Role Of Youth Participation in Strengthening Democratic Governance

[1] **Dr. Santosh Kumar**
[1]Assistant Professor
Government First Grade College for Women, Raichur – 584101, Karnataka
revur.santosh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Youth participation represents an essential component of democratic governance because it promotes political inclusion, civic responsibility, accountability and representative decision-making. Young people contribute to democratic development through electoral participation, community activities, political campaigns, public consultations, social movements and digital platforms. However, their participation is frequently influenced by political inequality, limited institutional opportunities, inadequate civic education and declining trust in conventional political institutions. The present study examines the role of youth participation in strengthening democratic governance, with particular emphasis on political engagement, digital citizenship, civic awareness and institutional responsiveness. The research adopts a descriptive and qualitative approach based on secondary sources, including academic books and scholarly journal publications. It evaluates existing perspectives on youth civic engagement, political participation and democratic representation. The analysis suggests that meaningful youth participation can strengthen democratic accountability, encourage inclusive policymaking and improve public engagement with democratic institutions. The study concludes that governments and democratic institutions must create accessible, participatory and representative mechanisms to transform youth involvement into meaningful political influence.

Keywords: Youth Participation, Democratic Governance, Political Engagement, Civic Participation, Youth Empowerment, Digital Citizenship, Political Representation, Democratic Accountability.

I INTRODUCTION

Democratic governance is founded upon the principles of political participation, public accountability, equality, representation and the protection of citizens' rights. Its effectiveness depends not only on the existence of democratic institutions but also on the active involvement of citizens in political and public affairs. Within this framework, youth participation has acquired considerable importance because young people represent a significant section of society and contribute to the development of political ideas, social movements and democratic practices. Their involvement in governance enables democratic institutions to incorporate emerging perspectives, respond to changing social expectations and strengthen their connection with different sections of the population.

Youth participation extends beyond voting in elections. It includes involvement in political organisations, student associations, community development programmes, public consultations, voluntary activities, advocacy campaigns and digital political discussions. These activities provide opportunities for young citizens to express their concerns, influence public decisions and develop an understanding of democratic responsibilities. Active participation also enables young people to acquire leadership abilities, communication skills, political awareness and a sense of collective responsibility.

The relationship between youth participation and democratic governance has become particularly significant with the expansion of digital communication technologies. Social media platforms and online networks have created new opportunities for political expression, information

sharing and collective mobilisation. Bennett (2008) highlights the potential of digital media in encouraging civic learning and youth engagement. Similarly, Loader, Vromen and Xenos (2014) discuss the emergence of the networked young citizen, whose political engagement increasingly operates through digital communication and social networks. These developments have expanded the traditional understanding of political participation by providing alternative channels for democratic involvement.

Despite these opportunities, young people continue to encounter several barriers to meaningful participation. Limited political representation, inadequate civic education, economic inequalities, institutional restrictions and a lack of confidence in political organisations can discourage their involvement. Furthermore, the presence of online misinformation, political polarisation and unequal access to digital resources can reduce the democratic value of technology-based participation. Therefore, the availability of participation opportunities does not automatically guarantee meaningful influence over public decision-making.

In democratic societies, youth participation must be understood as both a political right and an important mechanism for improving governance. Young citizens should be provided with opportunities to participate in policy discussions, question public authorities, contribute to community initiatives and influence decisions affecting their present and future. Democratic institutions must therefore move beyond symbolic youth representation and establish mechanisms through which young people's opinions receive genuine consideration.

The present study examines the role of youth participation in strengthening democratic governance by analysing its political, social, institutional and digital dimensions. It also identifies the major barriers affecting youth engagement and discusses measures for developing more inclusive and participatory democratic institutions.

II NEED OF THE STUDY

The need to examine youth participation in democratic governance arises from the increasing importance of inclusive political representation and active citizenship in contemporary societies. Young people experience several social, economic, educational and environmental challenges that require effective political representation. Their involvement in democratic processes helps ensure that public policies reflect the concerns and expectations of different generations.

An important requirement is to understand how youth participation contributes to political accountability and institutional responsiveness. Democratic governance becomes more effective when citizens can communicate their concerns, question public authorities and participate in decisions concerning public welfare. Young people can strengthen these processes through electoral involvement, community initiatives, public discussions and organised advocacy.

The study is also necessary because traditional forms of political participation do not always attract young citizens. Changes in communication patterns and the growing importance of digital platforms have created new forms of civic engagement. Understanding these developments is essential for identifying how democratic institutions can adapt their participation mechanisms to changing youth expectations.

Furthermore, barriers such as political exclusion, inadequate civic education, economic inequalities and limited access to decision-making institutions continue to restrict meaningful engagement. Examining these challenges can help identify appropriate institutional and educational interventions.

III SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

The scope of the present research covers the political, social, institutional and technological dimensions of youth participation in democratic governance. It examines how young people

contribute to democratic processes through voting, political discussions, community engagement, voluntary organisations, student movements, advocacy campaigns and digital participation.

The research particularly focuses on the relationship between youth engagement and democratic accountability, political representation, civic awareness and institutional responsiveness. It also explores the importance of digital communication platforms in creating alternative opportunities for political participation and collective mobilisation.

The study considers the barriers that restrict meaningful youth participation, including political disinterest, limited institutional access, socioeconomic inequalities, inadequate civic education and declining trust in conventional political institutions. It also examines the responsibilities of educational institutions, governments, political organisations and civil society in encouraging youth involvement.

IV PROBLEM STATEMENT

Youth participation is widely recognised as an important element of democratic governance; however, the actual involvement of young people in political decision-making remains uneven. Although young citizens possess the constitutional and democratic rights to participate in public affairs, their influence over formal political institutions and policy decisions is often limited. A significant difference exists between providing opportunities for youth engagement and ensuring that young people's opinions genuinely influence governance.

One of the major problems concerns the limited representation of young people within political organisations and decision-making institutions. Traditional political structures may not adequately accommodate their expectations, concerns and participation preferences. Consequently, young citizens may perceive conventional political processes as inaccessible or insufficiently responsive to their needs. Such perceptions can contribute to political disengagement and declining institutional trust.

Another important problem involves the unequal distribution of opportunities for civic participation. Differences in education, economic resources, social background and digital access influence the extent to which young people can engage in democratic activities. While digital platforms have created alternative opportunities for participation, misinformation, online harassment and political polarisation can weaken constructive democratic discussions.

V LITERATURE REVIEW

Bessant (2003) examined youth participation as a new mode of government and explored the changing relationship between young citizens and public institutions. The study provides an important perspective on the growing recognition of youth involvement in governance and policy formulation. Youth participation is not limited to individual political expression; it also represents an approach through which governments can incorporate the perspectives of younger generations into public administration. The study suggests that involving young people in decision-making can contribute to more responsive governance by creating opportunities for dialogue between citizens and institutions. However, meaningful participation requires more than establishing consultative arrangements. Young people must have opportunities to influence decisions rather than merely being invited to express opinions. The research is relevant to democratic governance because it connects youth participation with institutional development, public accountability and the changing expectations of citizenship.

Checkoway (2011) explored the meaning and dimensions of youth participation and emphasised the importance of recognising young people as active contributors to society. The study provides a conceptual foundation for understanding participation as a process involving the expression of opinions, collective action and engagement in decisions affecting young citizens. It challenges

approaches that treat young people primarily as recipients of services or subjects of adult-led programmes. Instead, youth participation requires recognising their capacity to identify social problems, develop solutions and contribute to institutional decisions. This perspective is important for democratic governance because democratic institutions depend upon the involvement of citizens in public affairs. The study also suggests that participation should be evaluated in terms of the opportunities available to young people and the extent to which their involvement produces meaningful influence.

Bennett (2008) examined the relationship between digital media and youth civic engagement through a collection of scholarly contributions. The work highlights how online communication technologies can create new opportunities for political learning, information exchange and civic involvement. Digital platforms allow young citizens to access political information, discuss public issues, organise collective activities and communicate with wider communities. These developments have expanded the traditional boundaries of democratic participation, particularly for young people who may not actively participate through conventional political institutions. Digital media can also support civic learning by enabling young citizens to understand political issues through interactive and networked communication. However, digital participation must be supported by critical media literacy and reliable information. The contribution is particularly relevant to contemporary democratic governance because it demonstrates how technological developments can create alternative channels for political engagement.

Quintelier (2007) investigated differences in political participation between young and older citizens. The study contributes to the understanding of generational differences in political behaviour and the factors influencing political engagement. Political participation is shaped by several conditions, including education, political knowledge, social background and opportunities for involvement. Differences between younger and older citizens should therefore not automatically be interpreted as a lack of political interest among youth. Instead, young people may prefer different forms of engagement and may participate through activities that are not adequately reflected in conventional measures of political participation. The study is relevant to democratic governance because it demonstrates the importance of understanding different patterns of political involvement. Democratic institutions must recognise that political engagement can take multiple forms and should develop participation mechanisms that accommodate the changing preferences and circumstances of younger generations.

Flanagan and Levine (2010) examined civic engagement during the transition to adulthood and discussed the importance of developing democratic participation among young citizens. Their contribution highlights the relationship between social development, civic learning and the formation of responsible citizenship. The transition to adulthood represents an important period during which individuals develop political identities, understand social responsibilities and establish patterns of civic involvement. Educational institutions, families and community organisations can influence these processes by providing opportunities for political discussion, voluntary activities and collective problem-solving. The study is particularly significant because it connects early civic experiences with the development of long-term democratic engagement. It suggests that youth participation should be encouraged through sustained educational and institutional support rather than being treated as an activity restricted to electoral periods.

Henn and Foard (2012) examined young people's political participation and trust in Britain. Their research is important for understanding the relationship between political attitudes, institutional confidence and youth engagement. Political trust influences how citizens evaluate

democratic institutions and whether they believe participation can produce meaningful outcomes. Young people who perceive political institutions as unresponsive or disconnected from their concerns may become less interested in conventional political activities. However, dissatisfaction with established political structures does not necessarily indicate an absence of democratic interest. Young citizens may express their political concerns through alternative forms of participation, including campaigns, protests and community initiatives. The study contributes to democratic governance by demonstrating the importance of institutional responsiveness and trust in encouraging youth participation. It also highlights the need for political organisations to establish stronger relationships with younger citizens.

Bessant (2004) examined the relationship between youth participation and democratic practice, highlighting the complexities associated with translating participatory ideals into institutional arrangements. The study questions whether existing approaches to youth engagement provide genuine opportunities for political influence or primarily serve symbolic purposes. Participation becomes meaningful when young people are involved in identifying issues, discussing alternatives and influencing decisions. However, adult-dominated institutions may retain control over the agenda and the final outcomes, thereby restricting the influence of younger participants. This creates a gap between the formal recognition of youth participation and its actual democratic significance. The study is relevant because it emphasises the need to evaluate participation through the distribution of decision-making power. It also demonstrates that democratic governance requires institutions to recognise young citizens as legitimate political actors rather than merely beneficiaries of youth-oriented programmes.

Loader, Vromen and Xenos (2014) examined the emergence of the networked young citizen and the influence of social media on political participation and civic engagement. Their contribution highlights the transformation of political communication through digital networks and online communities. Social media provides young people with opportunities to share political information, express opinions, mobilise support and participate in public discussions. Networked communication can reduce some traditional barriers to political engagement by enabling individuals to connect with political organisations and social movements beyond geographical boundaries. The study also draws attention to the changing nature of citizenship, in which participation increasingly involves interactive and digitally mediated activities. Its relevance to democratic governance lies in demonstrating that political institutions must recognise new forms of civic engagement. However, online participation must be connected with constructive dialogue and institutional responsiveness to produce meaningful democratic outcomes.

Farthing (2010) explored the politics of youthful antipolitics and examined how youth participation is represented within political discourse. The study challenges the assumption that young people's distance from conventional political institutions necessarily reflects political apathy. Young citizens may be dissatisfied with established political practices while remaining concerned about social justice, equality and public accountability. Their reluctance to participate through traditional political organisations may represent criticism of existing political arrangements rather than a rejection of democratic values. This distinction is important because conventional approaches may underestimate youth engagement when they focus primarily on party membership or electoral activity. The research suggests that democratic institutions should recognise alternative forms of political expression and address the reasons behind institutional disengagement. It provides an important framework for understanding youth participation as both political engagement and a possible form of democratic criticism.

Lundy (2007) examined the concept of children's participation through the interpretation of Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The study proposed a framework emphasising space, voice, audience and influence. Although its primary focus is children's rights, its conceptual contribution is relevant to broader discussions of youth participation. The framework suggests that providing an opportunity to express opinions is insufficient unless individuals also have an appropriate audience and a possibility of influencing decisions. This perspective is particularly important for democratic governance because participation must involve meaningful institutional recognition. Young people require safe and accessible spaces to communicate their concerns, opportunities to express their views and institutions that take those views seriously. The study therefore provides a valuable conceptual basis for distinguishing symbolic consultation from meaningful participation in democratic processes.

Sloam (2007) examined youth participation in British politics and discussed the need to renew democratic engagement through more accessible political institutions. The study highlights the importance of understanding changing patterns of political participation among younger generations. Conventional political activities may not adequately reflect the interests and expectations of young citizens, particularly when political organisations fail to connect their programmes with everyday social concerns. Strengthening democratic engagement therefore requires opportunities for participation that are relevant, accessible and responsive. The study also draws attention to the importance of political education and institutional reforms in encouraging young people to become active participants in democratic processes. Its contribution is significant because it links youth engagement with the broader objective of democratic renewal and suggests that political institutions must adapt to changing forms of citizenship.

Checkoway and Aldana (2013) examined four forms of youth civic engagement and highlighted the importance of diverse participation opportunities within democratic societies. Their work demonstrates that youth engagement cannot be understood through a single form of political activity. Young citizens participate through different civic and community-based practices depending on their interests, social environments and available opportunities. Such activities can include organised participation, community initiatives, advocacy and other forms of collective engagement. The study is particularly relevant to inclusive democratic governance because different forms of participation enable young people from diverse backgrounds to contribute to public life. It also suggests that democratic institutions should avoid relying exclusively on conventional political participation indicators. Recognising diverse forms of civic involvement can improve political inclusion and provide broader opportunities for democratic learning and leadership development.

Sloam (2014) examined the civic and political engagement of young people in the United States and Europe and highlighted inequalities in political participation. The study draws attention to the fact that youth participation is influenced by social and economic conditions, including educational opportunities and access to political resources. Although younger generations may demonstrate strong interest in particular social and political issues, their ability to influence formal institutions can remain unequal. Such inequalities raise important questions about the representative quality of democratic governance. Participation mechanisms that primarily benefit educated or economically advantaged young citizens may fail to represent the diversity of youth experiences. The research therefore supports the need for inclusive participation policies that address socioeconomic barriers and provide opportunities for underrepresented groups. Its contribution demonstrates that increasing youth engagement

must be accompanied by efforts to reduce inequalities in political influence.

Kahne and Middaugh (2012) explored how digital media shapes youth participation in politics. Their discussion highlights the role of digital technologies in facilitating political information, discussion and collective action among younger citizens. Online platforms can make political content more accessible and provide opportunities for young people to participate in public debates outside conventional institutional settings. Digital media also allows citizens to communicate political concerns and coordinate activities around common issues. However, the democratic benefits of digital participation depend on the quality of information, media literacy and opportunities for meaningful engagement. The study is relevant to contemporary governance because it indicates that digital participation can complement traditional democratic processes. Educational institutions and public organisations can use digital platforms to encourage informed political discussion and strengthen civic awareness among young people.

Sloam and Henn (2018) examined the changing patterns of youth political participation in Britain through their analysis of the political developments surrounding the 2017 general election. Their work highlights the significance of young voters and the emergence of new forms of political mobilisation among younger generations. The study demonstrates that youth participation can become particularly visible when political issues connect with the concerns and priorities of younger citizens. It also provides insights into the importance of political identity, social networks and issue-based mobilisation in shaping electoral engagement. The research is relevant to democratic governance because it challenges assumptions that younger generations are permanently disengaged from electoral politics. Instead, youth participation can increase when political institutions and campaigns address issues that young people consider important. The study reinforces the need for political organisations to maintain continuous engagement with younger citizens.

VI METHODOLOGY

The present research adopts a descriptive and qualitative research design based exclusively on secondary data. The study examines the role of youth participation in strengthening democratic governance through a critical review of existing academic literature. The primary sources include scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles and published research concerning political participation, civic engagement, digital citizenship and democratic representation.

The selected literature provides the conceptual foundation for examining different dimensions of youth involvement in democratic processes. The collected information is organised into thematic categories, including electoral participation, civic engagement, digital participation, political representation and institutional accountability. Qualitative content analysis and descriptive interpretation are employed to identify recurring themes, evaluate existing scholarly arguments and examine the relationship between youth participation and democratic governance. The research does not involve primary surveys, interviews, questionnaires or field-based investigations. Consequently, the findings are based on the interpretation and synthesis of existing secondary information rather than original empirical measurements.

VII RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of secondary literature indicates that youth participation contributes to democratic governance through multiple interconnected mechanisms. Young citizens influence democratic processes not only by participating in elections but also through civic activities, political communication, public advocacy and community development. Their involvement can improve institutional responsiveness, strengthen democratic accountability and increase the representation of diverse social concerns. The findings are discussed through the following dimensions.

Youth Participation and Democratic Representation

Democratic representation requires political institutions to reflect the interests and concerns of different sections of society. Youth participation strengthens this objective by providing younger generations with opportunities to communicate their priorities and influence public decisions. Young citizens frequently raise concerns relating to education, employment, environmental sustainability, digital rights, social equality and economic opportunities.

Their participation in elections, political organisations, student associations and public consultations enables democratic institutions to understand emerging social expectations. However, electoral participation alone cannot guarantee adequate representation. Young people must also have opportunities to contribute to policy formulation and participate in institutional decision-making.

Sloam (2014) highlights inequalities in youth political engagement, demonstrating that access to political influence is not distributed equally. Therefore, inclusive representation requires opportunities for participation across different socioeconomic and educational backgrounds.

Youth Civic Engagement and Political Accountability

Civic engagement enables young people to participate in activities that improve public welfare and strengthen relationships between citizens and institutions. Community development initiatives, voluntary organisations, awareness campaigns and public advocacy provide opportunities to identify social problems and encourage collective solutions. Youth participation can also strengthen political accountability by increasing public scrutiny of governmental decisions. Young citizens may question public policies, demand transparency and raise awareness about governance failures through organised campaigns and civic initiatives.

Bessant (2003) and Checkoway (2011) highlight the importance of involving young people in public decision-making. Their perspectives indicate that civic participation becomes more effective when young citizens are recognised as contributors to governance rather than passive recipients of public services.

Digital Platforms and Political Participation

Digital communication technologies have significantly expanded the opportunities available for youth participation. Social media platforms, online discussion forums and digital campaigns enable young citizens to access political information, express opinions and coordinate collective activities.

Digital participation can reduce certain barriers associated with conventional political engagement, particularly geographical distance and limited access to political organisations. Bennett (2008) and Loader et al. (2014) demonstrate the importance of digital media and networked communication in shaping youth civic engagement.

Nevertheless, digital participation also creates challenges. Misinformation, online harassment, political polarisation and unequal digital access can weaken constructive democratic dialogue. Consequently, digital citizenship requires media literacy, responsible communication and the ability to evaluate information critically.

Youth Participation and Democratic Trust

Trust represents an important condition for the effective functioning of democratic institutions. Citizens are more likely to participate when they believe that political institutions are accessible, responsive and capable of addressing public concerns.

Young people may become disengaged when political organisations appear unresponsive or when participation opportunities do not produce visible outcomes. Henn and Foard (2012) demonstrate the importance of understanding the relationship between youth political engagement and institutional trust.

Institutional responsiveness can be improved by creating youth advisory councils, student

representation mechanisms, public consultations and accessible channels for communicating with elected representatives. Such arrangements can help establish stronger relationships between younger citizens and democratic institutions.

Barriers to Effective Youth Participation

Despite growing opportunities for engagement, several factors restrict meaningful youth participation. Limited political representation, inadequate civic education, economic inequalities and restricted access to decision-making institutions remain important challenges.

Political participation can also be influenced by social background, educational opportunities and available resources. Sloam (2014) highlights the unequal distribution of civic and political engagement, indicating that participation opportunities may not benefit all young citizens equally.

Table 1: Major Forms of Youth Participation and Their Contributions to Democratic Governance

Form of youth participation	**Nature of involvement**	**Contribution to democratic governance**
Electoral participation	Voting and election-related activities	Strengthens political representation and democratic legitimacy
Civic engagement	Voluntary work and community development	Promotes social responsibility and collective problem-solving
Political participation	Campaigns, political organisations and public discussions	Encourages political awareness and accountability
Digital participation	Online campaigns, discussions and information sharing	Expands political communication and civic mobilisation
Student participation	Student unions and institutional representation	Develops leadership and participatory decision-making
Public advocacy	Campaigns concerning social and public issues	Increases institutional responsiveness and public scrutiny
Community leadership	Participation in local development initiatives	Strengthens grassroots democracy and social inclusion

Institutional Mechanisms for Promoting Youth Participation

Democratic institutions have an important responsibility to create accessible and meaningful opportunities for youth engagement. Educational institutions can strengthen civic awareness by incorporating democratic values, political literacy and community participation into learning activities. Student councils and representative bodies can provide practical opportunities for young people to experience democratic decision-making.

Governments can promote youth participation through youth advisory councils, public consultations, local governance initiatives and structured policy discussions. Political organisations can also encourage younger citizens to participate in leadership programmes and organisational decision-making.

Checkoway and Aldana (2013) emphasise the importance of recognising different forms of civic engagement, while Flanagan and Levine (2010) highlight the role of civic development during the transition to adulthood. These perspectives indicate that youth participation requires continuous institutional support rather than occasional engagement initiatives.

Relationship Between Youth Participation and Democratic Governance

The relationship between youth participation and democratic governance can be understood through several interconnected outcomes. First, participation improves representation by bringing younger generations' concerns into political

discussions. Second, civic engagement strengthens accountability by encouraging citizens to monitor public institutions. Third, digital participation expands opportunities for political communication and collective mobilisation. Fourth, inclusive participation can improve institutional trust by demonstrating that democratic institutions are willing to consider citizens' perspectives.

However, these benefits depend on the quality of participation. A high level of online activity or public consultation does not necessarily indicate meaningful democratic influence. Participation becomes more valuable when young people can contribute to agenda-setting, decision-making and the evaluation of public policies.

The literature reviewed by Sloam (2007), Sloam (2014) and Sloam and Henn (2018) demonstrates that youth political engagement can take different forms depending on political circumstances and institutional opportunities. This suggests that democratic governance should adopt flexible participation mechanisms that accommodate both conventional and emerging forms of political involvement.

Table 2: Challenges and Suggested Measures for Strengthening Youth Participation

Major challenge	**Impact on youth participation**	**Suggested measures**
Limited political representation	Reduces youth influence in formal decision-making	Promote youth representation in political and public institutions
Inadequate civic education	Restricts political awareness and democratic understanding	Strengthen civic education in schools and universities
Lack of institutional trust	Discourages engagement with conventional political processes	Improve transparency and institutional responsiveness
Digital inequality	Creates unequal opportunities for online participation	Expand digital access and digital literacy programmes
Misinformation and polarisation	Weakens informed political discussions	Promote media literacy and responsible digital citizenship
Symbolic consultation	Limits meaningful influence over public decisions	Establish mechanisms for incorporating youth recommendations
Socioeconomic inequality	Excludes disadvantaged groups from participation	Develop inclusive and accessible participation programmes

VIII CONCLUSION

Youth participation plays a significant role in strengthening democratic governance by promoting political representation, civic responsibility, public accountability and institutional responsiveness. The present study demonstrates that young people contribute to democratic processes through electoral participation, community engagement, political advocacy, student organisations and digital communication. These activities provide opportunities for expressing public concerns and influencing decisions affecting society.

However, meaningful youth participation continues to face challenges associated with institutional exclusion, socioeconomic inequalities, inadequate civic education, limited political trust and unequal access to digital resources. The study concludes that democratic participation must extend beyond symbolic consultation and provide young citizens with genuine opportunities to influence public decisions. Governments, educational institutions and political organisations should strengthen civic learning, encourage inclusive representation and establish accessible mechanisms for youth involvement. Digital

platforms should also be supported by responsible information practices and media literacy. Ultimately, recognising young people as active partners in democratic decision-making can improve the legitimacy, inclusiveness and accountability of governance institutions.

REFERENCES

[1] Bennett, W. L. (Ed.). (2008). Civic life online: Learning how digital media can engage youth. MIT Press.

[2] Bessant, J. (2003). Youth participation: A new mode of government. Policy Studies, 24(2–3), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144287032000170984

[3] Bessant, J. (2004). Mixed messages: Youth participation and democratic practice. Australian Journal of Political Science, 39(2), 387–404. https://doi.org/10.1080/1036114042000238573

[4] Checkoway, B. (2011). What is youth participation? Children and Youth Services Review, 33(2), 340–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.09.017

[5] Checkoway, B., & Aldana, A. (2013). Four forms of youth civic engagement for diverse democracy. Children and Youth Services Review, 35(11), 1894–1899.

[6] Farthing, R. (2010). The politics of youthful antipolitics: Representing the 'issue' of youth participation in politics. Journal of Youth Studies, 13(2), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/13676260903233696

[7] Flanagan, C., & Levine, P. (2010). Civic engagement and the transition to adulthood. The Future of Children, 20(1), 159–179.

[8] Henn, M., & Foard, N. (2012). Young people, political participation and trust in Britain. Parliamentary Affairs, 65(1), 47–67. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsr046

[9] Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2012). Digital media shapes youth participation in politics. Phi Delta Kappan, 94(3), 52–56.

[10] Loader, B. D., Vromen, A., & Xenos, M. A. (2014). The networked young citizen: Social media, political participation and civic engagement. Information, Communication & Society, 17(2), 143–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.871571

[11] Lundy, L. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. British Educational Research Journal, 33(6), 927–942. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033

[12] Quintelier, E. (2007). Differences in political participation between young and old people. Contemporary Politics, 13(2), 165–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569770701562658

[13] Sloam, J. (2007). Rebooting democracy: Youth participation in politics in the UK. Parliamentary Affairs, 60(4), 548–567. https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsm035

[14] Sloam, J. (2014). New voice, less equal: The civic and political engagement of young people in the United States and Europe. Comparative Political Studies, 47(5), 663–688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414012453441

[15] Sloam, J., & Henn, M. (2018). Youthquake 2017: The rise of young cosmopolitans in Britain. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97469-9