Young people, contemporary challenges and the future trends

Gary Pollock, Department of Sociology, Manchester Metropolitan University

Edward Hind, Sustainable Places Research Institute, Cardiff University

1. **Marginalisation, inequality, intervention and evaluation**

The perennial marginalisation of young people

Social structural inequalities have a disproportionate effect on young people. Young people are increasingly marginalised within modern labour markets to the extent that they can no longer participate in other dimensions of society. The least entrepreneurial activity and access to the labour market in the EU is seen among the 18-24 cohort, especially among females and those with lesser education (e.g. ethnic minorities) (European Commission, 2015; Tosun, 2015; Parreira do Amaral, 2015; Otto, et al., 2015). The results of such inequality for Europe's youth are that the outlook is that they are increasingly at risk of being unemployed or in less secure employment, have greater likelihood of receiving low wages, and are in poorer positions to start a family. In short, Europe's youth do not share the well-being levels of older generations (European Commission, 2015; OECD, 2015). It is probably no surprise then that they have been found to possess feelings of lesser social status and of having been excluded from society through the actions of policy-makers (Otto, et al., 2015). Research suggests that the political views of young people and, as a consequence, youth participation in formal politics are linked to ethnicity, social class, and levels of educational attainment, and geographical location within country, highlighting the role of background, life circumstances and educational variables in shaping political perspectives and outlooks (Brady et al, 2012; Henn and Foard, 2014; Pilkington and Pollock, 2015; Pollock, 2017).

Growing inequalities

The risk of growing social inequality for Europe's youth continues to be a key message: 'Europe's future depends on its youth. Yet, life chances of many young people are blighted' (Commission of the European Communities, 2008: p7). These concerns for social integration in times of drastic demographic transitions were reflected in the Council of the European Union's resolution on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018) (OJ (2009) C 311/1). Consequently, the EU has increasingly identified the necessity to enlarge their framework to 'reach young people with fewer opportunities'. The EU intends to reach out to these young people with means of 'permanent and regular dialogue' albeit realising that 'full participation of young people in civic and political life is an increasing challenge, in light of the gap between youth and the institutions' (Commission of the European Communities, 2009: p8). It is clear from the current

literature that working towards the 'ideal' European community would include reducing levels of unemployment and other forms of social exclusion while addressing inequality and discrimination (most notably by race and gender). However, a gap exists between a 'broad formal acceptance of these goals and their troublesome realisation' (Tichy, 2013, p. 1). The problem arises in deciphering the best way to realise these broad ambitions in an inclusive way that will engage and motivate young people. Young people, and those who are marginalised or excluded in a range of ways, are more likely to experience society as external to themselves through disaffection with traditional social structures and institutions, and are less likely to feel empowered or indeed to engage in society at all.

<u>The need for targeted interventions</u>

It is widely accepted that targeting assistance to help young people develop their skills so that they can work and participate actively in society is essential for sound and sustainable economic and social development (EMCO, 2010). Governments across the world have devised policy responses to the pervasive problem of disengagement of substantial numbers of young people from education and employment. These initiatives fall under one of a number of categories (O'Higgins, 2010): macroeconomic policies, educational policies and labour market policies / programmes, which can be subdivided into those which are active (promoting employment and/or employability) or passive (income support). Most countries implement a combination of different measures to incorporate a range of elements, including the provision of individualised support to young people; an emphasis on negotiating agreements that highlight the responsibilities of both the individual and support agency; and the provision of inducements to employers to employ, train and retain young people in the jobs market.

The EU, through its Europe 2020 strategy, has recognised the inequalities faced by young people in its most recent targeted interventions to address youth engagement in education and employment. *Youth on the Move*, the *European Platform Against Poverty*, and the *Agenda for New Skills and Jobs* have all been introduced as part of this strategy (Commission of The European Communities 2009). It remains to be seen how far these initiatives can successfully tackle unemployment and reach vulnerable groups. Systematic and robust monitoring, as well as evaluation will be required if we are to know what really works, why, and with whom.

Future trends

- Education: hypothesised 'mismatch' between the skills taught in schools, colleges and universities and the needs of industry and commerce is likely to continue to be a common theme.
- Employment: there is likely to be an embedding of the 'gig' economy whereby young people in particular are faced with insecure contracts and a lack of career progression.

- Independence: in terms of accommodation and family formation there is likely to be increasing dependence on family, often extended family. Young people will become increasingly used to high levels of financial debt where it is available and will normalise dependent relations on family to cope with an inability to become fully independent.
- Health: The current generation of young people are projected to be at risk of worse health in later life than their parents. The effects will be unevenly felt as there are trends in both positive and negative directions. A rise in sedentary lifestyles and poor diet will result in greater levels of obesity and associated morbidity. On the other hand, aggregate reductions in youth smoking and alcohol consumption suggest that associate health problems will decline. Mental health problems are rising and are likely to continue to do so. The extent to which this is partly to do with better diagnosis rather than a steep rise is open to question.
- The effects of austerity are unevenly felt and without targeted intervention there is likely to be further polarisation of inequalities of both opportunity and outcome. Where there are inequalities they are clustered geographically and socio-economically. In addition, there are particular vulnerable and marginal groups who have needs over and above broader society, for example minorities, the disabled, young people who have been involved in the criminal justice system, LGBT.

2. Power, participation and policies

How do young people conceptualise and access power?

While research recently commissioned by the EU focuses on space and engagement (e.g. the PARTISPACE project which documents young people's views of participation and their social spaces of action), few results have yet been reported in the literature. What is clear, however, is that the digital world will be one of the arenas in which youth envision political power to be active.

Research has shown a shift from conventional to alternative modes of participation related to the exclusion and disempowerment that parts of the population, particularly young people, experience due also to social inequalities (EACEA, 2013a; Wörsching, 2008). This trend has also been highlighted in the case of the recent Indignant and Occupy movements that mobilizsed large numbers of young people who challenged the mainstream modes of political participation, as well as the traditional institutional arrangements that support them (Sloam, 2014).

Digital alternatives

In terms of young people's conception of power in the digital realm, Lyons (2008) found that computer-mediated action was sometimes preferred over traditional forms of participation by young Europeans, especially those from different ethnic origins. The degree to which this preference was expressed differed. For example, for British Muslims in particular, the choice of the Internet was related differently to national and ethnic collective identities. Levels of ethnic identification were related to use of the Internet to support minority political rights, while levels of national identification were related to willingness to engage in peaceful conventional activities to protect minority rights. The latter finding demonstrates the complex ways in which minority groups balance ethnic, religious, and national ideologies. It suggests that, in cases of high national identification and high levels of perceived discrimination, ethnic minority groups may not want the majority group to perceive their political protest as a neglect of, or a barrier to, their integration into the host society.

Low levels of electoral participation

Youth participation in formal and institutional political processes is relatively low across the globe, particularly in comparison to older citizens. Figures from the European Social Survey indicate that voter turnout in preceding national elections was over 17 per cent higher for older respondents than for the younger cohort sampled (EACEA, 2013b). The MYPLACE project showed considerable geographical variations in youth voting in 14 European Countries ranging from 39% in Nuneaton (UK) to 94% in Odense (Denmark) (MYPLACE, 2016). Moreover, van Biezen and Poguntke (2014) maintain that party membership in European democracies has been in marked decline in recent decades. This decline in party membership across established democracies has been extensively documented (Katz and Mair, 1992; Whiteley, 2011). Such declines have led authors to surmise that the age profile of party membership across Europe is increasing due to diminished ability to recruit, which in turn is impeding youth membership (Scarrow and Gezgor, 2010, p. 839). Overall, when examined in the context of electoral behaviour, in terms of voting patterns and levels of party membership, evidence in the area of youth participation in formal politics suggests that there is a spiral of decline in both membership and activism in modern parties (Bennie and Russell, 2012). Such evidence may suggest that young people are politically disengaged and often disenfranchised (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007; Harris, 2009).

Disengagement or *Different* engagement?

Over the last decade, there has been strong interest in identifying, rectifying or explaining youth disengagement from politics and numerous explanations have been postulated for such disengagement. As identified in the European Commission's (2015) recent report, *Their Future is Our Future: Youth as Actors of Change*, 'The young are dissatisfied with our current democratic systems that tend to exclude them from decisions affecting their lives now and in the future'. Feelings of

powerlessness and marginalisation among youth voters, whereby there is a perception that political systems are closed to young people, are resulting in few opportunities for youth to intervene effectively with the political process (Henn, et al., 2002; Henn and Foard, 2014). In addition, little interest in and knowledge of political processes, the complexity of those processes, low levels of trust in politicians who are perceived as having self-serving interests, and growing cynicism of democratic institutions, are often cited as reasons for the younger generations' lack of political engagement (Haste and Hogan, 2006; Dalton, 2008; Stoker, 2006; EACEA, 2013a). Furthermore, research has highlighted that politicians tend not to champion policy issues prioritised by the current youth generation and as a consequence they feel relatively ignored and marginalised (O'Toole, 2003; Furlong and Cartmel, 2012).

Active participation

Increasingly, when youth wish to make their voices heard, they are more likely to turn to some participatory forms of expression, such as demonstrations, protests, signing petitions and boycotts, which, according to Furlong and Cartmel (2012), can be viewed as 'new' because young people attach new meanings to such actions and redefine their traditional role. Additionally, interest groups, advocacy coalitions or the media are alternatives to political parties as a means of expression. Van Biezen and Poguntke (2014) maintain that we are witnessing the development of various grass roots alternatives to traditional partisan mobilisation, which are sometimes fuelled by social media networks. There is a growing interest in forms of direct, participatory and deliberative democracy that aim to give ordinary citizens more influence over the political process that falls outside the traditional and hierarchical partisan channels. These changes in modes of political engagement are linked to new perceptions of citizenship. It is through new forms of political engagement and participation that young people feel that they influence political decisions more directly and effectively (Dalton, 2008).

One of the most in-depth studies to examine youth participation in democratic life across the EU (EACEA, 2013a) found that young people are stakeholders in the European democratic system. They express ideas and preferences, and defend diverse interests. There is no crisis of democratic participation amongst youth across Europe and neither is there major disenchantment with political issues and concerns on the part of young people (EACEA, 2013a). As is evident from the research previously outlined there is a high level of youth interest in politics, but how that interest translates into participation is changing. Young people opt more for the informal politically relevant processes, such as activism or civic engagement, which according to Global Network for Rights and Development (2015) is a deep concern that can influence the quality of democratic governance, challenge the representativeness of the political system and lead to the disenfranchisement of young people. This view is echoed by the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance who state that the 'relative under-representation of youth the national political scene has a critical

impact on the quality and, importantly, the legitimacy of domestic democratic governance and contributes to the further political marginalization of youth' (International IDEA 2008: p.10).

The need for inclusive policies

The inclusion of youth in formal politics is important and, to that end, a number of studies have put forward recommendations to reduce barriers to and increase rates of youth participation in democratic life: (i) increase youth representation through popular media and internet platforms and develop stronger more equitable democratic student unions; (ii) promote youth engagement with policy and politics, focusing on grass roots organisations that have the ability to directly connect with the youth population; (iii) support creativity innovation and participation through volunteering and social enterprise training and encourage participation through traditional and new media platforms (EACEA, 2013a; Forbrig, 2005). Other research suggest that citizenship education administered via formal education and participatory activities in schools and in local communities is an effective way of promoting participation. In addition, democratic institutions need to adapt and incorporate innovative modes of participation into their operations to prevent the loss of youth contributions (EACEA, 2013a). In the case of Ireland, online voting and automatic registration are seen to be the most effective methods of encouraging voter participation. In addition, reducing the voting age to 16, examining the introduction of online voting systems, and better strategies for political parties to interact with young people are recommended (NYCI, 2014).

Future trends

- Youth participation in elections is likely to remain low compared to older people.
- Young people are likely to continue to feel both uninterested in and shut out of political discourse.
- The ways in which young people communicate, in particular using digital forms, is likely to be the primary medium of choice for engagement.
- Young, as well as old, will increasingly be at risk of poorly regulated social media and will struggle to evaluate the degree of truth in stories. Perceived plausibility of a story is likely to be at least as important as the credibility of the source.
- Identity related political issues, already high in priority, will increase in importance with notions of citizenship, ethnicity, religion and regional belonging alongside patriotism, nationalism and nativism routinely discussed.
- The effects of austerity will continue to impact upon communities, but will spread wider in society as public services are cut and this will result in economically driven ideological debates. These debates will, however, be linked to the identity debates described above in terms of both causes and consequences of societal inequalities.

- Where there are acute national political events it is likely that young people will be at the vanguard and will be a core component of mobilized participation such as demonstrations and occupations.

3. Political values and the future of youth participation

The processes that are currently driving younger people away from conventional political participation towards other forms of participation are poorly understood. There is a need for citizens to be engaged in social and political life not only to ensure that basic democratic values flourish, but also to foster social cohesion at a time of increasing social and cultural diversity. However, in order for individuals to participate fully in civic life, research suggests that they must be equipped with the right knowledge, skills, and competences grounded in understandings of social values, political concepts and structures. Such knowledge, skills, and attitudes are important in forming future citizens (Eurydice, 2012). How young people are educated to become active citizens will define the future of all societies. In the context of European civic and citizenship education, there has been extensive activity over the past 10 years. Countries and institutions are placing increasing emphasis on educational and training activities concerning the promotion of active citizenship, equity, and social cohesion (Kerr et al., 2010; Eurydice, 2005).

The role of formal education: national and European perspectives
Citizenship education, which remains the responsibility of nation-states, is part of the national curricula in all European countries. Resultantly, considerable variations to curriculum, pedagogies, learner access, and participation in non-formal and informal education for citizenship provided by non-governmental organisations exist across Europe. Citizenship education in individual nation-states still tends to emphasise national citizenship and national solidarity rather than European and international solidarity (Osler, 2012). However, the EU does have some influence on citizenship and other education programs and actively promotes the concept of a common European identity through its policy, funding initiatives, and education recommendations for member states (see Birzea et al., 2004). In addition, the Council of Europe's programme on Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) became a common ambition for education policies in the late 1990s and has been influential in formulating a goal, which encourages the development of autonomous, critical, participatory, and responsible citizens who respect the principles of democracy, human rights, peace, freedom and equality in a national and international context (Print and Smith, 2002). The 2010 Council of

Europe's, *Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education*, is the culmination of years of consultative processes and aims to reflect best practice in citizenship education. The *Charter* is currently being taken forward through a new Council of Europe project on 'Competences for Democratic Culture' led by Martyn Barrett, (see http://www.coe.int/competences). This project is developing a new reference framework of the competences that young people need to acquire to in order to participate effectively in democratic culture. The framework is being targeted at the education ministries of the 47 member states of the Council of Europe, with detailed recommendations on how national school curricula in citizenship/civic education can be harnessed more effectively to prepare young people for future life as democratic citizens (Barrett, 2016).

Informal educational practices

Citizenship education is also provided through the facilitation of informal activities associated with the school environment (e.g. student participation in school governance), as well as through programmes and structures outside of school that provide practical experiences of citizenship. Both traditional and informal learning have been found to improve outcomes in civic knowledge, skills, dispositions and civic engagement (Eurydice, 2012; Billig et al., 2005). However, means of assessing citizenship education and support for teachers have been identified as still posing some challenges (Eurydice, 2005; CIDREE, 2005; Ajegbo et al, (2007). Research has found that the challenge for the education system is to 'strike a balance between school autonomy, with the necessary flexibility for a school to develop its own imaginative solutions to local problems; and the need to ensure every pupil's core entitlement to education for diversity and for citizenship, which will give them the skills to participate in an active and inclusive democracy, appreciating and understanding difference' (Ajegbo et al., 2007, p. 21).

The effectiveness of citizenship education

Research examining the effectiveness of citizenship education on civic engagement of young people is still unclear. Geboers et al. (2013) found in their review of 28 articles pertaining to the effectiveness of citizenship education on students' citizenship, that an open and democratic classroom climate (i.e., where dialogue and discussion takes place) appears most effective in promoting the development of citizenship among secondary school students (see especially the findings of the IEA's multi-nation CIVED and ICCS studies: Torney-Purta et al, 2004, and Schulz et al., 2010). They added that a formal curriculum that includes citizenship projects and courses also appears effective.

Where citizenship education is thought effective, it has been deemed to be a consequence of having opportunities for agency, social relatedness, and for the development of understanding (Wattset al. 2008 cited in Kahne and Sporte, 2008). School-based support for students' academic and social development is thought to foster a sense of belonging and such feelings are consequently linked with

the development of commitments and capacities for democratic ways of living (Meier, 2002). Extracurricular activities, such as youth organisational membership, have been linked to later civic and political engagement through exposure to the social skills that foster maintenance of ties (McFarland and Thomas, 2006). Demographic variables and academic capacities are also thought to influence civic participation in young people. Educational attainment and socioeconomic status are strongly related to greater civic engagement according to EACEA (2013a). In addition, gender, ethnic identity, and race are related to both civic commitments and to forms of engagement and political participation. Neighbourhood and family civic context are significant influences in the development of civic orientations. Research shows that those who are part of civically active, wealthier communities and families (i.e. usually those that are native and white) tend to be more active than those from other backgrounds (Marcelo et al., 2007; Jennings et al., 2001).

Democracy and citizenship

There is a fluidity of current forms of political participation, as consumer choice which effectively blurs the distinctions between politics, civic engagement and (changing) perceptions of citizenship. To offer a helpful lens on this, it is worth referring to Bang and Sørenson's (2001) distinction between '*Everyday Makers*' and *'Expert Citizens'*. Bang and Sørenson (2001) talk of '*Everyday Makers*' as a new form of political engagement that stresses individuality through new relations of self and co-governance. Everyday Makers are not defined by the state, and do not wish to get involved with it, rather they prefer to be involved at the lowest possible level, thinking globally, but acting locally. They are not driven by a sense of duty, nor are they interested in gaining political influence, rather they wish to feel involved and develop themselves within a given community. In other words, they aim to encourage what Bang and Sørenson term 'small local narratives' and do so on an ad-hoc, experiential basis, rather than through substantive social movement activism (also see Marsh and Li, 2008). Similarly, Dekker and Uslaner (2003) and Boyte (2010) talk about 'everyday politics', and the new and interesting ways through which citizens connect to public life through their personal interests.

Bang and Sørenson's distinction helps us establish why some come to mobilise around 'everyday politics', based on the understanding and drive to participate in their own culture, and why others prefer to continue down more formal pathways, established through time and experience. Riley et al. (2010) provide an example of the Everyday Maker in their analysis of electronic dance music culture. They show how partying (as a consumer activity) provide the conditions of possibility for political participation, as these local and informal spaces mean that people are free to negotiate and critique ideas of the self, within forums that celebrate a mixture of community, sociality, and hedonism. Here, it may be said, that the process of *making* a community allows people to *connect* in ways that prompts politics, whether in a dance music culture or online through Facebook and Twitter (Gauntlett, 2011;

Polat, 2005). Importantly, what remains to be better understood is whether such cultures of participation are effectively closing down the possibilities for Expert Citizens, as the trajectories (and experiences, networks, capital) into formal politics become displaced with a focus on identity and consumer politics.

Findings of CITISPYCE suggest that excluded youth from deprived urban settings (often from ethnic minorities) are starting to overcome segregation by living in lifeworlds beyond their neighbourhood. While their experience with statutory agencies is one of reduced opportunities, they are prepared to innovate to surpass such barriers. The project's researchers emphasise that youth are keen to emphasise their own potential as collaborating participants in social innovation projects, willing to tackle their own exclusion and to address widening inequalities (http://www.citispyce.eu/). One example of such social innovation was a poetry event where young people voiced their opinions on political inclusion. Social media was also the location of much of the social innovation observed.

While one dominant conclusion in the literature is that young people alienated from traditional ways of politics and their activity in non-hierarchical networks cannot be associated or described as purely political activity, there is still a growing body of literature contributing to a popular understanding of social media as a potent tool for moving young people to political engagement (Bode, 2012; Conroy et al., 2012; Gil de Zúñiga et al., 2012). The political identity and attitudes of young citizens, in particular, are seen to be increasingly shaped less by their social ties to family, neighbourhood, school or work, and more by the manner in which they participate and interact through the social networks, which they themselves have had a significant part in constructing. A groundswell of academic opinion has also suggested that the political attitudes of many young people in many parts of the world can be characterised increasingly by a less deferential and more individualised (Beck, 1992; Giddens,1991; Inglehart, 1990) self-actualising (Bennett et al., 2009) and critical disposition (Norris, 1999), which marks a re-casting of what is meant by the dutiful norms of citizenship (Dalton, 2008).

Future trends

- Initiatives to promote positive civic engagement and participation will continue at both national and EU levels. There will be no doubt about the good intent of policy makers to improve the possibilities for engagement and specific programme based successes will be evidenced. It is likely that the availability for funding such initiatives will decline and that there will be a need to somehow do more with less resource. This will result in projects seeking to promote social innovations which are able to more effectively target scarce resources.
- Vulnerable, marginal and 'hard to reach' groups of young people will continue to be disproportionately underrepresented in most engagement based initiatives. This will result in

highly stratified opportunity structures which will systematically exclude many young people seen as the most important to engage with.

- In the face of the groundswell of support for parties and policies which reflect populist sentiment, it will become increasingly difficult to develop educational material that satisfies a broad range of political opinion. Concepts which have long been regarded as unquestioned pillars of society such as press freedom, democracy, tolerance and openness, will be subject to debate.

- Educational and training materials aimed to promote tolerant and inclusive citizenship are likely to be identified as problematic by organisations seeking to exploit contemporary societal tensions over nativism and migration.

- The self articulation of political values for most young people will continue to be through non formal structures and will manifest in everyday social life: education, leisure, employment and family.

- 'Place' will become an ever more important concept in understanding the motivations for civic and political engagement. Local context, related to historical socio cultural trajectories, will become increasingly important narratives when understanding sub-national political events.

References

Ajegbo, K., Kiwan, D., & Sharma, D. (2007). *Diversity and citizenship curriculum review, London*, UK: Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

Bang, H.P. and Sørensen, E. (2001). The Everyday Maker: Building political rather than social capital in Dekker, Paul and Eric M. Uslaner (eds.), (2001). *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London: Routledge, pp. 148-162.

Barrett, M (2016) *Competencies for democratic culture: living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London: Sage.

Bennett, W. L., Wells, C., & Rank, A. (2009). Young citizens and civic learning: Two paradigms of citizenship in the digital age. *Citizenship Studies*, *13*(2), 105-120.

Bennett, W. L., Wells, C., and Deen, F. (2011) Communicating Civic Engagement: Contrasting Models of Citizenship in the Youth Web Sphere, *Journal of Communication Volume 61, Issue 5, pages 835–856.*

Bennie, L., Russell, A., (2012). Radical or Compliant? Young Party Members in Britain' Elections, Public Opinion and Parties (EPOP) Conference, University of Oxford, 7-9 September.

Billig, S., Root, S., & Jesse, D. (2005). *The impact of participation in service-learning on high school students' civic engagement*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement

Birzea, C., Kerr, D., Mikkelsen, R., Pol, M., Froumin, I., Losito, B., & Sardoc, M. (2004*). All European study on education for democratic citizenship policies*, Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

Bode, L. (2012). Facebooking it to the polls: A study in online social networking and political behavior. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, *9* (4), 352-369.

Boyte, H. C. (2010). *Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens and public life*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brady, B., Dolan, P., Kearns, N., Kennan, D., McGrath, B., Shaw, A., and Brennan, M., (2012). *Understanding Youth Civic Engagement: debates, discourses and lessons from practice*. UNESCO Family and Child Research Centre, National University of Ireland, Galway.

Claes, E (2010). Does Citizenship Education Work? A Longitudinal Perspective on Political Socialization Effects in Belgian High Schools. *APSA 2010 Annual Meeting Paper*. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1644720 [Accessed 14 January 2016]

Commission of The European Communities (2008). *Renewed social agenda: Opportunities, access and solidarity in 21st century Europe*. 412 final. Brussels.

Commission of The European Communities (2009). An EU Strategy for Youth – Investing and Empowering, A renewed open method of coordination to address youth challenges and opportunities. 2009 final. Brussels.

Conroy, M., Feezell, J. T., & Guerrero, M. (2012). Facebook and political engagement: A study of online political group membership and offline political engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *28*(5), 1535-1546.

Consortium of Institutions for Development and Research in Education in Europe (CIDREE) (2005). *Different faces of citizenship: Development of citizenship education in European countries*. Brussels, Belgium: Author/DVO.

Dalton, R.J., (2008). Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation. Political Studies, 56(1), pp. 76-98

Dekker, P. and Uslaner, E. M. (eds.) (2003). *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*. London and New York: Routledge.

EACEA (2013a).Youth Participation in Democratic Life. Final Report, EACEA 2010/03, LSE Enterprise, January 2013.

EACEA (2013b). Political Participation and EU Citizenship: Perceptions and Behaviours of Young People: Evidence from Eurobarometer surveys. Brussels: EACEA [pdf] Available at: http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/youth/tools/documents/perception-behaviours.pdf [Accessed 04 January 2016]

EMCO (2010). Policies to support youth. *Ad Hoc Group report on the 2010 thematic review*. Issue 5

European Commission (2013), European Youth: Participation in democratic life, Flash Eurobarometer 375. Available: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/library/reports/flash375_en.pdf [Accessed 05 January 2016]

European Commission (2015). Their Future is Our Future: Youth as Actors of Change. DG for Research and Innovation, Brussels.

Eurydice. (2005). *Citizenship Education at School in Europe. The Information Network on Education in Europe* (Eurydice). Brussels: European Commission.

Eurydice (2012). *Citizenship Education in Europe. The Information Network on Education in Europe* (Eurydice). Brussels: European Commission

Evers A. and Guillemard A.M. (eds.) (2012). *Social Policy and Citizenship: The Changing Landscape.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Forbrig, J., (Ed.) (2005). *Revisiting Youth Political Participation: challenges for research and democratic practice in Europe*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Furlong, A., and Cartmel F., (2012). Social Change and Political Engagement among Young People: Generation and the 2009/2010 British Election Survey, *Parliamentary Affairs 65* (1), pp. 13–28.

Furlong, A., and Cartmel, F., (2007). Young People and Social Change, New Perspectives, 2nd edition. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Gauntlett, D. (2011). Three approaches to social capital. Supplementary text to *Making is Connecting: The Social Meaning of Creativity, from DIY and Knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*. Polity Press: Cambridge.

Geboers, E. Geijsel, F. Admiraal, W., and ten Dam, G (2013). Review of the effects of citizenship education, *Educational Research Review*, 9, pp. 158-173.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.

Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer- Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 319-336.

Global Network for Rights and Development (2015) The Joint Local-International Election Observation Mission to Egypt's Parliamentary Elections, preliminary report http://www.gnrd.net/source/EgyptPreliminaryReportFinal141115_FORSITE.pdf accessed 10th January 2015.

Gretschel, A. Levamo, T.M., Kiilakoski, T., Laine S., Mäntylä N. Pleyers, G, and Raisio, H. (2014). Youth Participation Good Practices in Different Forms of Regional and Local Democracy, Helsinki: Finnish Youth Research Network.

Harris, A. (2009). Young People's Politics and Citizenship', in Andy Furlong (ed.), *Handbook of Youth and Young Adulthood,* pp. 301–06. London: Routledge

Haste, H. and Hogan, A., (2006). Beyond conventional civic participation, beyond the moral-political divide: young people and contemporary debates about citizenship, *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(4), pp. 473-493.

Henn, M., and Foard, N., (2014). Social differentiation in young people's political participation: the impact of social and educational factors on youth political engagement in Britain, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17:3, pp. 360-380.

Henn, M., Weinstein, M., and Wring, D. (2002). A Generation Apart? Youth and Political Participation in Britain? *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 4(2), pp 167–192.

Inglehart, R. (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton University Press.

International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance) (2008). *Youth Voter Participation: Involving Today's Young in Tomorrow's Democracy*. Stockholm: International IDEA.

Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., & Bowers, J. (2001). *Politics across the generations: Family transmission re-examined* (Working Paper 2001-15). Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies

Kahne, J. E., and Sporte, S. E., (2008). Developing Citizens: The Impact of Civic Learning Opportunities on Students' Commitment to Civic Participation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(3), pp. 738-766

Katz, R., and Mair. P., (1992). The membership of Political Parties in European Democracies, 1960-1990, *European Journal of Political Research*, Vo.22, pp. 329-45

Keating, A., Kerr, D., Benton, T., Mundy, E. and Lopes, J. (2010). Citizenship Education in England 2001–2010: Young People's Practices and Prospects, *The Eighth and Final Report from the Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study (CELS)*. DFE-RR059.London: Department for Education.

Kerr, D., Sturman, L., Schulz, W. and Burge, B. (2010). ICCS 2009 European Report. Civic knowledge, attitudes, and engagement among lower secondary students in 24 European countries. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement

Lyons, E. (2008). *Political Trust and Participation amongst Young People from Ethnic Minorities in the NIS and EU countries: A Social Psychological Investigation.* INTAS (International Association for the Promotion of Cooperation with Scientists from the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union). Ref. Nr: 03-51-3123.

Marcelo, K. B., Lopez, M. H., & Kirby, E. H. (2007). *Civic engagement among minority youth.* (Fact Sheet), College Park, Washington, DC: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.

Marsh, D and Li, Y. (2008). 'New Forms of Political Participation: Searching for Expert Citizens and Everyday Makers, *British Journal of Political Science*, 38(2), p. 247.

McFarland, D. A., & Thomas, R. J. (2006). Bowling young: How youth voluntary associations influence adult political participation, *American Sociological Review,* 71, pp. 401–425.

Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust: Creating communities of learning in an era of testing and standardization*, Boston: Beacon.

MYPLACE (2016) 'Political Activism' Thematic report of the MYPLACE project available at: https://myplaceresearch.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/160127_myplace-poltical-activism.pdf

National Youth Council of Ireland (2014) Youth Empowerment in Ireland: Part One An Overview of Young People's Political Participation and Access to rights, Dublin: National Youth Council of Ireland.

Norris, P., ed., (1999). *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Higgins, N. (2010) The impact of the economic and financial crisis on youth employment: measures for labour market recovery in the European Union, Canada and the United States. *Employment Working Paper* No.70. Geneva: ILO.

O'Toole, T. (2003). "Engaging with Young People's Conceptions of the Political". Children's Geographies 1 (1): 71–90.

OECD (2009). *The Jobs Crisis: What are the Implications for Employment and Social Polic*y, OECD Labour and Employment Ministerial Meeting, 28-29 September, Paris.

OECD (2015). How's Life? 2015: Measuring well-being, Paris: OECD Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/how_life-2015-en.

Osler, A. (2012). Higher education, human rights and inclusive citizenship. *Social inclusion and higher education*, 295-312.

Otto, H.-U., Atzmüller, R., Berthet, T., Bifulco, L., Bonvin, J.-M.,Chiappero-Martinetti, E., Egdell, V., Halleröd, B., Kjeldsen, C.C.,Kwiek, M., Schröer, R., Vero, J., Zielenska, M. (Eds.) (2015). *Facing Trajectories from School to Work Towards a Capability-Friendly Youth Policy*. Switzerland: Springer.

Parreira do Amaral M., Dale R., and Loncle, P (eds) (2015). *Shaping the Futures of Young Europeans - education governance in eight European countries*. Oxford: Symposium Books.

Pilkington, H. and Pollock, G. (2015) 'Politics are Bollocks': youth, politics and activism in contemporary Europe. *The Sociological Review*, 63, pp. 1-35.

Polat, R. K. (2005). The Internet and Political Participation: Exploring the Explanatory Links. *European Journal of Communication*, 20(4), pp.435-459.

Pollock, G. (2017 forthcoming) 'Survey research and sensitivity to context: The MYPLACE project and its case study approach' in H. Pilkington, G. Pollock and R. Franc (eds.) *Understanding Youth Participation across Europe: From Survey to Ethnography,* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Print, M. (2007). Citizenship education and youth participation in democracy. *British journal of educational studies*, 55(3), 325-345.

Print, M., and Smith, A., (2002). Editorial. *European Journal of Education*, 37 (4), 103-105

Riley, S, More, Y. and Griffin, C. (2010). The 'pleasure citizen': Analyzing partying as a form of social and political participation. *Young* 18(1), pp. 33-54.

Scarrow, S. E. and Gezgor, B., (2010). Declining memberships, changing members? European political party members in a new era, *Party Politics Vol.16, No.6,* pp.823-843.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D. and Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic Knowledge, Attitudes, an Engagement among Lower-secondary School Students in 38 Countries*, Amsterdam: IEA.

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), pp. 663-688.

Stoker, G., (2006). Explaining Political Disenchantment: Finding Pathways to Democratic Renewal. *The Political Quarterly*, 77(2), pp.184-194.

Tichy, G. (2013) Subjective well-being and socio-ecological transition. *Policy Paper No. 6.* WWW FOR EUROPE.

Torney-Purta, J., Barber, H. B. and Richardson, W. K. (2004). Trust in government-related institutions and political engagement among adolescents in six countries 1'. *Acta Politica*, 39 (4), pp. 380–406.

Tosun, Jale (2015). Jugendarbeitslosigkeit und Beschäftigungspolitik in der EU. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 65, pp. 12-19.

Van Biezen,, I. and Poguntke, T. (2014). The decline of membership-based politics. *Party Politics 20*(2), pp. 205-216.

Whiteley, P., (2011). Is the party over? The decline of party activism and membership across the democratic world', *Party Politics* 17, pp. 21-44.

Wörsching, M. (2008) Making a Difference? Political Participation of Young People in the UK, *Young People's Studies Magazine,* 81, June 08.