

Policy & Politics

How Young People can Shape Environmental Policy in Urban Spaces

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	POLICYPOL-D-23-00252R2
Article Type:	Original article
Full Title:	How Young People can Shape Environmental Policy in Urban Spaces
First Author:	James Sloam
Corresponding Author:	James Sloam UNITED KINGDOM
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	James.Sloam@rhul.ac.uk
Other Authors:	Matt Henn
Abstract:	<p>Younger generations have become increasingly disillusioned with mainstream democratic politics in established democracies. Although young people are interested in politics and engaged in many issue-based forms of participation, it is hard for them to realise the fruits of their labour at the national level. Local democracy may provide a better opportunity for engaging effectively in the issues that affect young people's everyday lives. This article examines how Public Value approaches work in practice for young people whose voices are usually excluded from the policy-making process. The research adopted a complex large-scale multi-stage qualitative design, that involved focus groups and interviews with young people and local civic leaders from across London. It used participatory research with young Londoners from traditionally marginalised groups. The research revealed that, although policy-makers face important structural challenges, such as the concentration of power and resources in Westminster, they have the potential to move beyond tokenistic engagement with young people. In particular, the results showed how civic and local authorities can build efficacy and trust through initiatives that provide opportunities for deliberation and the co-creation of public policy. In this way, the article makes a clear contribution to our understanding of the role of young people in environmentalism and their democratic value.</p>
Keywords:	Young People; Participatory Governance; Public Value; London; Environmental Policy; Environmentalism; Exclusion; policy-making
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Conflicts of Interest Please declare any possible conflicts of interest, or state 'The Author(s) declare(s) that there is no conflict of interest' if there are none. Further information about conflicts of interest can be found in our Ethical Guidelines .	The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.
Word Count Submissions must not exceed 8,000 words, including all tables.	7999
Special issue	No

<p>Is this a submission for a special issue? If so please give details of the special issue, including the Editor if known.</p>	
<p>Twitter</p> <p>Are you on Twitter? If so, and you are happy for us to follow you, please give us your Twitter name (and follow us @policy_politics).</p>	<p>@james_sloam; @MattHenn2011</p>
<p>Provide a tweet</p> <p>Please provide a tweet for @policy_politics to send out about your article, so that we can help promote your work as widely as possible. The tweet should summarise the key findings of your article in laymen's terms, and be no longer than 130 characters.</p> <p>The tweet can be provided with the final version of the article.</p>	<p>New research on the benefits, barriers and opportunities for integrating youth voice into the making of public policy</p>
<p>Research Ethics Statement</p> <p>Please advise if any clearance was granted by your institution or an external ethics committee and provide a statement detailing the approval granted. If your research involved human participants but you did not obtain formal ethics approval, please include a statement to that effect giving the reason. If your paper is accepted, the ethics statement will be included in your published paper.</p> <p>For more information on ethical research practices please see the BUP Guidelines on Ethical Research</p> <p>Examples of ethics statements which could be used are:</p> <p>'This study has [ETHICS COMMITTEE or INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD] approval (XX Ref No: xxxx/xxx)' or</p> <p>'Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee at [UNIVERSITY OF XXX]' or</p> <p>'Permission to conduct the interviews for the purposes of this research was</p>	<p>Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee at Royal Holloway University. Permission to conduct the interviews for the purposes of this research was obtained from all participants, who were fully informed about the purposes of this research and how their responses would be used and stored by the Greater London Authority (for the focus groups with young people) and Royal Holloway University (for the interviews with policy-makers).</p>

<p>obtained from all participants, who were fully informed about the purposes of this research and how their responses would be used and stored.' or</p> <p>'Written informed consent was obtained for anonymized patient information to be published in this article ' or</p> <p>'Ethical approval was not sought for the present study because [REASON]'. </p>		
<p>Artificial Intelligence (AI)</p> <p>The use of AI tools must be explicitly declared and detailed when submitting a manuscript. We do not recognise AI as meeting the conditions of authorship, and authors are expected to bear full responsibility for ensuring the originality and accuracy of their work.</p> <p>For more information, see our Ethical Guidelines.</p> <p>Please use the tick boxes to indicate if you have used AI tools in writing your manuscript, creating figures or tables, or in the collection and analysis of data.</p>	<p>I have not used AI tools to prepare my submission</p>	
<p>Funding Information:</p>	<p>British Academy (VSPFoFGC1\100020)</p>	<p>James Sloam</p>
<p>Response to Reviewers:</p>	<p>We have accepted your helpful suggestions regarding the abstract, title and keywords, which we will - we hope - enhance the appeal of the article. We have added all the documents and additions at the end of the main manuscript as specified in the last email. Best regards, James and Matt</p>	

How Young People can Shape Environmental Policy in Urban Spaces

Professor James Sloam (Royal Holloway University)

Professor Matt Henn (Nottingham Trent University)

Abstract: Younger generations have become increasingly disillusioned with mainstream democratic politics in established democracies. Although young people are interested in politics and engaged in many issue-based forms of participation, it is hard for them to realise the fruits of their labour at the national level. Local democracy may provide a better opportunity for engaging effectively in the issues that affect young people's everyday lives. This article examines how Public Value approaches work in practice for young people whose voices are usually excluded from the policy-making process. The research adopted a complex large-scale multi-stage qualitative design, that involved focus groups and interviews with young people and local civic leaders from across London. It used participatory research with young Londoners from traditionally marginalised groups. The research revealed that, although policy-makers face important structural challenges, such as the concentration of power and resources in Westminster, they have the potential to move beyond tokenistic engagement with young people. In particular, the results showed how civic and local authorities can build efficacy and trust through initiatives that provide opportunities for deliberation and the co-creation of public policy. In this way, the article makes a clear contribution to our understanding of the role of young people in environmentalism and their democratic value.

Keywords: Young People; Participatory Governance; Public Value; London; Environmental policy; Environmentalism, Exclusion; policy-making

How Young People can Shape Environmental Policy in Urban Spaces

Introduction

The 2021 United Nations Conference on Climate Change (COP26) closed with an agreement on efforts to reduce carbon emissions and address a potential catastrophic global warming. Without commenting on the nature of the agreement, two points are clear. First, compared to their older contemporaries, younger generations are more concerned about, and politically active on, the issue of climate change (Barford et al. 2021; Henn et al. 2022). Second, the implementation of environmental policy agreed at COP26 will largely need to take place at a sub-national level with the support of emerging adults, who will need to adapt their behaviour for countries to hit Net Zero goals (Kythreotis 2021; Sloam 2020). The aim of this article is to investigate how, by harnessing youth support for action on climate change, we can achieve sustainable public policy in the places where we live.

During COP26, there were many insightful narratives concerning young people's leadership of grass-roots initiatives across the world. In contrast, there is a relative absence of research on how young people are engaging with local and civic authorities on these issues, or how the voices of under-represented and marginalised groups of young people can be amplified to ensure a just transition to a Green economy.¹ This article helps to fill this research gap. It examines *youth engagement in environmental issues*, shedding new light upon how – in which spaces and under what conditions – it can shape sustainable local environmental policy.

The practical benefits of youth engagement in public policy are beginning to be recognised on every plane of governance: from the United Nations (2018) to the OECD (2020a), to local councils and city authorities across the UK (Local Government Association 2023). In the context of the COVID-19 recovery and the Green Transition, it has become more generally accepted that the voices of young people (including those from traditionally marginalised communities) are integral to the development of future-oriented, sustainable public policy (OECD 2020a; Sloam 2023). But how can civic authorities move beyond mere *tokenism* and effectively engage with younger generations? This article addresses this question from both sides of the equation, through research co-produced with the Greater London Authority and the London Mayor's Office. This involved a complex large-scale multi-stage qualitative

¹ Youth Councils provide a potential channel to convey young people's views to local environmentally-focused policy-communities (Augsberger et al. 2024). However, these are often criticised for their narrow social membership that does not reflect the diversity of local youth populations, and for offering only 'tokenistic' forms of political participation (Freeman and Aitken-Rose 2005; Taft and Gordon 2013).

1 research design. This included interviews and focus groups conducted by young peer researchers with
2 145 young Londoners from traditionally marginalised groups, and a series of eight semi-structured
3 interviews with officials in civic authorities and civil society actors in London.
4

5 Examining the value of a Public Value approach to policy-making (Ansell and Torfing 2021) that
6 advocates active participatory methods, the article begins by providing context by focusing on young
7 people’s participation in the environmental movement. There is then an examination of Public Value
8 and how this offers the backdrop for the benefits to be gained by creating meaningful opportunities
9 for young people’s engagement in local environmental policy-making. Following that, we offer an
10 analysis of the role of place and the city as a site for rejuvenating democracy (whilst recognising the
11 many challenges this might entail). The article then discusses how the fieldwork with young Londoners
12 and policy-makers across the city was conducted. The results explore young people’s perspectives on
13 environmental issues and environmental policy-making, and efforts by London’s civic authorities to
14 amplify youth voice in this area. They indicate that young people lack optimism that their voices carry
15 much weight in local environmental policy-making; this sense of pessimism is compounded by the
16 views expressed by local authority and civic leaders, who would like to involve young people in such
17 dialogue and decision-making processes, but who remain unsure how to initiate such engagement.
18 Nonetheless, there is measured optimism that emerges from the research at a general level – that
19 young people are very motivated to engage in such conversations and processes. Our research
20 suggests that providing opportunities for young people to learn about environmental issues and
21 incorporating the development of civic skills and the co-design of public policy are especially important
22 in generating effective youth participation.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Young People, Political Participation and Environmental Activism**

42 Young people have become disillusioned with mainstream electoral politics over several decades
43 (Henn et al. 2018). In most established democracies, youth voter turnout and membership of political
44 parties has declined significantly (Sloam and Henn 2019),² and younger generations have turned to
45 alternative forms of political participation: from the ballot box to the streets, to the Internet and social
46 media (Norris 2002; Castells 2015; Bennett and Segerberg 2013).
47
48
49
50

51 Opinion is divided on the extent to which we should be concerned about these developments. Indeed,
52 there is an on-going debate on whether or not young people are becoming politically apathetic, or
53
54
55
56

57
58 ² Although notable exceptions include the ‘youthquake’ at the 2017 UK General Election, where veteran left-
59 wing Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn inspired the highest rate of youth support in a quarter of a century (Sloam
60 and Henn 2019).
61

1 whether they retain an interest in politics but are feeling increasingly alienated from the institutions
2 and processes of electoral politics because of their distrust in politicians (eg, Dahl et al. 2019; Henn
3 and Oldfield 2016). Furthermore, some authors have pointed to the negative cycle of low youth
4 electoral turnout and party membership (Patterson 2009; Van Biezen et al. 2012) – parties and
5 politicians are more likely to neglect groups that do not vote, potentially feeding further
6 disillusionment amongst young people. However, others emphasize the positive influence of *engaged*
7 *citizens* and issue-based forms of participation (Dalton 2015; Sloam and Henn 2019).

8
9
10
11
12 Regarding issue-based participation, the role of place is central. Several scholars have highlighted the
13 significance of ‘everyday politics’ in shaping youth civic and political engagement in the cities, towns
14 and neighbourhoods in which they live (Bang 2005; Boyte 2010; Li and Marsh 2008). According to
15 Wray-Lake, ‘youth learn to be political by forming attachments to their communities and accessing
16 opportunities in the settings of their everyday lives’ (2019: 137). This is confirmed by the large upturn
17 in local volunteering in many countries in recent years (Dalton 2015; Department for Culture Media
18 and Sport 2021).

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Yet, on closer inspection, the picture is not so promising. First, there are large inequalities of
27 participation between those young people with high levels of educational attainment and those from
28 socio-economically advantaged backgrounds when compared with their contemporaries from less
29 advantaged backgrounds (Sander and Putnam 2010; Dalton 2015). Second, the rate of youth
30 interactions with politicians and officials is very low when compared to that of older generations
31 (Sloam 2014a), so that local politics (as well as public consultations in local areas) tends to be
32 dominated by older, more affluent, male and white citizens (Tonkens & Verhoeven 2019;
33 Intergenerational Foundation 2020).

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Intergenerational inequalities of political participation have been exacerbated by recent global events. Evidence indicates that successive waves of crisis (Sloam and O’Loughlin 2022) – the 2008 banking crash and subsequent austerity in public spending, the COVID-19 pandemic, and climate change – have had a profound impact on younger generations, serving to make their lives more precarious (Bessant et al. 2017; Cowie and Myers 2021; OECD 2020b). These waves of crisis have precipitated corresponding waves of political protest; these include expressions of outrage at financial inequalities and corruption after the 2008 financial crisis (Occupy Wall Street, the Spanish Indignados and many more), at racial discrimination and oppression in all its forms (Black Lives Matter), and at the lack of progress on action to combat climate change (#FridaysforFuture) (Sloam 2014b; Castells 2015, Della Volve 2022).

1 A significant body of literature has emerged to explain the climate strikes and youth environmental
2 activism that has taken place since 2019 (Pickard 2019). For example, Grasso and Giugni's *Routledge*
3 *Handbook of Environmental Movements* (2022), as well as special issues of the *Journal of Youth Studies*
4 (Sloam et al. 2022) and *Frontiers in Political Science* (Henn and Pickard 2023), provide invaluable
5 investigations of common trends and individual case studies from a wide range of perspectives. These
6 shed light on who, why and how so many young people became involved in environmental activism
7 over such a short space of time (Boulianne and Ohme 2022; Flanagan et al. 2022 Pickard et al. 2022).

8
9
10
11
12 Of course, not all young people are environmental activists - some young people are not civically or
13 politically engaged or simply have other political priorities (Arya and Henn 2021). There is also a large
14 group of young people who feel overwhelmed by the scale of the climate crisis, and research indicates
15 that this can lead to a sense of fatalism, anxiety (with implications for mental health) and inaction
16 (Hayward 2020; Hickman et al. 2021). Indeed, the experience of COP26 was a negative one for many
17 young people. Climate protestors continued to scorn the efforts of national governments for not going
18 far or fast enough. For instance, at a rally outside the Conference venue, youth activist Greta Thunberg
19 told fellow protestors: 'Change is not going to come from inside there. That is not leadership - this is
20 leadership' (BBC News 2021). The inclusion of the voices of young people (other than to provide
21 emotional pleas for action) in complex negotiations between national governments, international
22 organisations, large companies, and even large environmental campaign groups, was always a high
23 bar to clear.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Published research indicates that political engagement at the *local* level on different issues has the
potential to generate a greater sense of efficacy amongst young participants than is the case at
national and international levels, as they are more likely to achieve tangible change within their
communities (Brady et al. 2020; Wray-Lake 2019). Despite the absence of empirical evidence, we
might reasonably expect them to feel equally predisposed to engage with *local environmental* issues.
Furthermore, it makes sense that these 'micro-territories of the local' (Harris and Wyn 2009) are likely
to be more appealing for those from less privileged backgrounds. Indeed, our own research for this
article has found that traditionally marginalised groups of young people do not always feel
represented by the global climate movement, which – in the words of one of the interviewees quoted
below – 'has a very white face'. In this article, the focus on urban environmental activism provides a
more level playing field for young people from diverse backgrounds.

Public Value and Young People's Engagement with (Local) Public Policy-making

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

To address the opportunities for young people to engage meaningfully in local environmental policy-making – and to assess the potential barriers and value in doing so - this article draws on public policy literature to provide a theoretical framework for this study. Ansell and Torfing (2021) emphasise how, in recent decades, the dominant New Public Management approach has been challenged by ideas of Public Value, which recast the role of the citizen as an active participant in the making of public policy. From the perspective of youth engagement, many public bodies now support efforts to integrate youth voice into the *co-design* and/or the *co-production* of a more inclusive and sustainable public policy. According to Ansell and Torfing, what they describe as ‘co-creation’ in governance, aims to:

‘construct a new interface between the state and the public sphere that harnesses both the public sector’s attempt to engage citizens and relevant stakeholders in an open-ended problem-oriented dialogue and the efforts of citizens and stakeholders to engage public authorities in community-based problem-solving strategies’ (Ansell and Torfing 2021:7).

Yet genuine co-creation with citizens – including young people from traditionally marginalised groups – is not always easy to achieve. For instance, Abels (2007) has observed that such active collaborative processes often use non-representative selection methods, and this may be problematic, essentially deepening structural inequalities within such participatory efforts. Elsewhere, authors have cautioned that such processes may be tokenistic - often limited by their scope and substance, and re-producing existing power relations (Farr 2013; Monno and Khakee 2012; Osborne et al. 2016). In this article we explore the extent to which this takes place in practice, and investigate the hurdles that are placed (however unintentionally) in the path of open-ended and problem-oriented dialogue.

To do so, we employ Hart’s (1992) seminal UNICEF report, which characterises youth engagement with policy-makers as a ‘ladder of participation’ (drawing on Arnstein 1969). The lowest steps of the ladder, ‘manipulation, decoration and tokenism’ are described as de facto ‘non-participation’, where children get no real say in the policy-making process. Genuine participation (‘degrees of participation’) involves, at the bare minimum, information exchange and consultation and, at best, young person-initiated policy and shared ownership of the decision-making process. Whilst not all policies that affect young people can involve the highest degree of participation, the ladder is helpful in shining a light on when and how young people are involved in the policy process.

From a young person’s perspective, we investigate the mechanisms for effective public value or participatory approaches through the concepts of *internal* and *external* efficacy (Balch 1974). Operationalizing *internal efficacy* requires a focus on young people’s belief in their ability to participate effectively. Operationalizing *external efficacy* requires a focus on young people’s belief that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

by engaging with policy-makers, they can make a difference by informing and shaping policy. In this regard, we feel that the onus is placed on policy-makers to pro-actively ensure that young people develop the skills, knowledge and opportunities for engagement that are necessary to enable effective participatory governance.

Youth, Sustainability and the Promise of Urban Democracy

The points made above are important because evidence demonstrates that youth participation can increase the *quality* of public policy. According to Elinor Ostrom (2009), Nobel Prize-winner for economics: ‘There is no reason to believe that bureaucrats and politicians, no matter how well meaning, are better at solving problems than the people on the spot, who have the strongest incentive to get the solution right’. In general, it is young people who have the most to gain by solving environmental problems in the places where they live - since by definition, this generation will be expected to outlive their older contemporaries and to experience environmental degradation for longer (Swim et al. 2022). But to what extent do cities offer opportunities for youth participation in policy-making?

There is a large body of work – heavily concentrated in the United States – on the promise of urban democracy. Archon Fung (2009) in his seminal work on civic participation in Chicago, highlighted the ways in which civic groups can influence public policy in their neighbourhoods. Whilst the need to strengthen and democratise local government in the UK has been recognised for some time (Phillips 1996; Stoker 1996), there is little empirical literature on this subject. Most studies have focused on the work of local action groups or broader social movements to improve public services – for example, to save local green spaces or skate parks from closure (Sloam 2019) – rather than policy interactions with local or civic authorities. The few existing studies of youth engagement with local authorities concentrate on the liminal existence of children in an adult world (Weller 2006).

We have discussed above how policy-makers and academics have increasingly recognised the justice and utility of strengthening youth voice. Nonetheless, doing so does not come without potential drawbacks. For instance, evidence indicates that there is unequal engagement with, and participation in, urban democracy and that this problem is a feature that is present in all countries. According to Tonkens and Verhoeven (2019: 1596), ‘Research on civic engagement consistently shows that citizens active in urban neighbourhoods are not representative... Middle-aged, higher educated, white men are often over-represented.’ Conversely, the voices of young people – especially those from poorer communities and ethnic minority backgrounds – are often ignored (O’Toole et. al. 2013). In London, for example, the *urban renaissance* after the 1990s (often deliberately) excluded young people from

1 poorer communities, as illustrated by the gentrification of large parts of Newham in the run-up to the
2 2012 Olympic Games (Kennelly and Watt 2012).

3
4 Brady et al. (2020) provide one of the few comparative studies of attempts by civic authorities to
5 engage young people – in their case, ‘marginalized urban youth’ in London, Belfast and Dublin – in
6 decision-making at the city level. Although they point to some successes in youth engagement through
7 a wide variety of initiatives, such as deliberative forums, volunteering, and expression through the
8 arts, they also identify some areas of particular concern: youth ‘alienation’ from institutions, ‘capacity
9 and resource limitations’, ‘challenges of inclusion’ and ‘ritual rather than real engagement’ (Brady et
10 al. 2020: 1). With regard to the latter point, it is evident that *tokenistic* inclusion of young people is
11 common and that genuine two-way interactions with tangible policy outcomes are rare (Loebach
12 2020; Sloam 2020). In this sense, a change of mindset is required amongst policy-makers – from ‘civic
13 participation’ to ‘civic empowerment’ (Wray-Lake and Abrams 2020).
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 The evidence underpins the importance of interconnected policy areas for the everyday lives and
23 politics of young people. This is highlighted in Carmen Sirianni’s (2020) seminal study, *‘Sustainable
24 Cities in American Democracy’*, which investigates environmental policy in American cities over several
25 decades and across many policy areas. In this work, the author highlights the linkages between
26 explicitly environmental policies, such as air and water pollution, and other policy areas, such as public
27 transportation, housing and agriculture, as well as the value of citizen participation for the purposes
28 of building ‘a more robust civic Green New Deal’ (Sirianni 2020: 306). Helpfully, these interconnections
29 have also been recognised by the United Nations in its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which
30 link poverty and hunger, health and well-being and decent work, to more traditional environmental
31 issues such as clean water, clean energy and pollution. Reflecting on sustainability allows us to identify
32 vicious circles (for example, poverty leading to poorly insulated housing and environmental waste)
33 and potential virtuous circles (for example, the insulation of houses, leading to lower heating costs
34 and less use of fossil fuels in heating homes). The academic evidence also supports the quest for
35 greater youth participation, as ‘both a maker and a marker of the progress of city or country to meet
36 the challenge of sustainable development’ (Malone 2015: 18).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Yet, there has been an apparent failure in cities to measure and evaluate initiatives to meet these
50 objectives for youth participation. Cities have made great strides in measuring some environmental
51 targets such as pollution (Holden et al. 2017), but ‘in most cities and countries, we have little idea of
52 the priority issues for young people’ that relate to these wide-ranging goals (London Sustainable
53 Development Commission 2019). Only recently has the academic literature begun to examine what
54 youth participation in cities’ sustainability policies might look like in practice. Nissen et al. (2020), for
55 example, explore common lessons from initiatives in seven cities in the global North and South.
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Moreover, work is also emerging on mechanisms through which youth participation might be more effectively achieved, such as through deliberative exercises with young people and policy-makers (Ataol et al. 2019; Brady et al. 2020; Sloam 2020).

This article addresses these gaps by investigating the views of young people in urban areas on environmental issues, their interactions with policy-makers, and the potential for ‘civic empowerment’ regarding climate issues. To analyse this complex relationship between youth, sustainability and (local) democracy, we focus on the views of young people and policy-makers in London by addressing the following research questions:

1. How do young people (from disadvantaged backgrounds) understand environmental issues within the context of their own lived experiences within their communities and across London?
2. To what extent do pathways exist for young people to influence environmental policy-making in London, and what are the main barriers to effective youth participation?

Methods

The research adopted a complex large-scale multi-stage qualitative research design that involved focus groups and interviews with young people and with local civic leaders from across London.

Data collection

Data collection for this co-produced case study took place between 2019 and 2022 and involved close collaboration with the Greater London Authority – in particular, with the young people working part-time in the Mayor of London’s Peer Outreach Team. The research was founded on participatory research with these young peer outreach workers, who were aged 16 to 24, mostly female, overwhelmingly from racially minoritized backgrounds, and largely from disadvantaged backgrounds. For example, approximately half of the young Peer Outreach Workers (POWs) were care leavers compared to less than two percent of young people nationally. Interviews with 30 of these young people were conducted in Spring 2019. We asked POWs to reflect on top issues facing young people in the UK (YouGov 2019), to prioritise the issues that were most important to them and then to connect them to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, with a focus on challenges that could be addressed locally in London. These interviews generated the themes that were then discussed with 90 participants in a world-café style-event in Summer 2019. The event involved nine focus groups, which were facilitated by the young POWs, and incorporated creative methods (such as

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Lego building) to stimulate conversations. The focus group participants were recruited through the GLA-run *Young Londoners Participation Network* and contained a disproportionately large number of young Londoners from traditionally marginalised groups: over half from low-income areas and approximately two-thirds from racially minoritized backgrounds.³ We obtained an approximately equal mixture of young men and women (43 to 47). One sixth of the sample were aged 16 or 17 (15 in total), a half (46) were aged 18 to 21 and a third (29) were aged 21 to 24 (London Sustainable Development Commission 2019).

In 2021, a further round of four focus groups with 25 young people was conducted, led by a new cohort of GLA POWs. These groups were designed to address young Londoners' views on the environment and action on climate change in the context of the upcoming COP26 Summit. Finally, in March 2022, the research turned to policy-makers, exploring their attitudes towards engaging young people in environmental policy-making and their reflections on any such initiatives that they had implemented. Eight semi-structured interviews were held with these policy-makers, including senior officials based within relevant local authority departments, members of prominent local environmentally-focused social action and civil society groups, and GLA officials responsible for environmental matters across London.

Interpretation and Analysis

To interpret the voices of young Londoners, we adopt a narrative approach, following the work of O'Loughlin and Sloam (2022), which pays attention to the role of 'plot', 'affect' and 'efficacy' for understanding the everyday politics of young people. In this study, the approach focuses our attention on: a) who or what young people hold responsible for the (environmental) challenges they face (*the plot*); b) how they feel about or identify with a particular (environmental) issue (*affect*); and, c) whether they believe that they can make a difference (to influence policy or change) (*efficacy*). We also looked at how young people's perceptions and attitudes altered over time, with the greater prominence given to environmental issues in the run-up to the (2021) COP26 and the climate strike movement, through comparison between the first and second waves of qualitative research. Regarding policy-makers, this approach was less appropriate. Instead, we focussed on the views of these expert practitioners on the opportunities for, and the barriers to, effective youth engagement.

³ The qualitative analysis fed into a set of questions for a representative survey of 16-to24-year-olds in the Capital (N=2,002), fielded by *Survation* in Summer 2019 (London Sustainable Development Commission 2019).

Results

1
2 One of the main themes to emerge from the 2019 interviews and focus groups was that whilst young
3 Londoners cared about the environment, it was not their most pressing concern. One female focus
4 group participant (aged 19) summarised a generally shared view that, 'it is a very ignored issue,
5 because in London now there are more serious issues that we focus on that are life dependent... like
6 housing, or poverty, or crimes.' The one exception, confirmed in our later survey, was air pollution,
7 which was ranked fourth in terms of youth issue saliency – just below *housing, crime* and *mental health*
8 as priorities for government in our subsequent survey (London Sustainable Development Commission
9 2019). The focus groups themselves provided a platform for the young participants to think deeply
10 about environmental issues with their peers. A female participant (aged 18) had built a Lego model,
11 which depicted: 'a person and their little boat and they're trying to get away from all the trash and
12 pollution that we have created... to a greener space where everything's clean and the environment is
13 looked after'. Indeed, the narratives of the young Londoners we spoke to were often constructed in a
14 deeply personal and *affectual* way – for example, being upset with the impact of pollution on a family
15 member's asthma.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Young Londoners expressed different attitudes to the environment depending upon their social class
28 and where they lived in the city; they also connected the environment to broader issues associated
29 with 'poor and ignored' neighbourhoods. For example, participants talked about a lack of recycling
30 and of their concerns about rubbish on the streets in what they described as 'shit neighbourhoods'.
31 Poverty and underfunded public services were seen as the driving forces behind the challenges they
32 faced – and that poorer places in London were being ignored and left behind by local and national
33 power-holders. Regarding environmental issues, one young man (aged 18) commented: 'you've got
34 the Boris bikes⁴, which are great, but they're only for a certain area... They need to bring it to South
35 London... where people do actually need this transportation'.
36
37

38
39
40
41
42
43
44 Environmental issues were often quite explicitly linked to the other key priorities. With respect to
45 crime and personal safety, one young woman (aged 21) complained that 'bus stops are closing, buses
46 are passing by in neighbourhoods that are deemed as unsafe or deprived in a way'. Mental health was
47 often mentioned: 'the environment is a big part, because it is constantly adding and decreasing to
48 either our emotional state or our health and the way we function as a society' (female, aged 19).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

⁴ This hire scheme was launched by the Mayor of London – Boris Johnson – in the capital in 2010 to encourage greater bicycle use and reduce motor vehicle traffic (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-53577750>).

1 from one participant that these offered ‘a space with your community that really de-stresses you’
2 (female participant, aged 18).
3

4 The visualization of the world café discussions by an artist who attended the event (Figure 1) illustrates
5 the points above. First, environmental issues were linked to local or city-wide issues and challenges.
6
7 Second, environmental issues are connected to a whole raft of other challenges that young Londoners
8 face in their everyday lives – from ‘overpriced public transport’ to ‘mental wellbeing’ – and that
9 solutions to these challenges relate to trust in institutions (e.g. ‘politicians need to come out to our
10 communities’), and social investment (e.g. in youth clubs and community centres).
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE [alternative text: Figure 1 provides a graphic visualization of the themes
18 discussed by young Londoners, showing how the issues they care about connect with one another.]
19
20
21
22

23 *Power, powerlessness and efficacy*

24
25
26 Yet, most of the participants felt a sense of powerlessness with regard to environmental issues – either
27 they did not know how to engage or did not believe that their own actions would make a difference.
28
29 Moreover, the few who were already engaged in community activities felt frustrated by the lack of
30 support from civic authorities. Interestingly, young people’s sense of efficacy was closely related to
31 the issue of *scale*. When thinking about action and solutions, young Londoners emphasized the need
32 to participate in projects and initiatives in their communities to: ‘make a change’ through participation
33 in community projects through, for instance, youth work and mentoring. For example, they presented
34 various ideas for solving what they saw as a London-wide housing crisis, including ‘community-led self-
35 build projects’ for affordable homes using recycled materials, such as those led by the *Rural Urban*
36 *Synthesis Society* in Lewisham (female, aged 24).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The world café event in 2019 provided a valuable forum for the discussion of environmental issues –
45 and potential solutions to what they considered to be an area of escalating concern (Figure 1). Many
46 of the young Londoners told us that they had never had an opportunity to think and discuss these
47 issues before. The results offered a wide array of suggestions for individual action, civic engagement
48 and intervention from local authorities and the GLA. The ideas for tackling environmental issues were
49 varied, ranging from boycotting companies with low environmental standards, pressurizing London
50 authorities not to invest in those companies, introducing new schemes for growing your own produce
51 within the community, becoming involved in maintaining local parks and communal gardens, through
52 to building more dedicated cycle routes in the city. These deliberations strongly indicate that events
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

such as these can build efficacy and generate solutions that might prove beneficial for civic authorities to adopt.

The impact of the climate strike movement and the 2021 COP26

By 2021, environmental issues were much higher up the agenda. In the wake of the climate strike movement and in the run-up to the 2021 COP26 Summit in Glasgow, the environment had become the top issue for young adults in the UK (YouGov 2021). In this context, we ran several focus groups with a new wave of GLA POWs. It was immediately apparent that news regarding the climate strikes and COP26 had stimulated more thought and momentum regarding youth engagement. It was also apparent that the young Londoners we spoke to had more nuanced views about the scale of any response to climate change, being much more aware of global issues, yet still tied to local solutions.

We wanted to re-examine young Londoners' sense of efficacy on environmental issues and whether they felt they were being included at any level in the run-up to the UN Conference. Typical answers to a question about whether young people felt they had a say were: 'Not really, but I think we can still play our part' (female, aged 22) and, 'we have a say through our actions' (female, aged 24). Interestingly, one young person (from a racially minoritized background) mentioned that it made them feel like their community was not wanted in the conversation. In relation to COP26 and the climate strikes, it was mentioned that the protests have a 'very white face'. So, even the youth-led climate strikes were seen to be somewhat less inclusive for those young people from traditionally marginalised groups. When thinking about climate change and who was responsible, young Londoners also spoke about Western countries seeming to 'blame countries in the global South for pollution as they try to develop' (male, aged 23). So, just as poorer Londoners (many from immigrant backgrounds) feel they are being ignored and dictated to on climate change, they felt the same was true at an international level. This suggests that the exclusion of young (minoritized) voices from climate change discussions represents a major problem both in the UK and at an international level.

Regarding public policy in London, conversations addressed congestion charges for driving cars in the city. The participants recognised that something had to be done to address the problem of pollution in general and also around schools, and how it affects children's and young people's health. One young participant drew the support of others when they highlighted how they understood why congestion charges were good for the climate crisis, but they worried about the impact upon the elderly or those who suffer with disabilities where mobility becomes more difficult. So, although public policy to protect the environment might be well-intentioned, the POWs wondered whether it discriminated against those that were less well-off, especially in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. For example,

1 many participants agreed with one young Londoner who expressed their general support for the T-
2 Tax⁵ introduced around the London South Circular highway that had helped lead to massive reductions
3 in pollution levels, but who was also concerned that many ordinary people might not be in a position
4 to afford the associated additional costs involved. Another commonly shared concern was that, whilst
5 encouraging people to reduce their reliance on cars was welcomed, public transport costs remained
6 very high. Indeed, free travel for under 18-year-olds on London public transport was suspended in
7 2020 as part of the UK Government's pandemic deal with *Transport For London*.

8
9
10
11
12 The young people we spoke to in 2021 presented a number of general ideas that were relevant to the
13 wider climate debate at the time, as well as offering more specific ideas for implementation at a local
14 level. At a general level, they advocated: making sustainable solutions affordable, a greater regulation
15 of large companies with respect to such matters as pollution, the promotion of schemes to support
16 saving and sharing of energy in housing, and more public conversations about climate change. At a
17 local level, their suggestions included: providing free shared plots of land to low-income households
18 to grow food, implementing car restrictions to deal with pollution, investing more in public transport
19 to lower the costs for young people, developing more community-based projects (e.g., to save
20 electricity while the city is sleeping), tree-planting initiatives, and getting school children involved in
21 these projects. These findings again suggest that were civic authorities to engage with young people
22 more intensively, there are many practical ideas that might be integrated into environmentally-
23 focused public policy; that creating the means and spaces to deepen youth civic engagement in
24 environmental policy-making might provide opportunities to harness the creativity of London's youth
25 population in local solution planning processes.

40 *How the local policy community engages with young Londoners on environmental issues*

41
42 Finally, we wanted to look at the issue of youth participation in environmental policy-making from the
43 perspectives of local policy-makers. This was approached through an analysis of the initiatives at GLA
44 level and in certain London boroughs, and through discussions with policy-makers – eight semi-
45 structured interviews were conducted with civic leaders and with those engaged in environmental
46 policy and youth engagement across the Capital.

47
48 In recent years, civic authorities have seen a large increase in mandatory duties to promote action on
49 climate change in addition to the increased expectations of citizens and voters for action. At the GLA
50 level, this was illustrated by the decision by the Mayor of London to take the politically high-risk

59
60 ⁵ The expansion of London's Ultra Low Emissions Zone.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

decision to expand the low-emissions zone, which entails significant additional costs for motorists within the Capital. Yet, despite the relative enthusiasm of younger generations for action to protect the environment, the London policy-makers we spoke to were unanimous in their view that civic authorities in London had been slow to engage. However, they also believed that the willingness to engage (the *quantity* of engagement) had taken-off in recent years, even if the interactive nature of these initiatives (the *quality* of engagement) was often not appropriately designed.

At the GLA level, a whole raft of initiatives had been put together as a response to the climate strikes and in the run-up to COP26. When asked, ‘Can you talk about any initiatives you have developed to engage young people in policy work (with particular reference to environmental policy)?’, the two interviewees from the GLA environment team highlighted the work the Authority had undertaken with and for children on pollution, leading to a network of air pollution sensors installed at hospitals, schools and in local communities. They also pointed to several initiatives to promote environmental issues in schools to coincide with the UN Conference. The centrepiece was *Climate Kickstart*, which engaged 66,000 London children in a variety of activities during the first week of COP26 (1-5 November 2021).

Whilst these new initiatives for school children are certainly to be welcomed, and some of the programmes encouraged children to start their own projects (e.g., *Generation Earthshot* to recognise outstanding youth-led ventures), there was little sense of engaging young people in environmental policy-making at the GLA level. On the one hand, this is understandable given the Authority’s primary role in setting the broad framework for policy. On the other hand, members of the GLA’s own Peer Outreach Team reported on ‘how hard it is to engage with or influence the Environment team as a young person’ (even from within the Authority). They complained that youth engagement was ‘tokenistic at best’ when it came to policy design. Finally, these London-wide initiatives focussed almost entirely on school-age children (primary and secondary), missing out on the opportunity to engage with the large population of pro-environment young adults.

At the borough level, the picture is sporadic. Although a small number of councils have developed schemes to engage with young people, serious effort to connect beyond the promotion of education about climate change in schools were few and far between. Almost all the local policy-makers we interviewed recognised this deficit but found the realities of reaching out to young people very complex and extremely challenging. For example, one borough councillor with responsibility for environmental policy, ‘found it hard to fill the places for the Youth Community Reference Group set up to discuss environmental issues’. They conceded that many of the engagement opportunities for young people were, ‘as with youth councils, eventually filled by young people who are not altogether

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

representative of young people in the borough'. Consequently, the question of which young people end up engaging in environmental discussions remains an important and persisting challenge.

Council policy-makers struggled to achieve what co-ordinators in the Peer Outreach Team referred to as 'genuine engagement' for a number of reasons. According to one of the team with particular experience of working with a London borough council: first, 'they do not commit to youth engagement over a sustained period of time'; and, second, they are reluctant to cede control over policy-making to young people, so that 'the big decisions have already been made before the consultations have begun'. One interviewee – the leader of a civil society group working with young people in one of the borough councils – summed it up succinctly: 'Councils are not set up for genuine citizen engagement. They like decision-making processes to be neat. They do not like messy decision-making, and – when young people are involved – it becomes messy, if they allow them a proper voice'.

However, many of the problems surrounding youth engagement were attributed to contextual issues beyond the control of the GLA or of any individual council. In particular, the issues of inequality and poverty as well as the lack of public services that were emphasized by the young Londoners in our focus groups, were viewed by the local policy community as impediments to a more effective youth engagement strategy in environmental policy. Referring to the congestion charge expansion discussed previously, one interviewee from the central Government's Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (focussed on London) believed that:

'The Mayor rightly introduced greater congestion charges, because he had to protect children's lungs, but he does not have the means of mitigating the effects on poorer groups. The GLA and the boroughs do not have the resources to deal with the structural issue of poverty, which would be needed if we really want to take youth engagement on environmental matters seriously. Greening policies can actually lead to the embedding of these inequalities, as poorer young people are pushed out of their neighbourhoods.'

In the wake of COP26 and the legislative commitments by the UK Government to reduce carbon emissions, many London boroughs are in the process of updating their sustainability strategies – although with widely varying levels of breadth and depth. As noted by one London borough councillor, these 'strategies have tended to focus on economic development – for example, through Green jobs and upskilling – and achieving economic gains for young people. And, the community engagement dimension sometimes gets left behind, because it takes time and is often run by different departments.' Co-ordination of (youth) citizen engagement in environmental policy is, therefore, a horizontal challenge within local authorities and the GLA. The focus on economic development in areas of high poverty given the negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, is perhaps

1 understandable. However, this also hampers youth engagement and arguably may reduce the overall
2 quality of public policy.
3
4
5

6 *Institutional structural barriers*

7

8 The institutional dislocation of environmental policy from community engagement and youth
9 outreach was observed in all of the London councils that we considered, as well as in the GLA. For
10 example, a peer outreach co-ordinator in the GLA noted that the Environment team are ‘somewhat
11 cut off from the Community Engagement teams and the peer outreach teams, who have the expertise
12 of engaging with young people – especially those young people who do not come from privileged
13 backgrounds’. This expertise is also crucial for understanding both the connections between
14 environmental policy and other economic and social problems facing young people (e.g. mental health
15 and green spaces, the cost of public transport and low-polluting travel), and for providing a more
16 holistic and inclusive approach to environmental policy-making. As one civil society interviewee
17 emphasized: ‘You have to engage with young people with experiences of the problems you are dealing
18 with and the knowledge of how different policies may work – or not work – in their neighbourhoods’.
19
20

21 With these conversations, we conclude that the promise of urban democracy for environmental policy
22 is very much unfulfilled in London. However, the next few years offer opportunities – recognised by
23 all of our policy community interviewees – to gain the support and involvement of young people, if
24 civic authorities are able to find inclusive ways of engaging with them over a sustained period of time.
25 Schools are an essential venue for engagement. But schools have many other learning priorities, and
26 so should not be relied upon so heavily (or indeed almost exclusively in some cases). Furthermore,
27 environmental policy-makers can learn lessons from other policy areas, such as violence and crime
28 reduction, where there are many positive examples of youth engagement. For example, in 2022 the
29 *London Assembly Police and Crime Committee* engaged intensively with the young people from the
30 Mayor’s Peer Outreach Team on tackling the tens of thousands of incidents of children going missing
31 in the Capital each year. The final report led to concrete recommendations – many of those drawn
32 from evidence provided by the Peer Outreach Workers from their lived experiences – to address the
33 causes rather than the symptoms of the problem (London Assembly 2023). Adopting such an intensive
34 and inclusive approach to youth participation on key environmental issues, would require a change in
35 mindset from those charged with leading environmental policy – so that young people’s views are
36 properly integrated into policy-making processes.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **Conclusion and discussion**

58
59
60
61

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

In this article, our starting point was to look beyond youth participation in environmental politics at the national and international levels, and instead to examine youth engagement in environmental issues at a city and community level. We addressed Public Value approaches to policy-making, employing participatory methods with young Londoners and interviews with London policy-makers. Our main aim was to consider the ways that local and civic authorities already - or could, in the near future - harness the energy and imagination of young people into the crafting of sustainable local policies and initiatives to address the gathering crises of the climate and the degradation of the environment. Our findings make for sobering reading; young people lack confidence that their voices count for much in conversations about how best to address the climate emergency, whilst policy-makers seem unsure regarding how to engage with young people on such matters. So, there was a significant deficit in both internal and external efficacy.

Regarding the research questions, it was clear that young people from disadvantaged backgrounds viewed environmental challenges and solutions as relating to their local environment and to a host of other issues – in their terms, relating to poverty and a lack of public services. And it was clear to see that there is a long way to go to build trust in institutions and a sense that young Londoners can make a difference by influencing public policy in their local areas.

However, the data also offer some basis for measured optimism. Not only are young people keen to engage in dialogue with local policy communities about environmental and climate-related issues, civic authorities and wider policy communities are also becoming increasingly cognisant of the need to develop structures and processes for strengthening youth voice in policy-making. The optimism regarding youth engagement in local democracy is supported by findings from the Hansard Society's Audit for Political Engagement (2020), which recorded that almost half (46 percent) of 18- to 24-year-olds in the UK wanted to be more involved in decision-making in their local area (compared to 41 percent of all adults and just a quarter of over 65s). Intriguingly, the figure is even higher (55 percent) for young people without a degree qualification, who would usually be less likely to become civically or politically engaged.

But our research also highlights the fact that engagement with young people on local environmental policy-making needs to be carried out in appropriate ways. The young Londoners we spoke to expressed a deep sense of powerlessness in the face of what they saw as overwhelming and interconnected issues, and the vast majority of them believed that – as young people – their voices and actions to preserve the environment would not be heard nor make a difference. To instil a sense of efficacy in young people, policy-makers must ensure they establish genuine two-way engagement followed up by concrete and visible action.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

When involving young citizens in sustainable environmental policy-making, education and awareness-raising on environmental concerns are key. Our young participants identified a lack of education, information, and awareness as common problems when it came to environmental issues, many saying they felt relatively uninformed about environmental issues in general and particularly about ways to bring about change at the level of local government. Additionally, the findings indicate that environmental concerns are not uniformly distributed among young people. In particular, social class and where they live each matter with respect to how they prioritise and contextualise environmental issues.

The findings present clear challenges for Public Value approaches to policy-making that advocate cooperative governance within the context of persisting *unequal participation* (between younger people and older people as well as between young people from better-off and disadvantaged backgrounds) and *meaningful participation*. With respect to the former challenge, there is a clear tendency amongst local and civic authorities to pursue youth engagement through forums that attract young people who are from more affluent backgrounds (who are already more likely to engage) rather than pro-actively seeking out young people that might need more support in learning to engage effectively with officials and policy communities. A second challenge is that local and civic authorities tend to orient towards less *messy* forms of participation (such as consultations that have no clear outcome or discussing the implementation of policies that have already been agreed) that can be found towards the lower (*tokenistic*) end of Hart's (1992) participation 'ladder'.

To move towards genuinely inclusive and *meaningful* forms of youth engagement, civic and local authorities must build youth participation into the design of policy-making processes. In environmental policy, this would include concerted efforts to reach out to young people – to ask for their views, priorities and solutions – through schools and via collaborations with youth sector organisations. In London, the Mayor's Peer Outreach Team has tried to achieve this through the setting up of a Youth Participation Network, involving 450 local and city-wide youth sector organisations. Furthermore, initiatives to promote youth learning and action, such as the *Climate Kickstart* initiative discussed above, should be sustained on an annual basis rather than treated as one-off events. In London, we recommend that meaningful youth participation in policy-making could be achieved by a change in institutional culture: by bringing young people into GLA policy teams and encouraging them to conduct peer outreach; and, by providing training for officials in how to work with children and young people as partners (GLA 2021).

REFERENCES

- 1
2 Abels, G. (2007). A Comparative Analysis Citizen Involvement in Public Policy-making: Does it Improve
3 Democratic Legitimacy and Accountability? The Case of pTA. *Interdisciplinary Information Sciences*,
4 13(1), 103-116.
5
6
7
8 Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2021). Co-creation: The new kid on the block in public governance. *Policy &*
9 *Politics*, 49(2), 211-230.
10
11
12 Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of*
13 *planners*, 35(4), 216-224.
14
15
16 Arya, D., & Henn, M. (2021). The impact of economic inequality and educational background in shaping
17 how non-activist “Standby” youth in London experience environmental politics. *Educational Review*,
18 75(1), 93–114.
19
20
21
22 Ataol, Ö., Krishnamurthy, S., & van Wesemael, P. (2019). Children's participation in urban planning
23 and design: A systematic review. *Children, Youth and Environments*, 29(2), 27-47.
24
25
26 Augsberger, A., Collins, M. E., Howard, R. C. (2024). The global context of youth engagement: A scoping
27 review of youth councils in municipal government, *Children and Youth Services Review*, 156, 107349,
28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2023.107349>.
29
30
31
32 Balch, G. I. (1974). Multiple indicators in survey research: The concept" sense of political
33 efficacy". *Political Methodology*, 1-43.
34
35
36 Bang, H. (2005). Among everyday makers and expert citizens. *Remaking governance: Peoples, politics*
37 *and the public sphere*, 159-178. Bristol: Policy Press.
38
39
40 Barford, A., Mugeere, A., Proefke, R. and Stocking, B. (2021) *Young People and Climate Change*. British
41 Academy COP26 Briefings. British Academy
42 [https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/knowledge-frontiers-cop26-briefings-young-](https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/knowledge-frontiers-cop26-briefings-young-people-and-climate-change/)
43 [people-and-climate-change/](https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/publications/knowledge-frontiers-cop26-briefings-young-people-and-climate-change/) (last accessed 30 April 2024).
44
45
46
47
48 BBC News (2021) *COP26: Thunberg tells Glasgow protest politicians are pretending*. BBC News
49 <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-glasgow-west-59116611> (last accessed 30 April 2024).
50
51
52 Brady, B., Chaskin, R. J., & McGregor, C. (2020). Promoting civic and political engagement among
53 marginalized urban youth in three cities: Strategies and challenges. *Children and Youth Services*
54 *Review*, 116, 105184.
55
56
57
58 Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2013). *The logic of connective action: Digital media and the*
59 *personalization of contentious politics*. Cambridge University Press.
60
61

1 Bessant, J., Farthing, R., & Watts, R. (2017). *The precarious generation: A political economy of young*
2 *people*. London: Routledge.

3
4 Boulianne, S., & Ohme, J. (2022). Pathways to environmental activism in four countries: social media,
5 environmental concern, and political efficacy. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 1-22.

6
7
8 Boyte, H. C. (2010). *Everyday politics: Reconnecting citizens and public life*. Philadelphia: University of
9 Pennsylvania Press.

10
11
12 Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. John Wiley
13 & Sons.

14
15
16 Cowie, H., & Myers, C. A. (2021). The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health and well-
17 being of children and young people. *Children & Society*, 35(1), 62-74.

18
19
20 Dahl, V., Amnå, E., Banaji, S., Landberg, M., Šerek, J., Ribeiro, N., Beilmann, M., Pavlopoulos, V., & Zani,
21 B. (2019). 'Apathy or alienation? Political passivity among youths across eight European Union
22 countries', in: E. Cicognani & F. Motti-Stefanidi, (eds.), *Youth Citizenship and the European Union*.
23 Routledge.

24
25
26 Dalton, R. J. (2015). *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. CQ
27 press.

28
29
30 Della Volpe, J. (2022). *Fight: How Gen Z Is Channelling Their Fear and Passion to Save America*. St.
31 Martin's Press.

32
33
34 Department for Digital Culture, Media and Sport (2021). *Civic Engagement and Social Action -*
35 *Community Life Survey 2020/21*. GOV.UK [https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-survey-202021-civic-engagement-and-social-action/civic-engagement-and-social-action-community-life-survey-202021)
36 [survey-202021-civic-engagement-and-social-action/civic-engagement-and-social-action-community-](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-survey-202021-civic-engagement-and-social-action/civic-engagement-and-social-action-community-life-survey-202021)
37 [life-survey-202021](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/community-life-survey-202021-civic-engagement-and-social-action/civic-engagement-and-social-action-community-life-survey-202021) (last accessed 30 April 2024).

38
39
40
41
42
43 Farr, M. (2013). 'Citizens and the co-creation of public service innovations', in: S. Osborne, & L. Brown
44 (eds.), *Handbook of Innovation in Public Services*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

45
46
47 Flanagan, C., Gallay, E., & Pykett, A. (2022). Urban youth and the environmental commons:
48 rejuvenating civic engagement through civic science. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 1-17.

49
50
51 Freeman, C., & Aitken-Rose, E. (2005). Voices of Youth: Planning Projects with Children and Young
52 People in New Zealand Local Government. *The Town Planning Review*, 76(4), 375-400.

53
54
55
56 Fung, Archon. *Empowered participation* (2019). Princeton University Press.

Greater London Authority (2021). *Children and Young People as Partners Handbook*.

[london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/final_children_and_young_people_as_partners_handbook.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/final_children_and_young_people_as_partners_handbook.pdf)

(last accessed 30 April 2024)

Grasso, M., & Giugni, M. (2022). *The Routledge Handbook of Environmental Movements*.

Hansard Society, (2020). *Audit of Political Engagement 16 – The 2019 Report*. Hansard Society

<https://www.johnsmithcentre.com/research/audit-of-political-engagement-16-the-2019-report/>

(last accessed 30 April 2024).

Harris, A., & Wyn, J. (2009). Young people's politics and the micro-territories of the local. *Australian journal of political science*, 44(2), 327-344.

Hart, R. (1992). *Children's Participation: from Tokenism to Citizenship*. UNICEF. Available at:

<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/227219?ln=en> (last accessed 30 April 2024).

Hayward, B. (2020). *Children, Citizenship and Environment: # schoolstrike Edition*. Routledge.

Henn, M. & Oldfield, B., (2016). Cajoling or coercing: would electoral engineering resolve the young citizen–state disconnect? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 19(9), 1259-1280.

Henn, M., Sloam, J. & Nunes, A. (2022) Young cosmopolitans and environmental politics: how postmaterialist values inform and shape youth engagement in environmental politics. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 25(6), 709-729.

Henn, M., Oldfield, B. & Hart J. (2018). Postmaterialism and Young People's Political Participation in a Time of Austerity. *British Journal of Sociology* 69(3), 712–737.

Henn, M. & Pickard, S. E., eds. (2023). *Youth Activism in Environmental Politics*, 2nd Edition. Lausanne: Frontiers Media SA.

Hickman, C., Marks, E., Pihkala, P., Clayton, S., Lewandowski, R. E., Mayall, E. E., ... & van Susteren, L. (2021). Climate anxiety in children and young people and their beliefs about government responses to climate change: a global survey. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 5(12), e863-e873.

Holden, E., Linnerud, K., Banister, D., Schwanitz, V. J., & Wierling, A. (2017). *The imperatives of sustainable development: needs, justice, limits*. Routledge.

Intergenerational Foundation (2020). *Grey Power: Young people missing from politics*.

Intergenerational Foundation. <https://www.if.org.uk/research-posts/grey-power-young-people-missing-from-politics/> (last accessed 30 April 2024).

1 Kennelly, J., & Watt, P. (2012). Seeing Olympic effects through the eyes of marginally housed youth:
2 changing places and the gentrification of East London. *Visual studies*, 27(2), 151-160.

3
4 Kythreotis, A. P., Howarth, C., Mercer, T. G., Awcock, H., & Jonas, A. E. (2021). Re-evaluating the
5 changing geographies of climate activism and the state in the post-climate emergency era in the build-
6 up to COP26. *Journal of the British Academy*, 9, 69-93.

7
8
9
10 Li, Y., & Marsh, D. (2008). New forms of political participation: Searching for expert citizens and
11 everyday makers. *British journal of political science*, 38(2), 247-272.

12
13
14 Local Government Association (2023). *Engaging Young People in Policy Development*.
15 [https://www.local.gov.uk/topics/children-and-young-people/engaging-young-people-policy-](https://www.local.gov.uk/topics/children-and-young-people/engaging-young-people-policy-development)
16 [development](https://www.local.gov.uk/topics/children-and-young-people/engaging-young-people-policy-development) (last accessed 30 April 2024).

17
18
19
20 [London Assembly \(2023\). *Missing Children in London Report*. London City Hall.](https://www.london.gov.uk/who-we-are/what-london-assembly-does/london-assembly-work/london-assembly-publications/missing-children-london-report)
21 [https://www.london.gov.uk/who-we-are/what-london-assembly-does/london-assembly-](https://www.london.gov.uk/who-we-are/what-london-assembly-does/london-assembly-work/london-assembly-publications/missing-children-london-report)
22 [work/london-assembly-publications/missing-children-london-report](https://www.london.gov.uk/who-we-are/what-london-assembly-does/london-assembly-work/london-assembly-publications/missing-children-london-report) (last accessed 30 April 2024).

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

London Sustainable Development Commission (2019). *Young Londoners' Priorities for a Sustainable Future*. https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/young_londoners_report_final_0.pdf (last accessed 30 April 2024).

Malone, K. (2016). Children's place encounters: place-based participatory research to design a child-friendly and sustainable urban development. *Geographies of global issues: Change and threat*, 7.

Monno, V., & Khakee, A. (2012). Tokenism or political activism? Some reflections on participatory planning. *International Planning Studies*, 17(1), 85–101.

Nambisan, S. & Nambisan, P. (2013). *Engaging Citizens in Co-Creation in Public Services: Lessons Learned and Best Practices*. IBM Center for the Business of Government - Collaboration Across Boundaries Series.

Nissen, S., Wong, J. H., & Carlton, S. (2020). Children and young people's climate crisis activism—a perspective on long-term effects. *Children's Geographies*, 1-7.

Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2009). Elinor Ostrom, Prize Lecture. <https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/economic-sciences/2009/ostrom/lecture/> (last accessed 30 April 2024).

1 OECD (2020a) Governance for Youth, Trust and Intergenerational Justice : Fit for All Generations?

2 OECD iLibrary [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/governance-for-youth-trust-and-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/governance-for-youth-trust-and-intergenerational-justice_c3e5cb8a-en)
3 [intergenerational-justice_c3e5cb8a-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/governance-for-youth-trust-and-intergenerational-justice_c3e5cb8a-en) (last accessed 30 April 2024).

4
5 OECD (2020b) *Youth and Covid-19: Response, recovery and resilience.*

6 [https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/youth-and-covid-19-response-recovery-and-](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/youth-and-covid-19-response-recovery-and-resilience-c40e61c6/)
7 [resilience-c40e61c6/](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/youth-and-covid-19-response-recovery-and-resilience-c40e61c6/) (last accessed 30 April 2024).

8
9
10
11 O'Loughlin, B., & Sloam, J. (2022). Cycles of Insecurities: Understanding the Everyday Insecurities of
12 Young Londoners. *Cities* 127.

13
14
15 Osborne, S. P., Radnor, Z., & Strokosch, K. (2016). Co-Production and the Co-Creation of Value in
16 Public Services: A suitable case for treatment? *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 639–653.

17
18
19 O'Toole, T., DeHanas, D. N., Modood, T., Meer, N., & Jones, S. (2013). Taking part: Muslim
20 participation in contemporary governance.

21
22
23
24 Patterson, T. E. (2009). *The vanishing voter: Public involvement in an age of uncertainty.* Vintage.

25
26 Partnership for Young London (2021). *Mapping Young London: A View into Young Londoners After a*
27 *Year in Lockdown.* Partnership for Young London
28 [https://www.partnershipforyounglondon.org.uk/post/mapping-young-london-a-view-into-young-](https://www.partnershipforyounglondon.org.uk/post/mapping-young-london-a-view-into-young-londoners-after-a-year-in-lockdown)
29 [londoners-after-a-year-in-lockdown](https://www.partnershipforyounglondon.org.uk/post/mapping-young-london-a-view-into-young-londoners-after-a-year-in-lockdown) (last accessed 30 April 2024).

30
31
32
33
34 Pickard, S. (2019). Young environmental activists are doing it themselves. *Political Insight*, 10(4), 4-7.

35
36
37
38 Pickard, S., Bowman, B., & Arya, D. (2022). Youth and environmental activism. In *The Routledge*
39 *Handbook of Environmental Movements* (pp. 521-537). Routledge.

40
41
42
43 Sirianni, C. (2020). *Sustainable Cities in American Democracy.* University of Kansas Press.

44
45
46
47 Sloam, J. (2014a). New voice, less equal: The civic and political engagement of young people in the
48 United States and Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 47(5), 663-688.

49
50
51
52 Sloam, J. (2014b). 'The outraged young': young Europeans, civic engagement and the new media in a
53 time of crisis. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(2), 217-231.

54
55
56
57 Sloam, J., & Henn, M. (2019). *Youthquake 2017: The rise of young cosmopolitans in Britain.*
58 Basingstoke: Palgrave.

59
60
61
62 Sloam, J. (2019). 'Young People and Everyday Politics'. H. Tam (ed.) *Whose Government is it Anyway?*

1 Sloam, J., Pickard, S., & Henn, M. (2022). Young People and Environmental Activism: The
2 Transformation of Democratic Politics. Introduction to Special Issue of *The Journal of Youth Studies*,
3 25(6), 683-691.
4

5 Sloam, J. (2023). Youth Voice and Sustainable Public Policy: Rejuvenating Urban Democracy. *United*
6 *Nations World Public Sector Report 2023*, 44-48.
7

8 Swim, J. K., Aviste, R., Lengieza, M. L., & Fasano, C. J. (2022). OK Boomer: A decade of generational
9 differences in feelings about climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 73, 102479.
10

11 Taft, J. K., & Gordon, H. R. (2013). Youth activists, youth councils, and constrained democracy.
12 *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 8(1), 87-100.
13

14 Tonkens, E., & Verhoeven, I. (2019). The civic support paradox: Fighting unequal participation in
15 deprived neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*, 56(8), 1595-1610.
16

17 United Nations (2018) *Youth 2030: Working With and For Young People*.
18 [https://www.un.org/youthenvoy/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/18-00080_UN-Youth-](https://www.un.org/youthenvoy/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/18-00080_UN-Youth-Strategy_Web.pdf)
19 [Strategy_Web.pdf](https://www.un.org/youthenvoy/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/18-00080_UN-Youth-Strategy_Web.pdf) (last accessed 30 April 2024).
20

21 Van Biezen, I., Mair, P., & Poguntke, T. (2012). Going, going... gone? The decline of party membership
22 in contemporary Europe. *European journal of political research*, 51(1), 24-56.
23

24 Watt, P. (2021). *Estate regeneration and its discontents: Public housing, place and inequality in*
25 *London*. Policy Press.
26

27 Weller, S. (2006). Situating (young) teenagers in geographies of children and youth. *Children's*
28 *geographies*, 4(01), 97-108.
29

30 Wray-Lake, L. (2019). How do young people become politically engaged?. *Child Development*
31 *Perspectives*, 13(2), 127-132.
32

33 YouGov (2021). The environment is once again a top three priority for the British public. YouGov
34 [https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2021/06/04/environment-once-again-top-](https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2021/06/04/environment-once-again-top-three-priority-british-)
35 [three-priority-british-](https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2021/06/04/environment-once-again-top-three-priority-british-) (last accessed 30 April 2024).
36

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Funding declaration: British Academy Grant This work was supported by the British Academy, Grant no.: VSFoFGC1\100020

Declaration of conflicting interests: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

1 **Acknowledgments:** The qualitative research with young people was taken in close co-operation with
2 the Mayor of London’s Peer Outreach Team, who provided us with invaluable insights into the issues
3 facing young people and their attitudes towards civic and political engagement, excellent
4 collaboration in leading the youth-run world café focus groups event, as well as providing direct
5 contact with key (youth-focussed) policy-makers in London. In particular, we would like to thank the
6 Peer Outreach team leaders – Rebecca Palmer and Mark Mouna – and leading Peer Outreach
7 Workers – Kismet Meyon and Alfie Kingsnorth for their support in the research.
8
9

10 **Research Ethics Statement:** Research ethics for the research carried out for the British Academy
11 Grant was received from Royal Holloway University.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1: Visualization of World Café-style Focus Groups with Young Londoners in City Hall

