POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT AMONG THE YOUNG IN AUSTRALIA

Paper prepared as part of the Occasional Senate Lecture Series, Parliament House, September 20, 2013.

Dr. Aaron Martin (University of Melbourne)

Young Australians are often claimed to be disengaged from politics on a number of levels. But is this true, and to what extent? In this paper I want to interrogate the accusation that young people are disengaged from politics through the use of survey data looking, in particular, at political participation. This work draws on a book I published last year entitled *Young People and Politics: Political Engagement in the Anglo-American Democracies* (Routledge). In the second section of the paper I want to speak more generally about democracy in the 21st century and speak about some voter engagement projects I was involved with over the course of the last election, namely Vote Compass and the Citizens' Agenda, and speak about the potential of these tools to engage the young.

PART ONE: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

We live in a period when the lack of political engagement among Australians, and others around the world, is commonly remarked upon. Norris (2002, 221) writes that 'Many are alarmed that Western publics have become disengaged from public affairs, detached from campaigns, and bored with politics, producing, if not a crisis in democracy, then at least growing problems of legitimacy for representative government.' This concern is particularly salient as it relates to young people.

But exactly what is the nature of that problem? Let me concentrate for the first half of this paper on political participation.

I should mention that by political participation I mean not only voting and joining a political party but what I would call 'non-electoral' forms of political participation as well, such as attending a demonstration and signing a petition. One of the features of political participation today is an expanding array of political activity beyond electoral forms of political participation such as voting or joining a political party.

We need then to distinguish electoral forms of political participation from non-electoral forms of political participation and ask whether young people are turning their backs on voting to engage in other forms of participation such as attending demonstrations or signing petitions.

In the literature there is often a debate between those who argue that political participation is in decline (Putnam, 2000; Stoker, 2006) and those who argue that political participation is evolving with non-electoral forms of participation such as signing a petition or attending a demonstration replacing electoral forms of participation (Inglehart, 1997; Norris, 2002; Dalton, 2008).

I think it's useful to see the data I'm presenting here in light of those debates.

ELECTORAL ENGAGMENT

Electoral engagement, I argue in my book (Martin, 2012), constitutes the most substantial form of political engagement for most citizens so I'll talk about that first.

The first thing I'll talk about is attitudes towards voting. The Australian Election Study asked respondents the following question: Would you have voted in the election if voting had not been compulsory? In 2010 88% of older people (aged 60 and over) said they would have voted but only 78% percent of young people (aged 18-29) said they would have voted.[1]

We also have data from the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) which shows that this is accompanied by low levels of civic duty. In 2005 the ISSP asked 'how important is it to always vote in elections?' Respondents were asked to respond on a scale of one to seven, one being 'not at all important' and seven being 'very important.' In terms of those who responded that voting is 'very important' older people are twice as likely to say voting is very important (the respective figures being 84 and 42). So, young people do not seem to see voting as a civic duty in the way older generations do. We know that these attitudes have real effects in relation to young people being much less likely to be enrolled to vote and much less likely to vote (see Martin, 2013).

What about broader measures of political engagement such as party identification. In terms of those who do not identify with any party in 2010 24 percent of young people did not identify with any party as compared to just 7 percent of older people who did not identify with that party. This trend has been increasing over time (see Martin, 2012).

So, I think it is clear that electoral politics is becoming less attractive to the young.

NON-ELECTORAL POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Okay, so what about non-electoral participation? As I said a moment ago there is a debate about whether political participation is evolving or declining. So here again we have data from the ISSP on non-electoral participation. The data shows that the most common form of activity is signing a petition and young people are more likely than older people to have done this in the past year, 47 to 35. The same applies for boycotting products which young people are 16 percentage points more likely than older people to have done in the past year. Far fewer people have attended a demonstration but again young people are three times as likely as older people to have attended a demonstration in the past year. Young people are also much more likely to have participated in political activities over the internet (16 to 6) and are much more likely to have visited a politicians or political organisations website (40 to 13).

Now, that data doesn't prove that young people today are more likely than young people 20 or 30 years ago to engage in these activities but other literature suggests

---

[1] For the remainder of the paper 'young people' will refer to those aged 18-29 and 'older people' to those aged 60 and over.

that these findings reflect generational rather than lifecycle effects. So, it seems that the way young people engage in politics is changing over time and this will obviously have implications for electoral commissions, parties and other organisations.

In short, it seems that electoral politics is becoming less attractive to the young and non-electoral politics more attractive.

IMPLICATIONS

There are a number of implications for these findings. First of all electoral commissions will have to work hard just to maintain the current rate of youth voting (electoral commissions are flying into a stronger headwind than before, it seems, in terms of attitudes).

Second of all parties can no longer rely on habitual party supporters and other research I've done shows voting patterns among younger generations are much more volatile than before with young people being less likely to support minor parties (Martin and Pietsch, 2013).

Because young people seem to be amendable to different types of political participation this creates opportunities for other organisations to mobilise young people in a way not possible before. The internet seems more a symptom than a cause of this.

We should also be aware of resource inequalities inherent in this change in styles of participation. If the trends I've documented continue political participation will increasingly become the province of the resource rich (those with more education and so on) who are more likely to participate in non-electoral forms of political participation.

In summary the political engagement/participation marketplace is more crowded and competitive than it was when you had parties as the sole conduits for political activity.

PART TWO: DEMOCRACY IN THE 21ST CENTURY AND VOTER ENGAGEMENT TOOLS

Having established the extent of young people's political participation I now want to turn to broader conceptions of democracy and speak about some voter engagement tools I have been involved with as they relate to this.

DEMOCRACY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

There are many different conceptions of what democracy entails in the 21st century. There has been a voluminous literature devoted to this topic. The debate feeds into an ongoing argument about what exactly 'the peoples' role should be in politics. 'Historically, there has been a widespread suspicion of placing day-to-day political decisions in the hands of ordinary citizens, a suspicion that started with Plato and Aristotle and continued with democratic theorists such as John Stuart Mill' (McAllister, 1991, 237). But there exists a sharp tension between these suspicions and

the views of those advocating a more participatory form of democracy. Put simply, these views can be divided between the 'bringing the people in' and the 'leaving the people out' positions.

PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY

Supporters of participatory democracy see the solution to the democratic malaise as making politics more participatory—bridging the gap between politics and the people, the rulers and the ruled. This line of argument contends 'that democracy cannot be fully realised until citizens express their shared interests as members of a community…participation in the democratic process is seen as vital to the political education of citizens if they are to develop this civic orientation' (Webb, Bale & Taggart, 2006, 9). There is a long line of thinking in this area dating back, in modern political theory, to Rousseau and Mill. 'Rousseau saw individuals as ideally involved in the direct creation of the laws by which their lives are regulated, and he affirmed the notion of an involved citizenry' (Held, 2006, 45). John Stuart Mill 'argued that by actively participating in the civic life, rather than allowing others to make decisions in their own interests, people learn and grow. In this view, involving the public can make better citizens, better politics, and better governance.' (Norris, 2002, 45).

Modern variants of this argument include that of Benjamin Barber (1998-1999, 585) who views modern democracy as 'weak democracy' whereby people have little say in government affairs. This is in contrast to the 'strong democracy' that he endorsed, a democracy that 'reflects the careful and prudent judgment of citizens who participate in deliberative, self-governing communities.'

These views have evolved into a distinct theory of participatory democracy. Carol Pateman, one of the most important thinkers in developing the notion of participatory democracy, argues that 'participatory democracy fosters human development, enhances a sense of political efficacy, reduces a sense of estrangement from power centres, nurtures a concern for collective problems and contributes to the formation of an active and knowledgeable citizenry capable of taking a more active interest in government affairs' (Webb, Bale & Taggart, 2006, 14).

The views of Pateman and Macpherson hold that if people know that meaningful channels exist for them to get actively involved then a greater number will. This is not to discount the significant obstacles that may stand in the way of participation. Further, Pateman doubted whether many citizens would be very interested in issues outside of their community or electorate and that the role of the citizen in national politics would always be highly restricted (Held, 2006, 212). Theories such as these allow us however to see richer channels for participation than elitists allow. And, support for more participatory democracy has some empirical support (Held, 2006, 212) and is in line with the views expressed by the Power Report in the United Kingdom. Further, many have argued that from the increase in activism in other non-conventional forms of politics (as discussed in the previous section) we can infer an eagerness to get more involved in conventional politics, if it was seen to be more attractive—a question I will return to.

ELITISM

Challenges to participatory democracy have evolved from earlier arguments concerning representative democracy. By the 18th century, faced with an increasingly expanded citizenry, representative democracy was seen as a more practical model. 'By ingrafting representation upon democracy,' wrote Thomas Paine, a system of government is created that is capable of embracing 'all the various interests and every extent of territory and population' (Held, 2006, 94). John Stuart Mill, an enthusiastic advocate of participatory democracy was very much aware of its shortcomings in a large, modern society and also supported representative democracy. However, the debate amongst advocates of representative democracy has become more fractured. In trying to find a suitable form of government for such a large *polis* as we have today became an issue of contention. Debate has continued up until the present day about the best way to solve this problem.

Trying to find a model that would fit with modern, complex society Max Weber and Joseph Schumpeter 'shared a conception of political life in which there is little scope for democratic participation and individual or collective development.' (Held, 2006, 125) Schumpeter believed the 'essential role of citizens should be relatively limited, confined principally to the periodic election of parliamentary representatives, along with the continuous scrutiny of government actions'—that would provide a check against the emergence of tyranny (Norris, 2002, 5). This was in line with concerns expressed at the time that 'excessive' participation might produce the mobilization of the demos with highly dangerous consequences' (Held, 2006, 142). According to this formulation of politics, the notion of 'rule by the people' comes into question. Schumpeter certainly did not shy away from this. He wrote: 'democracy does not mean and cannot mean that the people actually rule in any obvious sense of the terms 'people' and 'rule.' Democracy means only that the people have the opportunity of accepting or refusing' the politicians that rule them. 'Democracy is the rule of the politician,' he wrote (Held, 2006, 145). Elitists argue that the consequences of political participation by the public are either neutral or negative. According to this view political apathy or disinterest lies not so much with politicians and parties as with 'the widespread failure of ordinary citizens to understand the fundamental nature of politics and citizenship' (Webb, Bale & Taggart, 2006, 239).

Elitists are deeply sceptical of the public's capacity to be involved in decision-making. They argue that the level of knowledge of the average citizen is dangerously low—a suspicion dating back to early survey research in the 1920s and 1930s which revealed that the majority of citizens were 'not well informed, not deeply involved, not particularly active; and the process by which they come to their voting decision is anything but a process of rational calculation.' (McAllister, 1997, 129). In support of these arguments they also cite the separate works of Converse and Bishop. In his famous experiment Phillip Converse found that people, afraid of responding 'I don't know,' often answer survey questions referring to non-salient political issues almost randomly—a 'non-decision' as he termed it (Fishkin, 2006). Building on this work is George Bishop's experiment that found that people voiced opinions on a government statute that never existed as did readers of the *Washington Post* when the paper celebrated the '20th anniversary' of this act (Fishkin, 2006). This research should highlight the extent to which voters can hold contradictory and illogical positions and have little capacity for decision making, argue elitists. Lack of interest in politics therefore may not be a problem but rather seen as favourable.

Further, some find fault with the finding that people have any desire to get more involved in politics. John R. Hibbing and Elizabeth Theiss-Morse in their book *Stealth Democracy* present a very strong counter to the participatory model of democracy. They find fault with much of the research that shows that while people may be disengaged with conventional politics they hold favourable attitudes towards participatory democracy (Power Inquiry, 2006). They argue that: 'the last thing people want is to be more involved in political decision making: they do not want to make political decision themselves; they do not want to provide much input to those who are assigned to make these decisions; and they would rather not know all the details of the decision-making process.' Further, they argue, 'most people have strong feelings on few if any of the issues the government needs to address and would prefer to spend their time in non-political pursuits' (Hibbing & Theiss-Morse, 2002, 2). Their study found support for the idea that people want 'Stealth Democracy' that is hidden from view. 'The people as a whole', they say, 'tend to be quite indifferent to policies and therefore not eager to hold government accountable for the policies it produces' (Hibbing & Theiss-Morse, 2002, 2).

In regards to the above theories we may ask: what does politics mean to young people in the 21st century? In light of the lack of political participation (electoral engagement in particular) that characterises democracy in the 21st century this question is especially pertinent. Some have suggested that what is perceived as the current malaise may, in fact, be the default setting for democracy in the 21st century (Webb, Bale & Taggart, 2006, 2). Peter Mair (2006, 1) has argued that 'what we now see emerging is a notion of democracy that is already being stripped of its popular component—a notion of democracy without a demos.' The theories relating to participatory democracy and elitism prove fertile ground for exploring questions of importance to this study. Do young people actually want to get more involved in politics?

THE CITIZENS' AGENDA

In order to examine these questions, albeit in an indirect way, I would now like to examine a few voter engagement projects I was involved with over the course of the last election to examine whether, when given the choice, people chose to engage or not. We can't at this stage say a lot about the extent to which young people participated in these voter engagement projects (although we will be able to say more as we analyse the voluminous data collected). These projects do nevertheless allow us to think about the questions above and then relate that back to young people.

The first thing I should say is that the context of the election had an effect on these projects, in good and bad ways. A poll that colleagues and I released on behalf of the Centre for Advancing Journalism at the University of Melbourne highlighted the magnitude of this problem. Majorities said the quality of political leadership, and political debate, was noticeably worse now than it has usually been in the past. Fewer than 10 percent said it was 'noticeably better.' On top of this only 28 percent said they had confidence in the federal government!

The first project I will discuss was called the Citizens' Agenda. This was a project that I was involved with with colleagues from the Centre for Advancing Journalism at the University of Melbourne.

It worked thus: we chose 10 electorates to conduct a Citizens' Agenda in. These seats were chosen on the basis of a range of criteria including marginality, state representation, internet penetration and rural and urban locations.

In these 10 electorates a new social media group called OurSay organised the logistics of voting and the town hall meetings which followed. On the website citizens could either post a question, vote for a question (each registrant had 7 votes) and/or then comment on a question. The question with the most votes was then discussed in a 'town hall' meeting which we invited all incumbents and contestants in the particular seat to attend.

Bill Clinton has said that 'the first era of representative democracy was great…but there was a weak public mandate and inert citizenship.' He suggested we can now move 'toward a second era now where you have a culture of public deliberation and active citizenship.' The Citizens' Agenda was our attempt to contribute to this.

I wrote an opinion piece in The Age before the election in which I ended the article saying: 'This is a 'world-first' trial and we're excited to be a part of it. But do citizens actually want to be part of this conversation? Over to you.'

Well, what happened? The success, as you may expect, was patchy. In the seat of Melbourne we had 195 questions posted on the OurSay website, 5,973 votes and 227 comments. The town hall meeting was attended by over 250 people with the three major candidates contesting that seat attending this event and answering questions. The top question with 697 votes was by Mike Pottenger who asked: "In 2013, corruption and problems of integrity have been prominent nation-wide. What do you consider to be the most important reform needed in our political system to improve integrity and accountability, and what do you see as the biggest obstacle to that reform?"

Compare this Fowler in the west of Sydney where we had only 8 questions, 102 votes and no comments. Only one candidate (from the Australia United Party) agreed to turn up. And the event overall was poorly attended and not something we would call a success.

We are at the very early stages of the data analysis but one thing that has emerged is that the project, in many seats, seems to have engaged the already engaged. Another thing, more specific to the topic of this paper is that, on average, participants at the town hall meetings tended to be older which raises questions about young 'clicktivists' commitment to political engagement.

We'll be reporting in much more detail on this over the next few years. But for now we can say that when given the oppourtunity to participate in a 'participatory democracy' activity like this a relatively small amount of people took this up. As mentioned above, the views of Pateman and Macpherson hold that if people know that meaningful channels exist for them to get actively involved then a greater number

will. But we could did not see an overwhelming uptake of the Citizens' Agenda. There could have been other reasons for this: we may not have advertised the events well enough or it may have had something to do with the nature of the election. But at this stage we could only label the Citizens' Agenda a moderate success. Widespread 'participatory democracy' it wasn't and young people on average did not seem more engaged than others in this project.

VOTE COMPASS

Compare this to Vote Compass where we had more than 1.3 million people log onto the site and complete the survey.

What is Vote Compass? Vote Compass is an interactive electoral literacy application developed by a global non-profit network of political scientists. Its objective is to promote democratic engagement during election campaigns.

Australia was by no means the first country for Vote Compass to be used. Vote Compass was developed by Canadian political scientists and Vote Compass was first launched during the 2011 Canadian federal election campaign in partnership with CBC, the Canadian equivalent of the ABC. It drew nearly 2 million respondents, making it one of the largest datasets of Canadian public opinion of public policy issues in the country's history. Vote Compass has since been run in 2 provincial elections in Canada and the last US election.

The premise of the application is relatively straightforward: based on their responses to a series of public policy propositions, users are presented with an analysis of how their views compare with the positions of each of the political parties.

The project is motivated by many of the concerns expressed in this paper. A desire to stimulate voter engagement in election campaigns in particular, but also to spread awareness of the public policy positions adopted by parties, increase accountability of politicians to their platforms, and prompt government to be more responsive to public opinion.

How does it work? Anyone could log onto the website and fill out a questionnaire of 30 questions (which included questions on issues like the economy, health, education and foreign affairs). We arrived at these set of questions after whittling down a list of over 100 questions which we developed over the course of a two day meeting in Sydney. This was followed by numerous email and Skype correspondence to discuss what questions should be included. We arrived at what we thought were a set of question that we think representative of the most important issues facing Australia.

An example of the questions asked were:
- Australia should end the monarchy and become a republic.
- The government's parental leave pay should be the same for all working mothers.
- How many new immigrants should Australia admit?
- Australia should spend more on foreign aid.
- Students in government and non-government schools should receive the same amount of federal funding.

- How much should the federal government do to tackle climate change?
- The national budget deficit should be reduced, even if it means fewer public services.
- Private health insurance rebates should depend on income.
- The Australian constitution should recognise indigenous people as Australia's first inhabitants.
- Marriage should only be between a man and a woman.
- How much should the government spend on defence?
- Boats carrying asylum seekers should be turned back.

We then identified 17 broad areas like climate change, gender equality, immigration, budget deficit and defence and then asked respondents to ascribe an importance to issues as we recognised that people do not feel the same way about all issues and some will be more important to some people than others. For example, economic issues may be more important than other issues to many people.

As mentioned previously, based on people's responses to a brief questionnaire, Vote Compass generates an analysis of how the respondent's views compare to the positions of the parties. For various reasons we decided to only include the Coalition, the ALP and the Greens. We placed respondents answers and the party's positions on an economic right and left and social liberalism and social conservatism scale.

We then calibrated the parties. Party positions in Vote Compass are determined by way of a two-part process. A research team of political scientists based at the University of Melbourne analysed the available data on party positions vis-à-vis the issues reflected in the questionnaire. Based on this analysis, a determination is made as to how each party would respond to each proposition. The research team then initiated a direct dialogue with each of the parties represented in Vote Compass as an additional check as to the accuracy of its calibrations. All parties are provided with an opportunity to review and, if necessary, challenge the calibrations before Vote Compass was launched.

Voters could engage with this tool as much or as little as they liked. To complete the survey and see the results could take less than 10 minutes but respondents could go deeper into the results and compare themselves to the parties on particular issues or look up the party's position on different issues.

What lessons can we take from this? Clearly Vote Compass tapped into something. My personal view is that it was representative of the tenor of the election in which there was not a lot of substantial policy discussion. Vote Compass provided voters with an easy way to see where the parties stand when this was often obscured in media coverage. It was also novel for many and interactive.

We also did not have a major media partner with the Citizens' Agenda whereas the ABC heavily promoted Vote Compass. The Citizens' Agenda is also obviously more labor intensive in terms of attending a town hall meeting. It required something more than just filling out a survey.

So what does all of this mean for young people? It's actually a little too early to say. Vote Compass was completed more by young people than older people but its success

was in engaging the disengaged, to the extent that many people came to Vote Compass from other streams aside from through the ABC site so it didn't just engage ABC viewers and listeners.

CONCLUSION

I have tried in this paper to show how engaged young people are in politics, in terms of their political participation in particular. In terms of electoral engagement the picture is quite bleak. This is concerning. My personal view is that there is no replacement for the aggregating mechanism that electoral politics and voting in particular play which is why I am very admiring of the work that electoral commission and politicians do. Electoral politics matters. And it is largely to do with the success of electoral politics I think that young people are a little neglectful of it. In terms of non-electoral politics young people are more engaged. However, there is a real danger of resource inequalities being exacerbated here.

In the second section of the paper I outlined some models of democracy and gave examples of two voter engagement projects I was involved with. These are attempts to 'bring the people in.' In the case of the Citizens' Agenda it has been a moderate success but has been limited in large part to the already engaged and those attending many of the town hall meetings tended to be older rather than younger. Vote Compass, on the other hand, has engaged the disengaged to an extent and, we hope, improved the public's knowledge of the positions of the parties. There was clearly some appetite for this.

But in terms of what democracy means in the 21st century and what young people's place in it will be. That remains to be seen. What does seem certain is that different forms of engagement will continue to transmogrify with reverberations being felt around the political landscape.

Bibliography

Barber, Benjamin, 'Three Scenarios for the Future of Technology and Strong Democracy,' *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 113, No. 4, Winter, 1998-1999, 573-589.

Dalton, Russell (2008) *The Good Citizen: How a Younger Generation is Reshaping American Politics*, Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Fishkin, James S., 'The Nation in a Room: Turning public opinion into policy,' *Boston Review* sourced from http://bsotonreview.net/BR31.2/fishkin.html (accessed 30th October 2006).

Held, David, *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge (UK): Polity, 2006.

Hibbing, John R. & Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth, *Stealth Democracy: Americans Beliefs about How Government Should Work*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Inglehart, Ronald (1997) 'Postmaterial Values and the Erosion of Institutional Authority' in J.S. Nye, P.D. Zelikow and D.C. King (eds) *Why People Don't Trust Government*, London: Harvard University Press.

Mair, Peter, 'Democracy Beyond Parties' (paper posted on the eScholarship Repository, University of California, 2005), http://repositories.cdlib.or/csd/05-06 (accessed November 15 2006).

Martin, Aaron (2012) Young *People and Politics: Political Engagement in the Anglo-American Democracies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Martin, Aaron (2013) How High is Voter Turnout in Australia and Could it be Increased? Lessons for Policy Makers. *Representation* (forthcoming).

Martin, Aaron and Pietsch, Juliet (2013) Future Shock or Future Stability?: Generation Change and the Australian Party System. *Australian Journal of Politics and History.*

McAllister, Ian, 'Party Elite, Voters and Political Attitudes: Testing Three Explanations for Mass-Elite Differences,' *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 1991, 237-268.

Norris, Pippa. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, Pew Internet Project Data Memo, August 2006.

Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 'Who Votes, Who Doesn't and Why: Regular Voters, Intermittent Voters, and Those Who Don't,' http://people-press.org/reports/print.php3?pageid=1094 (accessed 20th October 2006).

Power Inquiry, *Power to the People: The Report of Power: an independent Inquiry into Britain's democracy*, sourced from www.powerinquiry.org/report/documents/ii.pdf (accessed 11th November 2006).

Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

Russell, Meg, *Must Politics Disappoint*?, London, Fabian Society, 2005.

Stoker, Gerry (2006) *Why Politics Matters: Making Democracy Work*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vromen, Ariadne, 'Three political myths about young people,' *The Australian Review*, March 2005.

Wattenberg, Martin P., *Where Have all the Voters Gone?*, London: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Wattenberg, Martin, *Is Voting for Young People?*, New York, Pearson Longman, 2007.

Webb, Paul, Bale, Tim & Taggart, Paul, 'Understanding Democratic Disconnect: An Agenda for Research,' Paper presented to the Elections, Public Opinion and Parties Annual Conference, University of Nottingham, 8-10 September 2006.