact on building relations in offline life and creation of non-hierarchic relations in both online and offline spaces. It also impacts on the forms of participation and development of open method- a combination of online and offline participation.
- Young people have low and declining trust in democracy as a political system. Thus, political and civic education, as a means of understanding political system plays an important role in learning about the political system and decision-making processes.
- The role of the youth work is reevaluated, as youth workers play a role of connector and translator, transferring information about political processes to young people, and also informing policy-makers about young people's needs.
- The boundaries between social and political, private and public are removed, as political participation now surpasses the 'traditional' politics, and concerns itself also with the wider issues, resulting in the "informalization" of politics Bang and Sorensen (2001)

Paradoxes of the youth political participation

In the studies and concepts of youth political participation, we can see paradoxes in several meanings and levels:

1. **The divergent opinions.** The opinions of youth researcher, policy makers and youth

workers are divided into two groups: some are pessimistic about youth political participation, as they note the decreasing political engagement of young people. On the other hand, the others are more optimistic, claiming that the young people are rejecting traditional ways of political participation of older generation and creating new models and forms of political participation. Therefore, young people always actively take part in political processes, but the type of participation is different from the usual models of the older generation.

2. **Knowledge of political participation.** The studies and knowledge on youth political participation indicated on the one hand that young people are passive and disengaged. Yet, at the same time, they agree that the new models and forms of political participation are developing, and that young people are active in using these forms.

3. **Democracy paradox.** In theory, the enlargement of democratic institutions should have increased the level of political participation of wider society, including the youth, but the same studies show a steady decrease of public participation and a widening gap between the politics and citizens.

4. **Transition paradox.** If “youth” is considered to be a transition from dependency to independence, and political participation as promoting factor and result of independence, then a young person will, through political participation, achieve independence and , therefore move to the adulthood.

Hence, these ideas are closely connected to each other, but are also contradictory, as they imply that [U+055B] [U+055B] When a young person integrates; (s/)he is no longer a young person [U+055B] [U+055B] (Garrido and Requena 1996: 15).

5. **The paradox of participation and control.** According to theorists, political participation is a process of socialization, the learning of social norms accepted by society. In this sense participation converts to control, management of behaviour and actions of the young people, instead of being an empowering practice.

6. **Is political participation always a good thing?** Youth political participation includes not only activities related to promotion of human rights, democracy, equality and inclusion of diverse social groups, but it also includes actions related to extremism, xenophobia, intolerance and terror; posing a question of what type of political participation do we want to promote.

The role of magic triangle in youth political participation

The changing nature of youth political participation and the emerging trends have an important impact on all three sides of the magic triangle: youth policy, youth studies and youth work.

Youth policy

· A number of recent studies (Deželan 2015) have highlighted the decline in voter turnout, membership of political parties, interest in politics and trust in political institutions amongst young people. Youth’s distrust of institutional politics has been seen as a widespread problem in Europe.

· Youth is not represented enough in formal political institutions and processes such as Parliaments, political parties, elections, and public administrations. The situation is even more difficult for both young women as well as women at mid-level and decision-making/leadership positions.

· The main challenge for youth is limited opportunities for effective participation in decision-making processes. With limited opportunities to meaningfully participate in inclusive

decision-making processes, young men and women feel excluded and marginalized in their societies and communities. The need for participatory structures and greater trust between youth and institutions and for greater capacity development is also stressed in the youth studies.

- Individualisation is another global trend affecting the political participation of young people in Europe. Attitudinal surveys (Iacovou& Berthoud 2001; Kovacheva et al. 2003; Macháčěk 2001) have documented the growing inclination to search for individual solutions and the dislike of collective action.

- The spread of consumerism among young people might be a serious challenge to their civic participation, as it represents a shift away from collective solidarity and ideological engagement.

- Youth participation in voting is usually high when combined with the other two forms of activities: unconventional and civic. Young people quickly mobilise around single issues.

- In Eastern Europe, a lot of the participatory potential of young people in the region is lost because of emigration.

- Political action is also not only the action structured through political institutions and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) but also involvement in less structured, looser networks and friendship circles, and even individual action, such as political consumerism.

- While some of the challenges towards a better participation are common to youth as a specific age category, most challenges are specific to different categories of young people. Policies to foster youth participation should thus target specific groups of young people and help them to overcome specific barriers or take into account their specific modes of participation.

Youth studies

- Different groups of young people might have different definitions of politics and different forms of political expression

- Researchers should develop concepts that are more sensitive to the political aspects of such forms of youth participation as leisure activities.

- Research methods need to be sensitive to explore new trends in political participation, which acknowledge variations across national, regional and local contexts in Europe. Another route is to widen the scope of research methods used to study youth participation patterns, which up to now seem to be dominated by quantitative designs.

Youth Work

- Youth organisations mostly represent a specific category of youth and should thus not be considered as representative of all young people.

- Internet has become another innovative resource for youth participation. Therefore, this fact should be taken into account when planning and implementing youth work.

- The area of the youth work was enlarged: the youth worker should understand the interest and, needs of t young people and communicate these to decision makers, without breaching the trust and confidence of youth.

Starting points for further discussions

The study of existing literature gives an important overview of main thesis and arguments regarding youth political participation. It serves as a stepping stone for further research and discussion on the topic.

· The discourse around definitions of youth political participation is characterised by a few paradoxes:

§ Whether participation is realisation of the rights or mechanism of social control

§ Youth political participation facilitates integration of young person into society; therefore, the young person becomes an adult.

§ The young people are not interested in traditional forms of political participation, but are active in implementation of non-traditional forms.

· Young people are not interested in politics, because the politics does not represent the problems that are important for the youth.

· Trust and social solidarity have direct impact on political participation, as it is built based on horizontal and not vertical connections. As a rule, young people rely on forms of political participation that are understandable and tangible, while traditional forms are by no means self-explanatory, as they are complex and impose certain conditions of participation that young people must meet. In this sense, non-traditional forms of participation do not have any precondition, it is possible to be involved in social movements without any preparedness, which excludes any hierarchy and is horizontal.

· Recent studies synthesized by H. Willems, A. Heinen, & C. Meyers (2012) point that voting turnout, membership in political parties, interest in politics and trust in political institutions are declining especially among young people (Pleyers and Karbach 2014).

· We can discuss youth political participation in the context of intergenerational relations: conflict or solidarity. In literature we can often see contradiction of political participation of young people and political participation of adults; young people are often presented as not interested, indifferent, apathetic towards political processes, and the adults are presented as active participants of political life. This situation is presented in literature as intergenerational conflict; it seems that active participation of two generations at the same time is self-exclusive. In the literature, conflict of interests between generations is also discussed. The young people have their own interests and needs that are not always shared by the adults (Pleyers and Karbach 2014).

· [/rus/event/request/123438/report/"https://www.multitran.com/m.exe?s](#) that in literature the importance of digital competence, as a component in political education, is also mentioned. Young people today have grown up in a world dominated by the internet, with new opportunities for participation and engagement (Council of Europe 2018).

· Issues of the quality of civic, political education are subject of many researches. They mainly reflect the content and teaching methods.

DelliCarpini (2003) at the Pew Charitable Trusts says, “My worry is that as good as a lot of service learning work is, that it does not encourage political involvement and policy involvement, but it may, in fact, even discourage it”.

· Mass media and advanced technologies influence the youth political participation. Moreover, political and digital competencies are significant for the positive impact.

· Studies about youth political participation cannot reveal new forms of participation. In most quantitative studies, when researchers find that young people participate at lower levels they conclude that they are indifferent to politics. However, this should not necessarily be the case as, young people can engage in other forms of political participation which are not often surveyed by researchers.

References

- 1) Arnett, J.J. (1997), Young people's conceptions of the transition to adulthood, available at www.jeffreyarnett.com/articles/arnett1997youngpeoplesconceptionsofthetransitiontoadulthood.pdf accessed 11 April 2019. Bang, H. P. y E. Sorensen (2001).

“The Everyday Maker”, en P. Dekker y E. M. Uslaner (eds.) Social Capital and Participation in Every Day Life (pp. 141-168). Londres: Routledge. Cieslik, M. and Simpson, D. (2013), Key concepts in youth studies, Sage, Los-Angeles. Council of Europe and European Commission (May 2018), Perspectives on Youth: Young people in a digitalised world, Volume 4, Council of Europe Publishing. Crowley A. & Moxon D., New and innovative forms of youth participation in decision-making processes, Council of Europe, October 2017. Deželan T. (2015) Young People and Democratic Life in Europe: What Next After the 2014 European Elections? European Youth Forum, available at www.youthforum.org/sites/default/files/publication-pdfs/YFJ_YoungPeopleAndDemocraticLifeInEurope_B1_web-9e4bd8be22.pdf accessed April 13, 2019. EU-CoE youth partnership (2019), glossary on youth available at www.pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/glossary accessed April 14, 2019. Forbig Joerg (eds.), Revisiting youth political participation. Challenges for research and democratic practice in Europe, Council of Europe Publishing. Foucault M. (1972), The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language. Pantheon Books, New York. Furlong, A. (2009, p23), Handbook of youth and young adulthood. Routledge, London-New York. Furlong, A. (2013, pp. 2-3), Youth Studies: An Introduction. USA: Routledge. Goodwin, J. and O’Conner, H. (2016), Norbert Elias’s lost Research: Revisiting the young worker project, Routledge, Taylor and Frances Group, London and New York. Guilford, G. (2016, November 30). Harvard research suggests that an entire global generation has lost faith in democracy. Quartz, available at www.qz.com/848031/harvard-research-suggests-that-an-entire-global-generation-has-lost-faith-in-democracy/ accessed April 16 2019. Hart Roger A. (1992), Children’s participation, from tokenism to citizenship, UNICEF International Child Development Centre SpedaledegliInnocenti Florence, Italy. Huntington, Samuel P. (1996) Political Order in Changing Societies. Published by: Yale University Press. Joerg Forbrig (2005), Revisiting youth political participation: Challenges for research and democratic practice in Europe, Council of Europe Publishing. Jones, G. (2010) Key concepts: youth, available at www.ukessays.com/essays/sociology/the-concept-of-youth-so-difficult-to-define-sociology-essay.php accessed April 3, 2019. Keer, D. (1999). Re-examining Citizenship Education in England. In Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. and Amadeo, J. Civic Education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA Civic Education project, Amsterdam, IEA Kehily M.J. (2007) Understanding Youth: Perspectives, Identities and Practices. Milton Keynes: Open University Press. Luhman N., Mass media reality. Macmillan Dictionary. Macmillan Publishers Limited. Retrieved 2013-8-15. Mannheim, K. (1952) ‘The problem of generations’, in P. Kecskemeti (ed.), Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Manzoni, A. (2016), Conceptualizing and measuring youth independence multidimensionally in the United States, available at www.researchgate.net/publication/304613252_Conceptualizing_and_measuring_youth_independence_multidimensionally_in_the_United_States accessed April 12, 2019. Merriam-Webster. Retrieved November 6, 2012. Niemi, R. G., & Junn, J. (1998). Civic education: What makes students learn? New Haven & London, CT: Yale University Press. Pleyers G. and Karbach N. (July 2014) Analytical paper on Youth Participation, Young people political participation in Europe: What do we mean by participation? Council of Europe Publishing, Brussels. Quintelier E. (June 2007), Differences in political participation between young and old people, Contemporary Politics, Volume 13, Number 2. Roker, D., Player K. and Coleman, J. (1999, Vol. 25, No. 1/2, pp. 185-198) Young People’s Voluntary and Campaigning Activities as Sources of Political Education, Oxford Review of Education. Rys Farthing, Why Youth Participation? Some Justifications and

Critiques of Youth Participation Using New Labour's Youth Policies as a Case Study, © YOUTH & POLICY, 2012 USAID (2005). Youth and Conflict: A toolkit for intervention. Available at: www.pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadb336.pdf accessed April 3, 2019. Wyn, J. and Woodman, D. (2006, 9:495–514) Generation, youth and social change in Australia, Journal of Youth Studies. Youth Definition. Available at: www.dictionary.com/browse/youth?s=ts accessed April 2, 2019. Young People and Political Participation: European Research, Young People's Studies Magazine, June 2008 Youth Participation globalisation and democracy, by Marie Schneider & Helmut Willems, Coyote Theme