



Youth and Politics

GOVT 3421-01 | Fall 2026

Georgetown University | Department of Government

Meeting time: Mondays, 11:00–13:30

Location: Intercultural Center (ICC), Room 103

Dates: August 31 – December 7, 2026

Credits: 3

Instructor: Hugo Ferrinho Lopes

Title: FLAD Visiting Professor, Department of Government; Researcher, Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon

Office: ICC 676-A

Office hours: Mondays, 15:00-16:00, pending appointment beforehand

Email: hugo.ferrinho.lopes@georgetown.edu

Website: hugoferrinholopes.github.io

Contents

1	Course Description	3
2	Prerequisites	3
3	Learning Objectives	3
4	Course Assignments & Grading Criteria	4
5	Academic Integrity and the Use of AI	6
6	Course Schedule	7
	Session 1: Introduction: Youth and Political Participation	7
	Session 2: Why Don't Young People Vote? And What Do They Do Instead? . . .	7
	Session 3: Socialization, Generations, and the Life Cycle	9
	Session 4: Education: Participation and the Educational Cleavage	10
	Session 5: Divides among Young Voters: Gender, Race, and the Radical Right . .	10
	Session 6: Parties and Youth Wings	11
	Session 7: Youth Representation: The Supply and Demand of Young Candidates	13
	Session 8: Democratic Support, Disaffection, and Polarization	14
	Session 9: Protest, Climate, and Environmental Politics	15
	Session 10: Youth in the Digital Sphere	16
	Session 11: Guest Session	16
	Session 12: Reforms: Votes at 16, Quotas, and Civic Education	16
	Session 13: Paper Workshop I	17
	Session 14: Paper Workshop II and Conclusions	17
7	Course Policies	18

1. Course Description

This seminar examines the relationship between young people and politics across contemporary democracies. It addresses electoral and non-electoral participation, the political attitudes of younger generations, and their engagement with formal political institutions.

The course begins with the evidence on youth turnout and its decline, and shows that young citizens have redirected rather than abandoned their political engagement. It then examines the formation of political attitudes through socialization, generational replacement, and life-cycle change, together with the role of education in structuring both participation and vote choice. Subsequent sessions address divisions among young voters by gender and race, the position of young people within political parties and their youth wings, and the causes and consequences of youth under-representation in elected office. The final sessions consider democratic support and disaffection, protest and climate mobilization, digital politics, and the institutional reforms proposed in response.

Evidence is drawn from the United States, Europe, and other regions. Several sessions address questions on which there is no scholarly or public consensus, including lowering the voting age, youth quotas, and compulsory civic education.

2. Prerequisites

No prior knowledge of European politics or of the literature on youth political participation is assumed. Prior coursework in political science or comparative politics is advisable but not required. No background in statistics or statistical software is necessary. Students will read quantitative research and help will be provided to identify what it does and does not demonstrate, which does not require conducting such analyses independently.

3. Learning Objectives

By the end of the semester you should be able to:

1. Compare patterns of youth political participation across countries and explain why they differ.
2. Apply theories of political socialization and generational change to concrete cases.
3. Tell life-cycle, period, and cohort explanations apart, and say what evidence would be needed to distinguish them.
4. Assess claims about young people's trust, polarization, and support for democracy against the survey evidence behind them.

5. Explain how parties recruit and mobilize young people, and what youth wings are actually for.
6. Account for youth under-representation in elected office and evaluate the reforms proposed to fix it.
7. Design and carry out an independent piece of research or policy analysis on a question of your own choosing.
8. Present an argument in writing and defend it in front of people who have read it.

4. Course Assignments & Grading Criteria

Graded Assignments

	Weight	Due
Participation and reading memos	35%	Ongoing (memos on Sundays, 08:00)
Paper proposal and annotated bibliography	10%	Monday, October 26
Presentation and peer discussion	15%	Sessions 13-14
Final paper	40%	TBC
Total	100%	

Participation and Reading Memos (35%)

You are expected to complete all readings, assignments, and activities on time. Participation is essential to your success in this class. You are expected to actively participate in discussions with your peers and to contribute to group assignments.

Most sessions carry required readings. You are required to submit six memos over the course of the semester, and you may choose which sessions to write on. Memos that are not submitted cannot be made up; the option to omit sessions is intended to accommodate variation in your workload.

A memo is 300 to 400 words and must be submitted by email by 08:00 on the Sunday preceding class. Memos should not summarize the assigned readings. A memo should identify a tension, a contradiction, or an unexamined assumption in the literature, relate it either to your case country or to material discussed in an earlier session, and conclude with one question for class discussion. Memos are read before class and inform the direction of the seminar.

Beginning in Session 2, you may select a case country to follow throughout the semester. Memos are encouraged to return to this case. This allows each student to develop ex-

pertise in a single national context, provides the seminar with comparative range, and establishes a foundation for the final paper.

Memos are graded ✓+ / ✓ / ✓- / ✗ (100 / 85 / 60). Individual written feedback is not provided on individual memos.

Paper Proposal and Annotated Bibliography (10%)

Due Monday, October 26. It should not exceed 1,000 words and should state your research question, its importance with reference to the relevant literature, the approach or cases you intend to use, and the evidence you expect to draw on. The annotated bibliography should list 8 to 10 scholarly sources, each accompanied by two or three sentences describing the work's central argument and its relevance to your question.

Following submission, each student will meet with me individually for fifteen minutes over the subsequent two weeks to discuss the proposal and receive feedback. Please email me to arrange a time.

Presentation and Peer Discussion (15%)

The final two sessions are conducted as a workshop rather than a series of presentations. You will present your project, including the research question, the framework, the evidence, and your conclusions. Slides are permitted but not required.

Final Paper (40%)

The final paper should not exceed 4,000 words, excluding references. It may be either a research paper or a policy paper.

A research paper poses a clear analytical question concerning youth and politics, engages the relevant scholarly literature, and brings evidence to bear on an answer. A policy paper identifies a specific problem in youth political participation or representation and evaluates the solutions proposed, where appropriate through case studies or comparative analysis.

Either way I am looking for an argument you can defend, evidence that supports it, a clear structure, and proper citation style.

Late Work

Work submitted after the deadline loses one third of a letter grade per day, so an A- becomes a B+. Memos cannot be submitted late, as their purpose is to inform a class that will already have taken place.

Students with an approved accommodation for extensions should contact me early in the semester so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

Grading Scheme

93–100% = A	87–89% = B+	77–79% = C+	67–69% = D+
90–92% = A-	83–86% = B	73–76% = C	60–66% = D
	80–82% = B-	70–72% = C-	Below 60% = F

Letter grades carry the quality points set out in Georgetown's Undergraduate Bulletin (bulletin.georgetown.edu): A 4.00, A– 3.67, B+ 3.33, B 3.00, B– 2.67, C+ 2.33, C 2.00, C– 1.67, D+ 1.33, D 1.00, F 0.00.

5. Academic Integrity and the Use of AI

Students at Georgetown University are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic and personal integrity. Although most Georgetown students conduct themselves in accordance with these standards, occasionally, there are students who violate the code of conduct. Cheating harms the University community in many ways. For example, honest students are frustrated by the unfairness of cheating that goes undetected and students who cheat can skew the grading curve in a class, resulting in lower grades for students who worked hard and did their own work.

Academic dishonesty in any form is a serious offense, and students found in violation are subject to academic penalties that include, but are not limited to failure of the course, termination from the program, and revocation of degrees already conferred. All students are expected to fully adhere to the policies and procedures of Georgetown's Honor System and to take the Honor Code Pledge.

Stealing someone else's work is a terminal offense in the workplace, and it will wreck your career in academia, too. Students are expected to work with integrity and honesty in all their assignments. The Georgetown University Honor System defines plagiarism as "the act of passing off as one's own the ideas or writings of another." More guidance is available through the Gervase Programs. If you have any doubts about plagiarism, paraphrasing, and the need to credit, check out Plagiarism.org.

This means you may use AI to explore a topic before you settle on a question, to find literature that you then go and read, to check grammar and clarity in prose you wrote yourself, or to have a concept explained to you a second way.

You remain responsible for all work you submit. You must credit every source of ideas, data, and wording that is not your own, and this applies to paraphrase as well as to direct quotation. You may not submit AI-generated prose as your own writing, generate memos, produce annotations for sources you have not read, or cite any work you

have not personally consulted and verified. Fabricated citations will be treated as academic dishonesty. Further guidance is available through Georgetown's Honor Code at honorcouncil.georgetown.edu, and research practice will be discussed throughout the semester.

Two requirements apply. First, the proposal and the final paper must be drafted in a document that retains version history (e.g., Google Docs), and this document must be shared with me at submission. Second, a short statement must be appended to the final paper indicating which tools were used, at what stage, and for what purpose. **Disclosure carries no penalty.**

If you are uncertain whether a particular use is acceptable, please consult me in advance.

6. Course Schedule

Readings marked ✓ are required and must be completed before class. Remaining readings are complementary. The schedule is **provisional** – the readings for each session will be confirmed one week in advance.

You are expected to be able to state the main argument of each assigned reading and to give a brief account of its approach, evidence, and contribution, in two to three minutes. Critical engagement with the readings is encouraged.

Some reading tips to help you beforehand:

- [How to read and understand academic literature](#)
- [How to read academic literature faster](#)
- [Remembering what you read](#)
- [Six reading habits](#)

Session 1 | Introduction: Youth and Political Participation

Monday, August 31 | No readings required.

Monday, September 7. Labor Day, no class. Classes follow a Monday schedule on Tuesday, September 8, so we meet as usual.

Session 2 | Why Don't Young People Vote? And What Do They Do Instead?

Tuesday, September 8 (Legislative Monday)

- ✓ van der Brug, W., & Kritzinger, S. (2026). Generations and age in electoral research. *European Political Science Review*, 1–21
- ✓ Kostelka, F., & Blais, A. (2021). The Generational and Institutional Sources of the Global Decline in Voter Turnout. *World Politics*, 73(4), 629–667
- ✓ Sloam, J., & Henn, M. (2019). Rejuvenating Politics: Young Political Participation in a Changing World. In *Youthquake 2017: The Rise of Young Cosmopolitans in Britain*. Palgrave
- Plutzer, E. (2002). Becoming a Habitual Voter: Inertia, Resources, and Growth in Young Adulthood. *American Political Science Review*, 96(1), 41–56
- Dalton, R. J. (2020). *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation Is Reshaping American Politics*. CQ Press (Chapter 1)
- Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. Cambridge University Press (Chapter 1)
- Grasso, M. T. (2014). Age, Period and Cohort Analysis in a Comparative Context: Political Generations and Political Participation Repertoires in Western Europe. *Electoral Studies*, 33, 63–76
- Amnå, E., & Ekman, J. (2014). Standby Citizens: Diverse Faces of Political Passivity. *European Political Science Review*, 6(2), 261–281
- Kitanova, M. (2020). Youth Political Participation in the EU: Evidence from a Cross-National Analysis. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 23(7), 819–836
- Sloam, J. (2016). Diversity and Voice: The Political Participation of Young People in the European Union. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 18(3), 521–537
- Henn, M., & 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), 360–380
- Dassonneville, R. (2017). Age and Voting. In K. Arzheimer, J. Evans, & M. S. Lewis-Beck (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Electoral Behaviour* (pp. 137–158). SAGE
- Bhatti, Y., Hansen, K. M., & Wass, H. (2012). The Relationship between Age and Turnout: A Roller-Coaster Ride. *Electoral Studies*, 31(3), 588–593
- Bhatti, Y., & Hansen, K. M. (2012). Leaving the Nest and the Social Act of Voting: Turnout among First-Time Voters. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 22(4), 380–406
- Hooghe, M., & Dassonneville, R. (2013). Voters and Candidates of the Future: The Intention of Electoral Participation among Adolescents in 22 European Countries. *Young*, 21(1), 1–28

- ☐ Franklin, M. N. (2004). *Voter Turnout and the Dynamics of Electoral Competition in Established Democracies since 1945*. Cambridge University Press (Chapters 1 and 3)
- ☐ Holbein, J. B., & Hillygus, D. S. (2020). *Making Young Voters: Converting Civic Attitudes into Civic Action*. Cambridge University Press (Chapters 1–3)
- ☐ Blais, A., & Rubenson, D. (2013). The Source of Turnout Decline: New Values or New Contexts? *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(1), 95–117
- ☐ Smets, K., & van Ham, C. (2013). The Embarrassment of Riches? A Meta-Analysis of Individual-Level Research on Voter Turnout. *Electoral Studies*, 32(2), 344–359

Session 3 | Socialization, Generations, and the Life Cycle

Monday, September 14

- ☒ Neundorff, A., & Niemi, R. G. (2014). Beyond Political Socialization: New Approaches to Age, Period, Cohort Analysis. *Electoral Studies*, 33, 1–6
- ☒ Jennings, M. K., Stoker, L., & Bowers, J. (2009). Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined. *Journal of Politics*, 71(3), 782–799
- ☒ Peterson, J. C., Smith, K. B., & Hibbing, J. R. (2020). Do People Really Become More Conservative as They Age? *The Journal of Politics*, 82(2), 600–611
- ☐ Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. G. (2014). *Generations and Politics: A Panel Study of Young Adults and Their Parents*. Princeton University Press (Chapters 1–2.)
- ☐ Sears, D. O., & Valentino, N. A. (1997). Politics Matters: Political Events as Catalysts for Preadult Socialization. *American Political Science Review*, 91(1), 45–65
- ☐ Bos, A. L., Greenlee, J. S., Holman, M. R., Oxley, Z. M., & Lay, J. C. (2022). This One's for the Boys: How Gendered Political Socialization Limits Girls' Political Ambition and Interest. *American Political Science Review*, 116(2), 484–501
- ☐ Bartels, L. M., & Jackman, S. (2014). A Generational Model of Political Learning. *Electoral Studies*, 33, 7–18
- ☐ Ghitza, Y., Gelman, A., & Auerbach, J. (2023). The Great Society, Reagan's Revolution, and Generations of Presidential Voting. *American Journal of Political Science*, 67(3), 520–537
- ☐ Dinas, E. (2014). Why Does the Apple Fall Far from the Tree? How Early Political Socialization Prompts Parent-Child Dissimilarity. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(4), 827–852
- ☐ Smets, K. (2016). Revisiting the Political Life-Cycle Model: Later Maturation and Turnout Decline among Young Adults. *European Political Science Review*, 8(2), 225–249

- ☐ Grasso, M. T., Farrall, S., Gray, E., Hay, C., & Jennings, W. (2019). Thatcher's Children, Blair's Babies, Political Socialization and Trickle-Down Value Change. *British Journal of Political Science*, 49(1), 17–36

Session 4 | Education: Participation and the Educational Cleavage

Monday, September 21

- ☒ Persson, M. (2015). Education and Political Participation. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(3), 689–703
- ☒ Lindgren, K.-O., Oskarsson, S., & Persson, M. (2019). Enhancing Electoral Equality: Can Education Compensate for Family Background Differences in Voting Participation? *American Political Science Review*, 113(1), 108–122
- ☒ Hooghe, L., Marks, G., & Kamphorst, J. (2025). Field of Education and Political Behavior: Predicting GAL/TAN Voting. *American Political Science Review*, 119(2), 794–811
- ☐ Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2025). How Does the Education Cleavage Stack Up against the Classic Cleavages of the Past? [Advance online publication]. *West European Politics*, 1–33 (Skim only.)
- ☐ Inglehart, R. (1977). *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton University Press

Session 5 | Divides among Young Voters: Gender, Race, and the Radical Right

Monday, September 28

- ☒ Dassonneville, R., & McAllister, I. (2026). Is There a 'Youthquake'? The Structure of Party Competition and Age Differences in Voting. *Comparative Political Studies*, 59(1), 193–225
- ☒ Nennstiel, R., & Hudde, A. (2025). Is There a Growing Gender Divide among Young Adults in Regard to Ideological Left–Right Self-Placement? Evidence from 32 European Countries. *European Sociological Review*, 41(6), 862–883
- ☒ Cohen, C. J. (2010). *Democracy Remixed: Black Youth and the Future of American Politics*. Oxford University Press (Chapters 1–3.)
- ☐ Van der Brug, W., Hobolt, S. B., & Popa, S. A. (2026). The kids are alt right? age, authoritarian attitudes and far-right support in europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 33(2), 469–494

- ☐ Milosav, Đ., Dickson, Z., Hobolt, S. B., Klüver, H., Kuhn, T., & Rodon, T. (2026). The Youth Gender Gap in Support for the Far Right. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 33(2), 444–468
- ☐ Off, G., Alexander, A., & Charron, N. (2025). Is There a Gender Youth Gap in Far-Right Voting and Cultural Attitudes? [Advance online publication]. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*
- ☐ Dassonneville, R. (2021). Change and Continuity in the Ideological Gender Gap: A Longitudinal Analysis of Left–Right Self-Placement in OECD Countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 60(1), 225–238
- ☐ Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2000). The Developmental Theory of the Gender Gap: Women’s and Men’s Voting Behavior in Global Perspective. *International Political Science Review*, 21(4), 441–463
- ☐ Campbell, D. E., & Wolbrecht, C. (2006). See Jane Run: Women Politicians as Role Models for Adolescents. *Journal of Politics*, 68(2), 233–247
- ☐ Fraga, B. L. (2018). *The Turnout Gap: Race, Ethnicity, and Political Inequality in a Diversifying America*. Cambridge University Press (Chapters 1–2.)
- ☐ Burn-Murdoch, J. (2024). A New Global Gender Divide Is Emerging [<https://www.ft.com/content/29fd9b5c-2f35-41bf-9d4c-994db4e12998?syn-25a6b1a6=1>]. *Financial Times*

Session 6 | Parties and Youth Wings

Monday, October 5

- ☒ Seeberg, H. B. (2026). Do Politicians Listen to Youth Wings? Evidence from an Elite Experiment. *Journal of Politics*, 88(2)
- ☒ McDonnell, D., Ammassari, S., Valbruzzi, M., Bolin, N., Werner, A., Heinisch, R., Jungar, A.-C., & Wegscheider, C. (2025). Inside Party Youth Wings: The YOUNEM Project. *Party Politics*, 31(6), 1049–1063
- ☒ Bruter, M., & Harrison, S. (2009). *The Future of Our Democracies: Young Party Members in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan
- ☐ Bolin, N. (2025). Influence or support? Member perspectives on youth wings in political parties. *European Political Science*, 24(4), 878–892
- ☐ Hooghe, M., Stolle, D., & Stouthuysen, P. (2004). Head Start in Politics: The Recruitment Function of Youth Organizations of Political Parties in Belgium (Flanders). *Party Politics*, 10(2), 193–212
- ☐ Weber, R. (2020). Why Do Young People Join Parties? The Influence of Individual Resources on Motivation. *Party Politics*, 26(4), 496–509

- Bolin, N., McDonnell, D., Ammassari, S., Werner, A., Valbruzzi, M., Heinisch, R., Jungar, A.-C., & Wegscheider, C. (2026). The added value of youth wings: Do they nurture the members their parties want? *Political Studies*, 00323217261444654
- McDonnell, D., Ammassari, S., Werner, A., Bolin, N., Valbruzzi, M., Ferrinho Lopes, H., Heinisch, R., Jungar, A.-C., & Wegscheider, C. (2025). Young Radicals, Moderates and Aligned: Ideological Congruence and Incongruence in Party Youth Wings. *European Journal of Political Research*, 64(4), 1759–1782
- Marini, S., & Seeberg, H. B. (2026). How Political Parties' Youth Wings Are Organized: Comparative Evidence from 57 Statutes in 11 Countries [Advance online publication]. *West European Politics*
- Kolltveit, K., & Karlsen, R. (2026). Radical or aligned? assessing issue congruence between youth wing elites, parliamentary candidates and voters in norway. *Party Politics*, 32(1), 28–40
- Ammassari, S., McDonnell, D., Bolin, N., Werner, A., Valbruzzi, M., Wegscheider, C., Heinisch, R., & Jungar, A.-C. (2026). Party Youth Wings as Forces of Renovation: A Study of Young Women Members' Efficacy and Ambition [Advance online publication]. *Politics and Gender*
- Ammassari, S., McDonnell, D., Werner, A., Heinisch, R., Valbruzzi, M., & Wegscheider, C. (2026). More social, less material, more influenced by family ties: Why young women join political parties. *European Journal of Political Research*, 1–21
- Ammassari, S., McDonnell, D., & Valbruzzi, M. (2023). It's about the type of career: The political ambition gender gap among youth wing members. *European Journal of Political Research*, 62(4), 1054–1077
- Claessen, C., Bailer, S., & Ohmura, T. (2026). Ambition and Access: Linking Regional Opportunity Structures and Career-Ambitious Youth Party Members [Advance online publication]. *Party Politics*
- Ohmura, T., & Bailer, S. (2023). Power-seeking, networking and competition: Why women do not rise in parties. *West european politics*, 46(5), 897–927
- Bolin, N., & Jungar, A.-C. (2024). A community of people like me. an analysis of members' perceptions of their engagement in party youth wings. *Young*, 32(5), 490–507
- Cross, W., & Young, L. (2008). Factors Influencing the Decision of the Young Politically Engaged to Join a Party: An Investigation of the Canadian Case. *Party Politics*, 14(3), 345–369
- Seeberg, H. B., Ammassari, S., McDonnell, D., Bolin, N., Heinisch, R., Jungar, A.-C., Valbruzzi, M., Wegscheider, C., & Werner, A. (2026). Political Parties and the Political Efficacy among Members of Political Parties' Youth Wings [Advance online publication]. *Party Politics*

Monday, October 12. Mid-semester holiday, no class. University closed.

Session 7 | Youth Representation: The Supply and Demand of Young Candidates

Monday, October 19

- ✓ Stockemer, D., & Sundström, A. (2022). *Youth without Representation: The Absence of Young Adults in Parliaments, Cabinets, and Candidacies* [Open access]. University of Michigan Press (Chapters 1–3.)
- ✓ McClean, C. T. (2025). Does Youth Representation Matter for Social Spending? [Advance online publication]. *Journal of Politics*
- ✓ Eshima, S., & Smith, D. M. (2022). Just a Number? Voter Evaluations of Age in Candidate-Choice Experiments. *Journal of Politics*, 84(3), 1856–1861
- ✓ Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2025). *Youth Participation in National Parliaments 2025* (<https://www.ipu.org/resources/publications/reports/2026-04/youth-participation-in-national-parliaments-2025>). Geneva
- ✓ *World Age Representation in Parliaments Dataset* [<https://www.warpdataset.com/>]. (n.d.).
- ✓ *World Age Representation in Cabinet (WARC) Dataset* [<https://warcdataset.com/>]. (n.d.).
- Mansbridge, J. (1999). Should Blacks Represent Blacks and Women Represent Women? A Contingent “Yes”. *The Journal of Politics*, 61(3), 628–657
- Kurz, K. R., & Anlar, B. (Eds.). (2026). *Youth Political Representation: A Global Perspective on Young Adults’ Presence in Political Institutions*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Stockemer, D., & Sundström, A. (2025). Age Inequalities in Political Representation: A Review Article. *Government and Opposition*, 60(1), 271–288
- McClean, C. T., Sundström, A., & Stockemer, D. (Forthcoming). Youth Representation and Democratic Legitimacy. *British Journal of Political Science*
- Sundström, A., & Stockemer, D. (2021). Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Explaining Youths’ Relative Absence in Legislatures. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 54(2), 195–201
- Lawless, J. L., & Fox, R. L. (2015). *Running from Office: Why Young Americans Are Turned Off to Politics*. Oxford University Press (Chapters 1–2.)
- Shames, S. L. (2017). *Out of the Running: Why Millennials Reject Political Careers and Why It Matters*. NYU Press

- ☐ McClean, C. T., & Ono, Y. (2024). Too young to run? voter evaluations of the age of candidates. *Political Behavior*, 46(4), 2333–2355
- ☐ Sipinen, J., Belschner, J., & Anlar, B. (2024). Age Gaps in Political Representation: Comparing Local and National Elections. *Electoral Studies*, 88, 102763
- ☐ Sevi, S. (2021). Do Young Voters Vote for Young Leaders? *Electoral Studies*, 69, 102200
- ☐ Belschner, J. (2024). Too Young to Win? Exploring the Sources of Age-Related Electoral Disadvantage. *Electoral Studies*, 88, 102748
- ☐ Stockemer, D., & Sundström, A. (2018). Age Representation in Parliaments: Can Institutions Pave the Way for the Young? *European Political Science Review*, 10(3), 467–490
- ☐ Stockemer, D., & Anlar, B. (2024). The Political Representation of Young Adults: Explaining Youth's Under-Representation in Parties, Candidacies and Parliaments. *Electoral Studies*, 90, 102836
- ☐ Anlar, B. (2024). Time, Money, and Support: Exploring Young Adult Representation in State Legislatures. *Electoral Studies*, 91, 102845
- ☐ Stockemer, D., Thompson, H., & Sundström, A. (2023). Young adults' under-representation in elections to the us house of representatives. *Electoral Studies*, 81, 102554
- ☐ Curry, J. M., & Haydon, M. R. (2018). Lawmaker Age, Issue Salience, and Senior Representation in Congress. *American Politics Research*, 46(4), 567–595

Session 8 | Democratic Support, Disaffection, and Polarization

Monday, October 26

Paper proposal and annotated bibliography due today.

- ☒ Foa, R. S., & Mounk, Y. (2016). The Danger of Deconsolidation: The Democratic Disconnect. *Journal of Democracy*, 27(3), 5–17
- ☒ Wuttke, A., Gavras, K., & Schoen, H. (2022). Have Europeans Grown Tired of Democracy? New Evidence from Eighteen Consolidated Democracies, 1981–2018. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52(1), 416–428
- ☒ Claassen, C., & Magalhães, P. C. (2023). Public Support for Democracy in the United States Has Declined Generationally. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 87(3), 719–732
- ☐ Foa, R. S., Klassen, A., Wenger, D., Rand, A., & Slade, M. (2020). *Youth and Satisfaction with Democracy: Reversing the Democratic Disconnect?* Centre for the Future of Democracy, University of Cambridge. Cambridge

- ☐ Fernández Guzmán Grassi, E., Portos, M., & Felicetti, A. (2024). Young People's Attitudes towards Democracy and Political Participation: Evidence from a Cross-European Study. *Government and Opposition*, 59(2), 582–604
- ☐ Huttunen, J., & Saikkonen, I. (2023). Are the Young Undemocratic? Evidence from a Conjoint Experiment. *Representation*, 59(4), 707–723
- ☐ Cammaerts, B., Bruter, M., Banaji, S., Harrison, S., & Anstead, N. (2014). The Myth of Youth Apathy: Young Europeans' Critical Attitudes toward Democratic Life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(5), 645–664
- ☐ Phillips, J. (2022). Affective Polarization: Over Time, Through the Generations, and During the Lifespan. *Political Behavior*, 44(3), 1483–1508
- ☐ Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge University Press (Chapters 1–2.)

Session 9 | Protest, Climate, and Environmental Politics

Monday, November 2

- ☒ Earl, J., Maher, T. V., & Elliott, T. (2017). Youth, Activism, and Social Movements. *Sociology Compass*, 11(4), e12465
- ☒ Pickard, S. (2019). *Politics, Protest and Young People: Political Participation and Dissent in 21st Century Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan (pp. 407-444).
- ☒ Sloam, J. (2014). 'The Outraged Young': Young Europeans, Civic Engagement and the New Media in a Time of Crisis. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(2), 217–231
- ☒ Fisher, D. R. (2019). The Broader Importance of #FridaysForFuture. *Nature Climate Change*, 9(6), 430–431
- ☐ Fisher, D. R., & Nasrin, S. (2021). Climate Activism and Its Effects. *WIREs Climate Change*, 12(1), e683
- ☐ de Moor, J., Uba, K., Wahlström, M., Wennerhag, M., & De Vydt, M. (Eds.). (2020). *Protest for a Future II: Composition, Mobilization and Motives of the Participants in Fridays For Future Climate Protests* (Research report)
- ☐ Wahlström, M., Kocyba, P., De Vydt, M., & de Moor, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Protest for a Future: Composition, Mobilization and Motives of the Participants in Fridays For Future Climate Protests* (Research report)
- ☐ Valentim, A. (Forthcoming). Repeated exposure and protest outcomes: How fridays for future protests influenced voters [Conditionally Accepted]. *American Journal of Political Science*. osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/m6dpg_v2

- ☐ Honwana, A. (2013). *Youth and Revolution in Tunisia*. Bloomsbury
- ☐ Howarth, R. B. (2011). Intergenerational Justice. In J. S. Dryzek, R. B. Norgaard, & D. Schlosberg (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Climate Change and Society*. Oxford University Press

Session 10 | Youth in the Digital Sphere

Monday, November 9

- ☒ Boulianne, S., & Theocharis, Y. (2020). Young People, Digital Media, and Engagement: A Meta-Analysis of Research. *Social Science Computer Review*, 38(2), 111–127
- ☒ Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less Than You Think: Prevalence and Predictors of Fake News Dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances*, 5(1), eaau4586
- ☒ Nyhan, B., Settle, J., Thorson, E., Wojcieszak, M., Barberá, P., Chen, A. Y., Allcott, H., Brown, T., Crespo-Tenorio, A., Dimmery, D., et al. (2023). Like-minded sources on facebook are prevalent but not polarizing. *Nature*, 620(7972), 137–144
- ☐ Boulianne, S. (2015). Social Media Use and Participation: A Meta-Analysis of Current Research. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 524–538
- ☐ Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2013). *The Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics*. Cambridge University Press
- ☐ 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
- ☐ Vromen, A. (2017). *Digital Citizenship and Political Engagement: The Challenge from Online Campaigning and Advocacy Organisations*. Palgrave Macmillan
- ☐ Guess, A. M., et al. (2023). How Do Social Media Feed Algorithms Affect Attitudes and Behavior in an Election Campaign? *Science*, 381(6656), 398–404
- ☐ Munger, K., & Phillips, J. (2022). Right-Wing YouTube: A Supply and Demand Perspective. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 27(1), 186–219

Session 11 | Guest Session

Monday, November 16

Guest speaker. Topic and readings to be announced.

Session 12 | Reforms: Votes at 16, Quotas, and Civic Education

Monday, November 23

- ✓ Mo, C. H., Holbein, J. B., & Elder, E. M. (2022). Civilian National Service Programs Can Powerfully Increase Youth Voter Turnout. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(29), e2122996119
- ✓ Wagner, M., Johann, D., & Kritzinger, S. (2012). Voting at 16: Turnout and the Quality of Vote Choice. *Electoral Studies*, 31(2), 372–383
- ✓ Neundorff, A., Niemi, R. G., & Smets, K. (2016). The Compensation Effect of Civic Education on Political Engagement: How Civics Classes Make Up for Missing Parental Socialization. *Political Behavior*, 38(4), 921–949
- Belschner, J., & Garcia de Paredes, M. (2021). Hierarchies of Representation: The Re-Distributive Effects of Gender and Youth Quotas. *Representation*, 57(1), 1–20
- Eichhorn, J., & Bergh, J. (Eds.). (2021). *Lowering the Voting Age to 16: Learning from Real Experiences Worldwide*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Zeglovits, E., & Aichholzer, J. (2014). Are People More Inclined to Vote at 16 than at 18? Evidence for the First-Time Voting Boost among 16- to 25-Year-Olds in Austria. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 24(3), 351–361
- Bergh, J. (2013). Does Voting Rights Affect the Political Maturity of 16- and 17-Year-Olds? Findings from the 2011 Norwegian Voting-Age Trial. *Electoral Studies*, 32(1), 90–100
- Campbell, D. E. (2019). What Social Scientists Have Learned about Civic Education: A Review of the Literature. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(1), 32–47
- Campbell, D. E., & Niemi, R. G. (2016). Testing Civics: State-Level Civic Education Requirements and Political Knowledge. *American Political Science Review*, 110(3), 495–511
- Tremmel, J., Mason, A., Godli, P. H., & Dimitrijoski, I. (Eds.). (2015). *Youth Quotas and Other Efficient Forms of Youth Participation in Ageing Societies*. Springer (Introduction)
- Zaidane, L. (2024). Their Generation: The Promise of Younger Elected Officials [<https://democracyjournal.org/magazine/73/their-generation-the-promise-of-younger-elected-officials/>]. *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas*, (73)

Wednesday, November 25 to Sunday, November 29. Fall Recess (Thanksgiving). Classes resume Monday, November 30.

Session 13 | Paper Workshop I

Monday, November 30

Session 14 | Paper Workshop II and Conclusions

Monday, December 7

7. Course Policies

Expectations

Students should plan on spending approximately 6-9 hours a week on assignments, readings, projects, etc. in addition to the 2.5 hours of instructional time.

Please feel free to email me with your questions and concerns, and/or to schedule a time to meet over Zoom. When sending emails please remember to follow the guidelines outlined below.

Check the syllabus. Before sending your email or message, be sure that your question has not already been addressed in the syllabus or announcements.

Be patient. If you have a concern and send me a message, you can expect a response within up to 3 business days. Please allow 3 business days for assessment submission feedback.

Specify subject. The subject line should include the topic of the message and class title.

Check writing. Proofread (i.e., grammar and spelling) your message before sending.

To promote the highest degree of education possible, we ask each student to respect the opinions and thoughts of other students and be courteous in the way that you choose to express yourself. Students should be respectful and considerate of all opinions.

In order for us to have meaningful discussions, we must learn to genuinely try to understand what others are saying and be open-minded about others' opinions. If you want to persuade someone to see things differently, it is much more effective to do so in a polite, non-threatening way rather than to do so antagonistically. Everyone has insights to offer based on his/her experiences, and we can all learn from each other. Civility is essential.

Attendance

Attendance is expected but not mandatory.

Accessibility and Inclusion

One of the central tenets of Georgetown's educational mission is *cura personalis*, a Latin phrase meaning "care of the whole person." Georgetown is committed to showing care and concern for each student by creating an inclusive and accessible learning environ-

ment that follows universal design principles to meet the needs of its diverse student body.

I am committed to creating a learning environment for my students that supports a diversity of thoughts, perspectives and experiences, and honors your identities (including race, gender, class, sexuality, religion, ability, etc.). If your name or pronoun needs to be corrected, please let me know early in the semester so that I can make the appropriate changes to my records.

Students with Disabilities

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, individuals with disabilities have the right to specific accommodations that do not fundamentally alter the nature of the course. Some accommodations might include note takers, books on tape, extended time on assignments, and interpreter services among others. Students are responsible for communicating their needs to the [Academic Resource Center](#), the office that oversees disability support services (202-687-8354; arc@georgetown.edu; before the start of classes to allow time to review the documentation and make recommendations for appropriate accommodations. The University is not responsible for making special accommodations for students who have not declared their disabilities and have not requested an accommodation in a timely manner. Also, the University need not modify course or degree requirements considered to be an essential requirement of the program of instruction. For the most current and up-to-date policy information, please refer to the [Georgetown University Academic Resource Center website](#). Students are highly encouraged to discuss the documentation and accommodation process with an Academic Resource Center administrator.

Academic Resources

The Writing Center (Lauinger Library 217A; 202-687-4246; writingcenter.georgetown.edu) offers free consultations at any stage of the writing process, including before drafting has begun. Students are encouraged to make use of this service.

Title IX/Sexual Misconduct

Georgetown University and its faculty are committed to supporting survivors and those impacted by sexual misconduct, which includes sexual assault, sexual harassment, relationship violence, and stalking. Georgetown requires faculty members, unless otherwise designated as confidential, to report all disclosures of sexual misconduct to the University Title IX Coordinator or a Deputy Title IX Coordinator. If you disclose an incident of sexual misconduct to a professor in or outside of the classroom (with the exception of disclosures in papers), that faculty member must report the incident to the Title IX

Coordinator, or Deputy Title IX Coordinator. The coordinator will, in turn, reach out to the student to provide support, resources, and the option to meet. Please note that the student is not required to meet with the Title IX coordinator. More information about reporting options and resources can be found on the [Sexual Misconduct Resource Center website](#).

If you would prefer to speak to someone confidentially, Georgetown has a number of fully confidential professional resources that can provide support and assistance. These resources include:

- Health Education Services for Sexual Assault Response and Prevention: confidential email sarp@georgetown.edu
- Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS): 202.687.6985 or after hours, call (833) 960-3006 to reach Fonemed, a telehealth service; individuals may ask for the on-call CAPS clinician

More information about reporting options and resources can be found on the [Sexual Misconduct Website](#).

Course Materials

Syllabi, slides, and recordings for this course are my intellectual property and are for your use in the course. Please do not redistribute or post them.

Support Services

If you are experiencing academic or personal difficulty, please contact me or Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS) at 202-687-6985. Students are encouraged to seek support early.