Sylwia MROZOWSKA

University of Gdańsk
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3032-9504

From Democratic (Citizenship) Education to Participative Democracy? Youth's Difficult Way to Active Citizenship

Abstract: In this article we make an attempt to join a discussions on the political and social activity of young people in contemporary polyarchies. On the basis of the assumption that the condition for the active fulfilment of civic functions are cognitive skills and the ability to communicate which the individual improves in the education process and through participation in social phenomena, we are trying to find the answer to the following questions: how is participation perceived in today's polyarchies, what can be the determinants of youth's political and social involvement, why do European international organisations – the Council of Europe and the European Union – take measures to activate European youth. In the first part of the article, we focus on democratic participation and try to recognise its role in selected models of democracy. Then we analyse selected aspects of youth electoral absenteeism. We cite examples of the activities of the Council of Europe and the European Union in the field of the youth democratic (civic) activation with an indication of the reasons for this activity. Finally, we point to the relationship between the political and social participation of young people and the condition of modern European polyarchies.

Key words: democratic participation, democratic education, youth political participation

Introduction

In Poland, a record number of people entitled to vote voted in the elections to the European Parliament of the 9th term (turnout was 45.68%), but in the 18–29 age group more than 70% of people did not exercise the right to vote (2019 European election results). This statistics has sparked off the already heated debate on the political and social activity of young people. However, most opinions have focused on linking the decision about abstaining from voting with the attitude of young people to the current political situation in Poland.

In our opinion, the problem of (in) active citizenship of young people has a much broader dimension (Kijewska, 2013). It does not only concern young Poles, but a significant proportion of European youth, of whom 14.2% (aged 15–29) are so-called NEET[1] young people. The reasons for young people's lower-than-expected political activity are complex. In order to stimulate it, attempts are made to implement programmes activating young people's civicism initiated by international organisations as well as national institutions, non-governmental organisations and political parties. They encompass formal

---

[1] NEET (not in employment, education or training) – the name of a sociological phenomenon and a social group defined with this term, which includes young people who are outside the sphere of employment and education, i.e. those who are not studying, working or preparing for a profession at the same time.

education instruments (e.g. social studies, democratic education) and non-formal ways of attracting young people to local, national and international politics. Most of them promote basic methods of political participation[2], assuming that knowledge about the possibilities of participation, its benefits and methods is necessary for the development of active political participation.

In this article we make an attempt to join a discussions on the causes and consequences of the current level of youth political activeness. On the one hand, we try to find the answer to the following questions: how is participation in today's polyarchies perceived, what can be the causes and possible consequences of a decline in youth political participation, and what role does motivation for political action play in this context. On the other hand, we consider the level of democratic (civic) education in Europe and its possible impact on the level of political participation of young people. Finally, we are trying to answer the question whether the current level of youth political participation is really "worrying" and can generate threats to the condition of contemporary polyarchies.

Democratic participation

It is a truism to say that the problems of democracy are very complex and that, despite the long history of the idea of democracy, the dilemma of what its scope is has not been resolved thus far. There is also no significant doubt that democracy offers many benefits to citizens. Robert A. Dahl lists the following: citizens are well protected from despotic authority, they have basic political rights, and they enjoy considerable freedom, as citizens they obtain the means to pursue their most important personal interests, they can also participate in deciding on the laws that apply to them, they have considerable autonomy in terms of morality and have extraordinary opportunities for personal development (Dahl, 2000, p. 72).

Democracy also empowers citizens. The literal concept of democracy considered as a theory referring to sources and titular rights to power indicates that we expect and demand from democratic forms that society takes precedence over the state, that *demos* precedes *kratia. Therefore, democracy exists when the relationship between the governed and the government does not violate the principle that the state is a servant of citizens, and not citizens are servants of the state, that the government exists for people, not vice versa* (Sartori, 1998, p. 53). The problem is to find the answer to the question whether democracy is to mean some kind of "people's" power (a form of life in which citizens are engaged in self-government and self-regulation) or an aid to decision-making (a means to legitimate the decisions of those voted into power – 'representatives') or, should democracy be clearly delimited to maintain other important ends? (Hedl, 2010,

---

[2] According to Ian Fyfe's political participation hierarchy, which stretches from passivity to activity, forms of political participation include: following political issues and debate; voting; initiating a political discussion; convincing someone else which way to vote; wearing a badge or displaying a sticker/poster; contacting a public official or a political leader; making a donation to a party or a candidate; attending a political meeting or rally; contributing time in a campaign; becoming an active party member; attending a caucus or strategy meeting; soliciting political funds; becoming candidate for office; holding public and party office (Fyfe, 2009, p. 38).

p. 3). Despite these difficulties "it has been defended on the grounds that it comes closest among the alternatives to achieving one or more of the following fundamental values or goods: rightful authority, political equality, liberty, moral self-development, the common interest, a fair moral compromise, binding decisions that take everyone's interest into account, social utility, the satisfaction of wants, efficient decisions" (Hedl, 2010, p. 3). Among the models of democracy we find the following: the classic idea of democracy, the republican concept of a self-governing community, liberal democracy, the Marxist concept of direct democracy, the democracy of competitive elitism, pluralism, legal democracy, participatory democracy and deliberative democracy. In each of them "participation" has a different place and role.

Constitutional systems – as Stephen Macedo writes – usually provide citizens with an important political role, making them participants of political power, and not just objects of power. Liberal states therefore expect and require from citizens a certain level of participation and a kind of virtue, and interpretation of law and assessment of decisions taken by other interpreters are a matter for every citizen (Macedo, 1995, p. 130). Society in modern democratic states expects the realisation of such a concept of democracy, but for both it and the rulers it is a great challenge.

Many researchers of modern democracy see democratic participation as a means of building citizenship and community (Barber, 1984; Dalton, 2002), and note that democracy offers the possibility of both direct and indirect participation in exercising power. Formidable tasks are set in this respect for the participative individual, whose commitment, ability, skills, etc. influence the picture of political life (Chodubski, 2003, p. 123). Some, e.g. Russell J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann note that every political system, whether democratic or not, expects some citizens' involvement in the political process, at least in the form of political obedience. Democracy, however, expects more active involvement than an undemocratic order because it is designed to aggregate individual preferences regarding public life into binding collective decisions. As such, it requires active civicism because it is through the articulation of interests, the transmission of information and deliberation that public preferences that can be identified, shaped and transformed into collective decisions recognised as legitimate (Dalton, Klingeman, 2010, p. 47).

When asked why political involvement is highly valued in contemporary polyarchies, supporters of participatory democracy and deliberative democracy provide direct answers. Participatory democracy is understood as any form of democracy that emphasises or enables broad participation in decision making of the members of the entire group concerned. In 1960, the term participatory democracy began to include expanding the opportunities for people to participate in decision-making in all aspects of human life (Dahl, 1974; Pateman, 1970). Proponents of this form of democracy questioned the view that "democracy" concerns state policy and the formation of state political institutions and procedures. They claimed that democracy could be applied in many areas and that it should be part of many decision-making processes both outside and within the state and government. They were interested in the democratisation of society, not only the state. The concepts of participatory democracy generally emphasised the broad, society-wide concept of "politics" and a flexible and open minded approach whereby social processes and institutions, like the state, could benefit from bottom-up participation in

decision making (Saward, 2008, p. 89). In addition, participation democrats believe that if democratic societies offered citizens greater opportunities to express political views, then citizens would take advantage of them and make collective decisions that they now leave to their representatives (Barber, 1984).

Paweł Śpiewak emphasises that supporters of participatory democracy may reasonably argue that the sharp separation of democracy mechanisms from citizens' culture, customs and political habits is unjustified. The effect of political choices – they say – is a function of civic skills, which can only be developed by active participation in public life. Participatory democracy brings up, educates responsible people, capable of cooperation and self-organisation. Most importantly, it deepens the political competence of citizens and makes them vote and act rationally (Śpiewak, 2004, p. 83).

Researchers of democracy also note that participant democracy theorists, making democracy the primary goal to be pursued by society at all levels, seem to believe that "democratic reason" – the wisdom and good will of the general public – will bring just and correct political solutions. Referring to the above and taking into account the observations of thinkers from Plato to Hayek, however, they suspend the judgment on the question whether the *demos* can be trusted to be essentially "democratic," whether "the will of the general public" will be good and wise, and if "democratic reason" will prevail (Held, 2010, p. 279).

Another model of democracy that focuses on the development of citizenship and the promotion of conscious political preferences, in which "political participation" is presented in a very specific way and is treated as an antidote to the ills of "modern democracy" is the model of deliberative democracy, which is not considered a variant of the direct democracy model. This concept emerged as a result of a critique of the liberal model, in particular the economic model with its instrumental attitude (Beyme, 2005, p. 225). The weaker version of deliberative democracy is normatively restrained and focuses on improving procedural decision-making. The stronger version is often based on Habermas's theory of communication (Habermas, 1999; 2002) and expects moral improvement from the universal openness of the discourse. Broadly understood deliberative democracy is defined as a concept in which it is assumed that free and equal citizens' reflection on public matters is the core of valid political decision-making and self-governance. Theoreticians of deliberative democracy want to raise the legitimacy of democratic procedures and institutions by expanding elements of reflection to develop the quality of life in democracy and improve its results (Held 2010, p. 308). The model of deliberative democracy has been widely criticised, among others, because of its excessively abstract character and very narrow concept of "good argumentation."[3]

Models of democracy differently capture the basic relationship of power in a democratic system, i.e. the relationship between the rulers and the ruled. It is clearly presented by Marcin Zgrieb (Zgrieb, 2014, pp. 22–23), who notes that in representative democracy citizens participate in governance through institutions that ensure the realisation of the will of the general public (the majority) as well as defend the will of the minority not included in this process. In turn, in the system of direct democracy, citizens operate within institutions that exercise their will (or the will of the majority), as well as against institu-

---

[3] See more on this topic in: J. Bohman, W. Regh (eds.), *Deliberative Democracy. Essays on reason and Politics*, The MIT Press Cambridge, Massausetts, London 2002.

tions that go against their will. Deliberative democracy is about the relationship between citizens' individual preferences and collectively exercised power.

Given the above, it should be emphasised that modern polyarchies contain components of representative, participatory and deliberative democracy. Moreover, what they have in common is the fact that in the majority of them indifference to politics is considered to be a definitely negative phenomenon (Braud, 2005, p. 23).

Voter Turnout and Motivation of Youth to Political Participation

Exercising the active right to vote is the most often analysed form of political activity. Researchers of electoral participation issues emphasise that, despite the fact that the low level of youth turnout is nothing new, the level of electoral absenteeism in this group of voters is becoming increasingly troublesome. According to the authors of *Engaging the Electorate* this situation is typical of developing countries, where young people form a substantial percentage of the overall population and poor youth voter turnout has a pronounced impact on overall turnout figures, non-participation by this demographic group may become an even greater threat to the stability of democracy (Ellis, Gratschew, Pammett, Thienssen at all., 2008, p. 23). The above thesis is related, among others to the fact that the election turnout legitimises the political system, and the higher its level, the higher the level of legitimacy of the system. Thus, political indifference is a direct cause of exceptionally weak participation in elections. Of course, it should be taken into account that a very high voter turnout may mean that we are dealing, for example, with an undemocratic system in which the principle of free elections has been violated. Researchers of political systems, however, recommend caution in simple analyses of electoral behaviour, pointing out that the catalogue of determinants of political activity of voters is vast.

Several years ago, linking a degree of indifference with voter turnout, and using two analytical categories: participation in elections and interest in politics, Philippe Braud identified four profiles of participation: those who are interested (voters with high or quite high interest in politics), conformists (voters with low or quite low interest in politics), dissidents (not voting, but a lot or quite a lot interested in politics) and uninterested (not voting and little or quite little interested in politics). In his research, he concluded that too big influence of dissidents or the uninterested could be a threat to the endurance of polyarchy. In turn, he saw the consolidation of polyarchy in a relative balance between those interested, who play a dynamic role in the functioning of the system and conformists who support the forces of inertia (Braud, 2005, p. 26). A few years later, the research of Robert A. Dahl and Bruce Stinebrickner on the participation of individuals in politics led to the conclusion that in most national political systems a smaller part of the population shows more serious interest in political affairs, is concerned with politics and has knowledge of this subject and is active in public affairs (Dahl, Stinerbrickner 2007, p. 160). According to the authors of *Modern Political Analysis* in every polyarchy, a significant proportion of citizens have an indifferent attitude towards policies in which their government is involved. In order to explain this situation, they presented seven explanatory theses (Fig. 1).

**Theses explaining why people do not get involved in the policy
of governing their country**

Individuals are less likely to get involved in politics if:
1) they attach lower value to rewards connected with political involvement than to rewards connected with other kinds of activity;
2) they believe that the possibilities they face do not differ significantly and, consequently, that their action does not matter;
3) they think their actions do not matter because they cannot change the result anyway;
4) they think the result will be relatively good for them without their involvement;
5) they believe that their knowledge is too limited to allow them to participate effectively;
6) the greater the obstacles on the individual's path to politics, the less likely they are to be involved;
7) if no person or group mobilises them to do so.

Source: Own study based on Dahl, Stinebrickner, 2007, pp. 162–171.

Many answers can be found to the direct question about the reasons for low voter turnout. Pippa Norris divides them into those that result from the context and the electoral system, and those that can be classified as individual and social factors (Norris, 2004, pp. 257–258). Factors resulting from the context are as follows: perceived effectiveness of political rivalry; intensification of competition and significance of the election event; the nature of the party system; campaign expenses; electoral traditions in various communities; strategic voting; time between elections; weather; type of election event. In turn, choice of the electoral system; whether voter registration is the responsibility of the state or citizen; fact of compulsory or voluntary voting; whether voting takes place on one or more days and whether elections are held on weekdays or non-working days; availability of alternative voting procedures; accessibility of polling stations or the possibility of using modern technologies are examples of systemic factors.

Among highlighted theories explaining the low level of voter turnout among young people, there are those referring to that moment in life when they have to concentrate on settling down, education, getting ready to embark on a career, establishing interpersonal relations before they can devote their time and find motivation to political participation, and those that refer to direct factors connected with the fact that political parties do not deal with young people's problems or the general feeling of apathy, similar to that which afflicts representatives of other groups.

Other opinions indicate that young people have not been raised in the spirit of democratic participation and that the state, school and family are to blame because they neglect this dimension of education and upbringing as the condition for the active fulfilment of civic functions are cognitive skills and the ability to communicate which the individual improves in the education process and through participation in social phenomena. Concentrating only on the issue of systemic preparation of youth to active participation, or more precisely the possible impact of democratic education on young people's political behaviour it is possible to refer to the conclusions of the analysis of the level and quality of democratic (citizenship) education in Europe.

Citizenship Education in Europe

The commitment to citizenship education of both international organisations and national institutions has increased in the last twenty years. The Council of Europe is one of the organisations which consequently devotes attention to democratic education. Exactly twenty years ago, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Council of Europe, the Committee of Ministers and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe adopted *the Declaration and Programme on Education for Democratic Citizenship, Based on the Rights and Responsibilities of Citizens*. It was two years after the Council of Europe started the implementation of the democratic education project. On the initiative of the organisation the year 2005 was the European Year of Citizenship through Education. In 2010 the member states adopted *the Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights*. In order to effectively implement the provisions of the Charter, including facilitating exchanges and cooperation between the member states, the Council of Europe Department of Education conducts the intergovernmental programme "Learning democracy and human rights." The network of officially appointed coordinators (EDC/HRE coordinators) plays a key role in this project. Training for education practitioners is organised as part of the "Pestalozzi" programme and regional summer academies. The Council of Europe cooperates with the European Union in this respect. In addition, the Council of Europe Youth Department organises training for youth NGOs and education professionals, and the Council of Europe Human Rights Directorate offers training for professional groups such as judges, prosecutors, chief judges, lawyers, law enforcement officials, prison staff, bailiffs, employees of national human rights institutions and members of non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The promotion of education about human rights is also part of the mandate of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights. The Eurydice report *Citizenship Education at School in Europe* presents, among others, ways of including civic education in national curricula, teaching hours and curriculum content with general and specific objectives and learning outcomes. The conclusions show that in the years 2012–2016 significant progress was made in 40 countries that responded to the survey: democratic (citizenship) education gained importance throughout Europe. At the same time, weaknesses of modern civic education are identified. It is stressed in the comments that very little curriculum content related to civic education was found in the curricula of vocational schools and universities. In addition, criteria for assessing the effectiveness of civic education curricula were not developed in the vast majority of the countries. In relation to the *Council of Europe Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights* it is pointed out that young people know very little about it and it is most often used by non-governmental organisations (Council of Europe, 2017, pp. 6–7).

Citizenship education is also seen as an opportunity to improve the quality of public debate and an antidote to the development of anti-democratic sentiments. The Council of Europe treats education as a tool for promoting fundamental values: democracy, human rights and the rule of law, as well as preventing human rights violation. Recently, the role of civic education in containing violence, racism, extremism, xenophobia and intolerance has also been indicated. Hence, work on the *Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights*. The adoption of the Charter by 47 countries was consid-

ered a great success, but its non-binding nature means that it can be as much as or just a reference point for all those involved in civic education and human rights education. In turn, the very idea of developing democratic education has many supporters. Among various arguments in favour of the development of democratic education there are both those that refer to Benjamin Barber's concept of public education, for whom "Public schools are not simply schools for society, but schools of public life: institutions where we learn what it means to be a society and where we enter the path towards a common national and civic identity. As the forges of our citizenship, they form the basis of our democracy" (Barber, 1998, pp. 225–226),[4] as well as those with a pro-European orientation, which treat civic education as a tool for counteracting the development of populist movements in the Member States of the European Union (Pagliarello, Palillo, Durazzano, 2019). In this year's report of 1989 Generation Initiative entitled *The missing link between civic education and populism. Restoring civic faith among Europe's youth* we find the following conclusions from the research: (1) The gap between legislation and implementation of civic education in schools must be bridged; (2) Specialist teacher training on civic education needs to be improved; (3) There are specific "skills" associated with civic education and these should be developed by embracing a better dialogue with local communities; (4) Civic Education should systematically incorporate concepts of European citizenship in its curriculum through direct initiatives in the classroom.

Also Amy Gutmann shares the position that the transformation of children into competent citizens participating in social life taking place in school lies in the state's interest. In *Democratic Education* she emphasises that a feature of democratic education is granting citizens the right to "exert influence on education, which in turn shapes the political values, attitudes and behaviour of future citizens. In democratic countries, citizens should determine, among others, how future citizens will be educated" (Gutmann, 1987, pp. 3–14). In fact, however, in most democratic countries not empowered citizens but political, bureaucratic and professional elites and organisations have an impact on school education and educational decisions. Students rarely participate in making decisions about their own education (Kymlicka, 1995). In addition, in the context of searching for optimal strategies to support civic education, it seems important to place greater emphasis on the involvement of states and their governments in the development of civic democracy. International and non-governmental organizations have far less opportunity to influence educational policies and curriculum content.

The European Union looks a little differently at civic education. Accepting the arguments of the Council of Europe, it sees more clearly the economic and political dimensions of civic education. Taking into consideration the facts according to which for the first time since the end of the Second World War there is a real threat that the current generation of young people will be in a worse economic situation than their parents, and that 29% of people aged 16–29 are at risk of poverty or social exclusion, and 11.6% of those aged 15–24 are not in education, employment or training (NEETs), while 15.9% of young people in this age group are unemployed – this indicator is twice as high as in the case of the general public – socio-economic exclusion and exclusion from democratic processes go hand in hand (European Commission 1, 2018, p. 1).

---

[4] Cited in: Juchacz, Malitowska, 2012, p. 4.

Youth Policy

The European Union's attitude to youth is directly related, among others, to the demographic situation. Statistical data clearly show that the European Union is aging. Currently, young people constitute around 17% of the total population of the European Union. This proportion varies from country to country. It is slightly smaller in Greece, Spain, Italy and Slovenia, reaching the highest level in Cyprus, where 23.6% of the population is under 30 years old. The share of young people in the total population fell gradually from around 24% in 1985 to 19% in 2010. According to forecasts, when the European Union population increases to 525 million (2050), the percentage of young people will decrease from around 17% in 2018 to below 16% in 2050, which corresponds to a reduction of over 7 million people. This will mean that there will be a situation in which young people will face the increased burden of supporting the older generation when they enter the labour market, e.g. by maintaining public health care system and pension programmes. The steady decline in the number of young people living in the EU over the past decades has been mitigated by the increase in immigration from outside the EU (European Commission 2, 2018, pp. 16–20).

In recent years the development of so-called European Union youth policy has been connected primarily with the awareness of the importance of the young generation of Europeans for the further development of the integration process, primarily in its economic and political dimensions. Youth policy is a competence of the Member States, the European Union only supports and complements their activities in this field, providing a forum for cooperation and exchange of experience and information on issues of common interest. Art. 165–166 of the *Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union* are a treaty basis for the EU's activities in the field of youth policy. Pursuant to their provisions, Union initiatives are aimed at developing exchanges of young people and socio-educational instructors, encouraging young people to participate in the democratic life of Europe, as well as facilitating access to vocational training, and promoting mobility. However, observing the dynamic increase in the activity of EU institutions in supporting youth, it should be emphasised that the new *EU Youth Strategy* provides a framework for EU cooperation in the field of youth policy for 2019–2027 (Council of the European Union, 2018). Its aim is to support the participation of young people in democratic life and their social and civic engagement, and provide young people with necessary resources to participate in social life.

The content of the "Engage" programme and European goals of youth testify to how the European Union perceives the political and social activity of young people.[5] The "Engage" programme is focused on increasing the participation of young people in civic, economic, social, cultural and political life of both European countries and the European Union itself. The strategy calls on the Member States to encourage and promote the democratic participation of all young people in society and democratic processes, to actively involve young people and youth organisations in policies affecting the lives of

---

[5] Connecting EU with Youth; Equality of All Genders; Inclusive Societies; Information & Constructive Dialogue; Mental Health & Wellbeing; Moving Rural Youth Forward; Quality Employment for All; Quality Learning; Space and Participation for All; Sustainable Green Europe; Youth Organisations & European Programmes. See more on this topic in: http://www.youthgoals.eu/, 10.08.2019.

young people at all levels and to support youth organisations at the local, regional and national level, recognising the right of young people to participate and self-organise. In addition, it points to the value of involving diverse youth voices in decision-making at all levels and supporting the development of civic competences through civic education and learning strategies. The value of young people's participation and their learning to participate was very clearly emphasised (European Commission (2)). We will see how the strategy implementation process will proceed in the coming years.

Conclusion

The discussion on the causes and consequences of the current level of political activity of European youth includes, on the one hand, references to wide-ranging political discourse on democracy, the condition of contemporary polyarchies and the role of citizens' "participation" in political and social life, as well as to motivation to be active. It thematically touches on the topics of the place and role of the state in modern Europe, especially in the context of multiculturalism resulting not only from the effect of the common market and "free movement of people," but also the consequences of global changes, including demographic, political and economic problems of countries outside the European Union. On the other hand, the discussion focuses on youth as a social group which is expected to stop many political and social pathologies occurring in modern Europe, such as populism, racism and intolerance. International organisations, including the Council of Europe, consistently promoting the development of democratic (citizenship) education in the Member States, pin a lot of hope on youth.

A slightly different approach to youth is presented by the European Union, many documents of which express economic concern for the future of the European integration process. By increasing their political activity and participation in social life, young people as a working-age social group (or about to join it soon) would lead to a situation in which the European Union will cope, among others, with a serious demographic problem, that is an aging society with the reverse trends forecast for countries outside the European Union.

The common conclusion of these discussions is that "youth participation in political and social life" is considered valuable and recognised as having great potential to counteract potential crises, the symptoms of which are visible in many modern polyarchies. It is noticeable that European organisations' plans of action in the field of youth policy are based on common assumptions according to which the condition for the active fulfilment of civic functions are cognitive skills and the ability to communicate which the individual improves in the education process and through participation in social phenomena. Hence the pressure of the Council of Europe on democratic (civic) education, and the European Union on creating conditions for young people to "learn to participate." The creation of "top-down" youth strategies and policies and their "theoretical" and "idealistic" character is a weakness. Given the "social" and "institutional" deficit of democracy constantly present in the European Union, a greater emphasis on bottom-up initiatives and more "subjective" treatment of European youth is indispensable because, paradoxically, in many cases policies focused on the political and social activation of young people are created in a non-participatory manner, ignoring the target group.

Bibliography

Barber B. (1998), *A Passion for Democracy: American Essays*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Barber B. (1984), *Strong Democracy*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Beyme K. von (2005), *Współczesne teorie polityczne*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.

Boryń M., Duraj B., Mrozowska S. (eds.) (2014), *Polityka młodzieżowa Unii Europejskiej*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.

Braud P. (1995), *Rozkosze demokracji*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Chodubski A. (2003), *Grupy interesu w ujęciu historycznym*, w: *Grupy interesu. Teoria i działanie*, red. Z. Machelski, L. Rubisz, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.

Council of the European Union, *Resolution of the Council of the European Union and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting within the Council on a framework for European cooperation in the youth field: The European Union Youth Strategy 2019–2027*, Official Journal of the European Union, C456/2018.

Dahl R. A. (1985), *A Preference to Economic Democracy*, University of California Press, Berkley–Los Angeles.

Dahl R. A. (2000), *O demokracji*, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Kraków.

Dahl R. A., Stinebrickner B. (2007), *Współczesna analiza polityczna*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Warszawa.

Dalton R. J. (2002), *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advansed Industrial Democracy*, Chatham House Publishers, New York.

Dalton R. J., Klingeman H.-D. (2010), *Obywatele a zachowania polityczne*, w: *Zachowania polityczne*, pod red. R. J. Dalton, H.-D. Klingeman, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Ellis A., Gratsche M., Pammett J. H., Thiessen E., Balinov I., Burges S. W., Chrabolowsky L., McGrane D., Hocman J., Lemón Omelko S. (2008), *Aktywizowanie wyborców. Inicjatywy z różnych krajów świata*, Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Warszawa.

European Commission (2), Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions Engaging, *Connecting and Empowering young people: a new EU Youth Strategy*, COM/2018/269.

European Commission (2), *Situation of the young people in the European Union*, Commission Staff Working Document, SWD (2018) 169 final of 22.05.2018.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, *Citizenship Education at School in Europe* – 2017.

Fyfe I. (2009), *Researching Youth Political Participation in Australia. Arguments for an Expanded Focus*, "Youth Studies Australia", vol. 28, no. 1.

Gutmann A. (1987), *Democratic education*, Princton University Press, Princton.

Habermas J. (1999), *Teoria działania komunikacyjnego*, t. I: *Racjonalność działania a racjonalność społeczna*, PWN, Warszawa.

Habermas J. (2002), *Teoria działania komunikacyjnego*, t. II: *Przyczynek do krytyki rozumu funkcjonalnego*, Warszawa.

Hedl D. (2010), *Modele demokracji*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.

Juchacz P. W., Malitowska A. (2012), *O filozofii publicznej i edukacji demokratycznej*, „Filozofia Publiczna i Edukacja Demokratyczna", t. 1, nr 1.

Kijewska B. (2013), *Partycypacja polityczna młodzieży w Unii Europejskiej*, w: *Polityka młodzieżowa Unii Europejskiej*, pod red. B. Duraja, M. Borynia, S. Mrozowskiej, Wydawnictwo Marszałek, Toruń.

Komisja Europejska/EACEA/Eurydice (2017), *Citizenship Education at School in Europe – 2017* (Edukacja obywatelska w szkołach w Europie – 2017) Raport Eurydice, Urząd Oficjalnych Publikacji Wspólnot Europejskich, Luksemburg.

Kymlicka W. (1995), *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Macedo S. (1995), *Cnoty liberalne*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków.

Norris P. (2004), *Electoral Engineering*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Pagliarello M. C., Palillo M., Durazzano V., *The missing link between civic education and populism. Restoring civic faith among Europe's youth*, "Policy Report" from 11.04.2019, 1989 Generation Initiative, LLC.

Pateman C. (1970), *Participation and Democratic Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Saward M. (2008), *Demokracja*, Wydawnictwo Sic!, Warszawa.

Śpiewak P. (2004), *Obietnice demokracji*, Prószyński i S-ka SA, Warszawa.

Szahaj A. (2000), *Jednostka czy wspólnota? Spór liberałów z komunitarystami a „sprawa polska"*, Fundacja ALETHEIA, Warszawa.

Timbro Authoritarian Populism Index, 2019.

Traktat o Funkcjonowaniu Unii Europejskiej. Wersja skonsolidowana, „Dziennik Urzędowy Unii Europejskiej", C326/47 z 26.10.2012, https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/PL/TXT/PDF/?uri= CELEX:12012E/TXT&from=EN.

Zgieb M. (2014), *Poza reprezentacją i partycypacją. Demokracja współczesna w świetle teorii demokracji deliberatywnej*, w: *Procesy i procedury demokratyczne w Polsce*, red. A. Stelmach, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.

Od edukacji demokratycznej (obywatelskiej) do demokracji partycypacyjnej? Trudna droga do aktywnego obywatelstwa młodzieży

Streszczenie

W artykule podejmujemy próbę włączenia się do dyskusji na temat aktywności politycznej i społecznej młodzieży we współczesnych poliarchiach. Wychodząc z założenia, że warunkiem aktywnego spełniania funkcji obywatelskich są umiejętności poznawcze i zdolności komunikowania się, które jednostka doskonali w procesie kształcenia się i poprzez uczestniczenie w zjawiskach społecznych staramy się znaleźć odpowiedź na następujące pytania: w jaki sposób postrzegane jest uczestnictwo w dzisiejszych poliarchiach? jakie mogą być determinanty angażowania się politycznego i społecznego młodzieży? Dlaczego europejskie organizacje międzynarodowe – Rada Europy i Unia Europejska – podejmują działania z zakresu aktywizowania młodzieży europejskiej? W pierwszej części artykułu uwagę koncentrujemy na uczestnictwie demokratycznym i staramy się poznać jego rolę w wybranych modelach demokracji. Następnie analizujemy wybrane aspekty absencji wyborczej młodzieży. Przywołujemy przykłady aktywności Rady Europy i Unii Europejskiej w zakresie aktywizowania demokratycznego (obywatelskiego) młodzieży wraz ze wskazaniem przyczyn tej aktywności. W końcu wskazujemy na związek pomiędzy uczestnictwem politycznym i społecznym młodzieży a kondycją współczesnych poliarchii europejskich.

Słowa kluczowe: partycypacja demokratyczna, edukacja demokratyczna, partycypacja polityczna młodzieży