Does the World Belong to the Young?

** Note: This is a preliminary version of the paper and all quotes from the paper require the approval of both authors. **

<u>**Does the World Belong to the Young? The Role of Youth in the IGF**</u>

Efrat Daskal and Anna Orlova

"The future belongs to young people with an education and the imagination to create. That is the source of power in this century." This declaration is from a commencement speech given by Barack Obama at the New Economic School in Russia on July 7, 2009 (Crawford, 2016). While we can all certainly agree that the future belongs to young people, the question remains, do we really allow them to have a say in shaping the future they will live in? This question guides our research as we try to unveil the role of youth in shaping the future of the Internet, focusing on the case study of youth involvement in the Internet Governance Forum (IGF).

The IGF is a United Nations-supported multistakeholder platform for policy dialogue on issues of internet governance (IG). It was established following the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) meetings in 2003 and 2005, and its mandate is to "discuss public policy issues related to key elements of Internet governance in order to foster the sustainability, robustness, security, stability and development of the Internet" (IGF, 2016a). Since 2006, it has convened annually at different locations around the world, and although it does not lead directly to policy outcomes, it remains the most popular political discursive sphere because it permits not only government representatives to discuss the norms and principles of the Internet in an open, non-binding forum, but other social actors as well (Hintz & Milan, 2009; Malcolm, 2011; Epstein, 2012).

There are three kinds of politics that shape the nature of IGF (Mueller, 2010): of representation (the people and groups that take part in the decision-making bodies of

Does the World Belong to the Young?

the IGF), of agenda setting (the topics that should be talked about), and finally, of principles (the dominant set of norms and values within the IGF). Without diminishing the power of the latter aspects, the issue of representation appears to be the crucial one, since IGF participants are those who eventually set the tone of the agenda and the principles of the forum. The representation system at IGF meetings is based on the concept of "stakeholderism," so that each of the participants defines him/herself as a representative of one or several stakeholders. As scholars have noted, this type of system has turned out to be more problematic than expected (Mueller, 2010).

In order to shed light on the matter, in the present research we focus on youth representation within the IGF as a case study, a topic that has been scarcely explored until now. The research asks if there are unique characteristics of youth as a distinctive stakeholder, thus contributing to the literature dealing with the concept of stakeholders, representation, and power relations within the IGF. In addition, this study will provide guidelines for individuals and organizations, especially youth, who wish to participate and become more engaged in IG processes. The paper is arranged according to the following structure: first, we address the issue of the multistakeholder approach within the IGF, followed by an outline of the problematics various stakeholders face when trying to engage and participate at IGF meetings, and then presentation of the ongoing trend of incorporating youth in various political and civic causes around the world. After describing our methodology and findings, we will conclude the paper by addressing the future of youth involvement at IGF meetings and the kind of representation youth participants construct.

Internet Governance Forum: Creating a New Form of Governance?

The most prominent outcome of WSIS was the establishment of the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), a new platform for multistakeholder dialogue on Internet

Does the World Belong to the Young?

policy (Hintz & Milan, 2009). There are two distinctive features to this forum. The first is that it is not a decision-making body. The IGF does not lead to any policy outcomes, nor does it have a decision-making role or the power to negotiate binding agreements. The decision to create such a forum was the result of compromise between the developing and developed nations, civil society organizations, and various private actors (Mueller, 2010). The second distinctive feature of IGF is its multistakeholder nature. This means that it involves "representatives" from governments, intergovernmental organizations, the Tech (or the IT) community and civil society. The aim was to establish a transparent, democratic, and multilateral process of IG with the participation of all these social actors (Hintz & Milan, 2009; Antonova, 2011; Fishkin & Senges, 2016; Malcolm, 2011). The underlying premise here was that the Internet is a global resource and as such, its fate should be decided by various social actors. From that point on, the multistakeholder concept was used as a legitimizing rationale not just within the framework of the IGF, but in all other IG institutions (Weinberg, 2011).

The establishment of the IGF was, at least at the beginning, a path-breaking innovation in global governance, since it symbolized transition into a formal collaboration between various stakeholders (Mueller, 2010; Mueller & Wagner, 2014). The aim in creating IGF was to build something more than just a public consultation process, but a long-term mechanism that would allow for various state and non-state actors to cooperate in a decision-making process concerning IG, hopefully leading to more sophisticated and efficient solutions to IG problems (Carr, 2015; Ballamingie, 2009; Barnes, Newman, Knops, & Sullivan, 2003; Newman, 2007; Newman, Barnes, Sullivan, & Knops, 2004). Furthermore, the multistakeholder approach to IG was regarded not only by many as the best way to organize around this particular issue, but

Does the World Belong to the Young?

was held up as a potential innovative governance model for managing other "post-state" issues in a globalized world (Mueller & Wagner, 2014; Carr, 2015).

The Limitation of the MSH Approach: The Representational Map of IGF

Applying a multi-stakeholder approach to the IGF held within it the promise of bringing together a diverse range of actors representing the interests of various stakeholders (Levenson, 2012). However, as reality has shown us, there appear to be at least three major barriers preventing people from participating in IGF meetings, therefore diminishing the ideal of the multistakeholder system. In what follows, we will elaborate on these obstacles, ranging from the least to the most problematic:

Lack of awareness, education, and money **-** While this might seem trivial, in order to engage in IGF one needs to know of its existence, possess basic knowledge of the IG topic, and be motivated to attend. IG is a complex techno-political topic and most people have no understanding or knowledge of it – and furthermore, have no idea the IGF even exists. Second, most people do not have the necessary funds to participate at IGF meetings, which usually take place in remote and exotic locations (e.g., Brazil, Kenya, Indonesia). Thus, only by associating with other stakeholders or initiatives (e.g., civil society organizations, governments, private companies, academic institutions) can one enter the IGF loop, understand the dynamic, secure funding, and take part (Carr, 2015).

Structure of the stakeholders - Each of the stakeholders who wish to participate in the IGF decides which delegates to send. Because countries that send delegates usually send public or governmental officials who deal with IG, they can be considered official representatives of their countries. However, the same cannot be said of the private sector and the tech community, where the delegates are either chosen by companies from among their employees or decide to come on their own behalf, hence representing

Does the World Belong to the Young?

the interests of their companies or their own interests. Choosing representatives becomes even more problematic in non-hierarchal organizations or institutions like civil society organizations. To begin with, such organizations tend to be less prepared and coordinated, so their institutions or procedures for appointing officials capable of being accepted globally are not well-defined (Malcolm, 2011; Mueller & Wagner, 2014; Carr, 2015). Moreover, as IG processes have become more institutionalized, two complementary circumstances have come about that influence the representatives who get to participate in IGF. First, quite a few grassroots tech groups, social movements, civil society groups, and citizen initiatives that are less structured have been left out of the IGF. Second, a strong group of civil society organizations was formed creating what can be defined as the "global civil society elite." Over the years, this group became one of the more dominant social actors within civil society working in the field of IG and specifically participating at IGF meetings. The participants of this group, however, come mostly from Western or Western-funded organizations, and thus do not include many representatives from developing countries or Internet end users. Therefore, the people who ultimately participate on behalf of civil society at IGF meetings do not really represent global civil society (Hintz & Milan, 2009; Mueller, 2010; Malcolm, 2011; Carr, 2015).

The politics of the UN - During the initial phases of IGF, the UN as well as other social actors suggested creating the Multistakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) to assist the IGF secretary in organizing IGF meetings. The role of the group is to help develop the agenda and content. It comprises 55 members from the following sectors: governments, intergovernmental governments, commercial private sectors, civil society, and the tech community. MAG members impact the agenda directly by actively participating in open consultations; then through face-to-face meetings and email correspondence the

Does the World Belong to the Young?

members agree on the overall theme for the annual IGF meeting and finalize the selection of workshops (Mueller, 2010; Epstein, 2011). Thus, those who are appointed to the MAG have the power to decide how the IGF meetings will look. But it is not easy to become a member. While every individual (or organization) can place his/her nomination for election to the group, the final decision is made by the United Nations Secretary-General. The assessment of the candidates is based on a number of factors, such as likely contribution, knowledge, and expertise, with the final aim to make the MAG as representative as possible, reflecting diversity of viewpoints, geography and gender balance, and knowledge of IG-related issues (IGF, 2016b). However, since the procedure of selection is confidential and not transparent, there is no way to know for sure what the considerations of the UN Secretary-General are, raising questions about the quality of representation within the MAG (Levenson, 2012).

Taking all of these obstacles together, the upshot is that anyone from any sector or any individual who has the funds to travel to the IGF meeting locations and register can attend them and constitute a representative (Levenson, 2012). The unique mixture of people who eventually do manage to participate in the meetings ultimately constructs an informal symbolic representation. It is informal because it lacks the dimensions of authorization and accountability that usually derive from formal representation (Pitkin, 1967) and it is symbolic because the representatives "stand for" the represented without going through any formal procedures (Pitkin, 1967). Symbolic representation can be constructed in two ways: substantive or descriptive. Substantive representation takes place in instances in which the role of informal representation is to act on behalf of the interests of a constituent group, regardless of one's identity, for example, the international, transnational, and non-governmental actors who promote public policies on behalf of various societal groups. On the other hand, in descriptive representation,

Does the World Belong to the Young?

the focus is on the identity of the person and not on what he or she supports or does (Levenson, 2012). This type of representation is based on the similarities between the characteristics of the representatives (such as gender, ethnic origin, religion, age) and the community they aim to represent. It implies that representatives share the same perceptions and interests as the community they represent. According to the rationale of descriptive representation, if a forum is to be representative, legitimate, and trustworthy, it needs to be an exact copy of society. Thus, using descriptive representation can help include the various identities and conflicts within this forum (Pitkin, 1967; Phillips, 1995; Shapira, Kenig, Friedberg, & Malka-Itzkovitch, 2013; Norris, 1996). This rationale stands at the core of incorporating young members in IGF, as we will discuss at the next section.

"We are Young, So Let's Set the World on Fire": Youth Involvement in IGF

In recent years, the research perspective on children and young people has shifted from seeing them as vulnerable societal sectors who need protection to considering them active and knowledgeable social actors who can contribute to society and whose voices should be heard in all matters that affect them (Hamelink, 2008; Livingstone 2002, 2009; Dahlgren, 2007).

In her work on children as digital-rights agents, Stald (2016) defined three possible roles children and youth can take upon themselves within this framework:

1. Children as informants – Under this category fall all children's activities in which they act as informants and provide information to their general surroundings.

2. Children as peer-to-peer agents – Similar to the first role, children function as informants, but the focus is different. Here they provide practical guidance to their friends and share their experience mainly with them.

Does the World Belong to the Young?

3. Children as politicians – Lastly, children can assume the role of advocates operating within their socio-political realm in order to bring about a change in their surroundings.

As scholars indicate, in recent years the latter role of children as advocates or even politicians, has gained a certain momentum. Today, all around the world youth are serving as members of boards of directors and key advisory groups, and they are working with adults on issues like program design, budgeting, hiring, community outreach, public relations, and assessment (Zeldin & Macneil, 2006).[1] Moreover, scholars as well as public figures call for governments, private foundations, and nonprofit organizations to incorporate young people in decision-making processes, citing three reasons why youth should be included in various policy forums and governance processes. First and foremost, to provide social justice for young people. Although young people still need adult protection and supervision, they are also entitled to be active agents in their own lives. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 12, for example, states that all children are capable of expressing a view; have the right to be heard in all matters affecting them, including policy matters; and have the right to have their views taken seriously in accordance with their age and maturity. Second, communities work better when the voices and capabilities of diverse stakeholders are represented; thus, allowing youth to take part in meaningful activities within a community helps to strengthen civil society. Third, studies have shown that youth engagement promotes civic competence and identity building, improves interpersonal skills, and encourages social responsibility among youth, therefore

---

[1] On the surface, these finding seems to contradict studies indicating a decline in youth involvement in the political sphere. Yet it coincides with another line of studies that distinguishes between interest and involvement in the formal political system and civic engagement. While regarding the former scholars have noted that there is a pattern of apathy and disengagement among youth across the world, regarding the latter, there is an increase in youth participation in non-mainstream forms of civil involvement that can be directed at progressive reform as well as conservative counter-reforms. (Delli Carpinih, 2000; Youniss, Bales, Christmas-Best, Diversi, McLaughlin, & Silbereisen, 2002).

Does the World Belong to the Young?

preparing them not only to become good citizens, but also good leaders (MacNeil & McClean, 2006; Youniss, Bales, Christmas-Best, Diversi, McLaughlin, & Silbereisen, 2002; Delli Carpini, 2000; Serido, Borden, & Perkins, 2011; Zeldin & Macneil, 2006).

Within the world of the IGF, since its creation in 2006 young people and youth organization representatives have always taken part in its annual meetings and consultations (Bucht & Edström, 2012). Over the years, not only has the number of young people participating in the forum increased, but the nature of their involvement has evolved. Youth participants took steps toward institutionalizing their representation in IGF by establishing the Youth Coalition on Internet Governance (YCIG) during the fourth IGF meeting in Sharm El Sheikh in 2009. By doing so, they declared that they, as a unique stakeholder, have the right to participate in making decisions about IG within the existing IGF structure, and took action to realize that right. Thus this study asks the question, how do young people realize their goals of being youth representatives within IGF?

Methodology

In our research we used several research methods triangulated to produce a thick description of youth activities within the IGF. First was content analysis of all youth-related materials from IGF meetings. The content analysis allowed us to map the various young social actors who have participated in IGF, their origin, their professional orientation, and their opinions. Second, in-depth interviews were conducted with past and present key activists taking part in the activities of various youth organizations in IGF. Within this framework, we asked them how they perceive (or perceived) their role within the IGF by focusing on the following questions: who are they, how did they get involved in the IGF, have they participated at IGF meetings in the past, what preparation did they receive and from whom before participating in IGF, who they

Does the World Belong to the Young?

represent (or represented) formally, what actions they carry (or carried) out in IGF, what problems they encounter (or encountered), and how have they tried to solve them. Finally, we also plan to conduct a participatory observation of several meetings at IGF Mexico, which is scheduled to take place in December 2016, in order to document in real time, the dynamic of youth. Thus at this point, we will present only the results based on the analysis of IGF transcripts and some preliminary interviews we have managed to conduct so far.

The Youth of IGF: Idealistic Dream versus Political Reality

The results of the analysis are presented below according to the following major themes: the initial vision of youth activists, the difficulties youth encounter in realizing their vision, and finally, the perceived future of youth representation within IGF. Each section includes the main ideas that emerged from the analysis of the interviews and the transcripts.

I have a dream: The preliminary vision of youth in IGF

A recurring theme in almost every IGF meeting in which youth participate is that young voices should be heard in the context of IG and the IGF in particular. This idea coincides with the vision of IGF as an open forum in which diverse stakeholders can participate; indeed, various civil society organizations dealing with youth have done their very best to bring them to the front in IGF.

Over time the prominence of youth in these meetings has grown, eventually leading, as mentioned, to the creation of (YCIG) during IGF 2009. Its charter articulates the structure of the coalition as well as its goals and vision. The coalition is led by a steering committee formed by three elected members below 30 years of age, each one serving a one-year term. In the charter, the founders of the coalition depicted their vision concerning youth in IGF:

Does the World Belong to the Young?

The Internet plays an important role in the lives of children, young people and young adults and will become even more important in the future. Youth are the largest group of internet users in most countries. . . Young people are using the Internet for their education, work life, social communication or private information. Far too often the local, national and international decision making and governance structure that impact on the Internet exclude young people from discussion and decision making. As the largest user group, young people need to get strongly involved in the process of Internet Governance. This involvement should not be limited to typical youth related issues like literacy or protection the young to [sic] harmful online content. The active involvement and leadership of young people should go beyond that, since the Internet is first and foremost a world of the young. . . . Youth have a very valuable contribution to make to discussions, debates and decision making regarding internet governance and have therefore to be actively involved in all policy- and decision making. . . . Young people need to be lobbyist for a free internet in an open society. We want to be actively involved in discussions about privacy, social media governance, future of intellectual property but also in literacy or online safety – and we ourselves will do our very best to reach that goal. The involvement of young people must not [sic] genuine, not tokenistic (YCIG, 2009).

Several main principles derived from the charter should be highlighted. First, according to it, the main justification for youth becoming a stakeholder on its own relies on the fact that "the Internet is a world of the young." This idea can be interpreted in two possible ways. First, that youth are the largest group of Internet users as stated explicitly in the charter, and thus should be considered an independent stakeholder. This argument is problematic because the Internet spreads both around and over the years, thus, those young users will sooner or later grow out of that category. The second interpretation relates to the experience youth acquire in Internet-related issues. This experience transforms young people into a type of expert, and it is this expertise that

grants them the position of stakeholder. While this premise is stated implicitly in the charter, our interviewees referred to it explicitly, as one of the activists told us, "You're [a young person] the expert in your own environment, you know how you use media, you know what annoys you with the digital stuff. . . . That's enough, that makes you an expert enough." However, this premise can apply to anyone who uses the Internet and not just young people, making it a problematic assumption as well.

The second principle derived from the charter, relates to the topics youth should engage with as part of their contribution to IG. Again according to the charter, young people should be confined not only to "youth-related issues like literacy or protection the young to [sic] harmful online content" (YCIG, 2009), but also to other aspects of IG. In the realm of IG, the subject of children and youth is often brought up either in the context of on-line safety or Internet literacy. The tendency to deal with these issues derives from the premise that youth constitute a vulnerable societal sector that needs to be protected and therefore are not qualified to make policy-related decisions. Thus, by articulating explicitly in the charter that youth-related issues include other aspects of IG, the coalition challenges traditional definitions of youth and Internet-related issues. Finally, claim the founders, "The involvement of young people must not [sic] genuine, not tokenistic," (YCIG, 2009) meaning that only the authentic voices of young should be heard in this framework. We will return to this claim further along.

Living out a dream ain't as easy as it seems: From awareness to funding

All civil society organizations who share the goal of bringing the voice of young people to IGF also share the same difficulties – lack of awareness, lack of education, and lack of money. Although these are general obstacles for all those who wish to participate at IGF, when it comes to youth, they are critical because young people are by default the least financially stable and less knowledgeable about IG or IGF.

Does the World Belong to the Young?

The first stage in bringing the voice of youth to IGF is actually recruiting young people to participate. As one the activists informed us, "Youth participation doesn't know that the dialogue exists," especially in countries in which there is no national IGF or even awareness of IG issues. Thus, activists who wish to recruit young people began reaching out to young people usually through their networks (e.g. Facebook pages and mailing lists) in order to raise awareness of the topic and find young people who would be interested – a task that turned out to be quite difficult since, as one of the activist described to us,

> Internet . . . 'Youth Internet Governance Forum' was very confusing for the youth; they didn't know what this is. . . . If we had explained that it is about copyrighting, it is about privacy, it is about security, and many, many other topics, which have simpler digital dimensions, that would have been more catchy [sic], and that would have got their attention much more.

As can be understood from this quote, the way to make IG relatable to young people is to translate the IG language into topics that are relevant to them, such as privacy, copyright, or social media. However, getting the young people involved and interested in IG and IGF is only the beginning for the organizations dealing with youth. What follows is the process of educating young people about IG and providing them with sufficient preparation and guidance so that they can participate properly at IGF meetings. As one of the activists informed us, the basic purpose of such training is to give young people

> …the possibility to build their own opinion afterwards. And the idea is not to influence young people to one or another direction, but to provide a balanced picture so that you can make up your own mind. . . having your own opinion about something and then you can express this opinion through different channels, networks, and different contexts . . . first you need to have an opinion and that's crucial in this field.

Does the World Belong to the Young?

In order to do so, youth activists need money to hire a venue, pay for lecturers, and draw participants. In cases of training that lasts more than a day, they need to provide food and accommodation. In these cases, activists approach organizations such as the local affiliates of the UN, Internet companies like Google and Facebook, governments, and even civil society organizations for donations. Procuring such funding requires a lot of work from youth organizations, and moreover, it may come with strings attached, as one of our interviewees told us:

> Usually you always make a deal. You need to have something to offer; you need to be clear before you go somewhere – what do you have to offer? So do you have a website where you can put a logo? Do you have a T-shirt; do you have a possibility to put fliers somewhere? And you need to be clear what approach you would like to take to commercial support. So how do you want your event to be commercialized?

The need for finance is not only limited to the period of training. While there are opportunities for young people to participate in local IGF meetings or remotely at the global or regional IGF, physical and actual participation at IGF meetings is considered the jewel in the crown for young activists. As such, it requires them again to procure funding in order to travel there. In some cases, the funding comes from nations that wish to promote the issue of youth involvement in IGF (e.g., Nordicom or national YGIF initiatives). In other cases, it might come from various NGOs, the most prominent example being the ISOC ambassadors program. Yet, going back to the desire of YCIG to allow young people to express their unique and authentic voices, this type of sponsorship might substantially diminish their ambition since they might feel pressured to say what their benefactors expect from them.

Does the World Belong to the Young?

The IGF can be a scary forum, especially for young people trying to fit in for the first time. For example, this is what one participant said at a workshop dedicated to youth involvement in IG, which took place in Istanbul during IGF 2014:

> For example, I was having a discussion, or rather an argument, with a participant of the IGF yesterday evening, who was saying that I wasn't really qualified to comment on Internet Governance because I was pronouncing the Internet assigned number authority IANA instead of IANA" [As separate letters rather than as an acronym] (IGF, 2016d).

As can be understood from this quote, young people can be silenced by older and more experienced participants, thus they might feel too intimidated to speak up during IGF meetings. Since these sentiments were repeated in all transcripts of IGF meetings in which youth participated, it is easy to understand why YCIG activists prepare a survival kit for young people participating at IGF and try to hold their annual meetings at the beginning of IGF so that young people can become acquainted with one another early on.

Youth is a transitory state: The next stop after IGF

The thrill that usually accompanies IGF gatherings vanishes quickly and, based on the interviews we conducted, the young people involved in IG youth activities either move on to participate in other forums or abandon IG activities altogether. As for YCIG leaders, since according to the charter the leadership must change every year, sustaining a continuous meaningful activity between IGF meetings is problematic. The analysis of the transcripts of YCIG meetings reveal how every year the same discussions are conducted and issues raised, such as the meaning of being a youth representative in IGF, the importance of young people participating in IGF, and the ways YCIG can make it easier for young people to participate at IGF meetings.

However, there is one development taking place within YCIG we would like to conclude with since it symbolizes, in our opinion, the beginning of change within the

Does the World Belong to the Young?

organization. During IGF 2015, a decision was made to review and revise the YCIG charter (IGF, 2016e). Throughout 2016 discussions have taken place concerning the issue, and while no agreement has yet been reached, there are two significant changes we would like to highlight. The first concerns the structure of the steering committee (the leadership of the coalition). While in the past, there were no rules regarding the makeup of the committee, according to the proposed charter, it will comprise five member elected from each regional group, including African, Asia-Pacific, Eastern European, Latin American and Caribbean, Western European, and Other Groups, with reference to the division of United Nations Regional Groups. This division for the first time constructs geographical borders within the YCIG and furthermore provides an advantage to non-Western members. The change allows for young people from non-Western countries to be part of YCIG, although the alienation of Western representatives might diminish the power of YCIG as an all-inclusive forum. The second significant change concerns the right to vote. According to the proposed charter, there will be three categories of membership: full members, associate members, and organization members. Full members must be between the ages of 16 and 30, but associate members can be older members who are willing to support the work of the coalition. Organization members are organizations that have interests in youth issues. Of these categories, only full members will have voting rights on issues about YCIG decisions, while associate and organization members will be encouraged to participate in the discussions, providing their comments and suggestions. While this change protects the coalition from being captured by older people, blocking older people out of voting means that even experienced past youth activists of YCIG are unable to transform their knowledge and expertise into voting. Given the time required for young activists to acquire experience, this modus operandi might keep the coalition in a

constant state of adolescence. Both changes taken together have the potential to weaken the coalition instead of strengthening it.

Concluding Remarks: Youth Representation as a Liquid Representation?

In Latin, to represent means "to make present", and indeed, according to Pitkin (1967), political representation allows for citizens' voices, opinions, and perspectives to be "present" in the making of public policy. Looking at the agenda for the upcoming IGF 2016, there will be seven workshops dealing with youth and IG led by young people, thus providing salience to youth and the issue of youth during IGF (IGF, 2016e). From an etic point of view, such an increase in the number of youth participants at IGF qualifies as a success, since more young people have the opportunity of expressing their ideas; yet from an emic point of view, since most young participants are usually sponsored by some entity, there is no way of knowing whether the opinions and ideas expressed by these young people are indeed authentic. This interpretation also coincides with the criticism of scholars and public figures who argue that the IGF only serves to reinforce the already existing power relations within the world of IG. (Mueller, 2010; Wagner & Mueller, 2014).

From a broader perspective of representation, it seems that the case study of youth representation at IGF constructs a new mode of representation – in which the not only do the representatives construct an informal symbolic representation but also since they are constantly changing, they are creating a liquid representation. This type of representation also raises the question what is the meaning of youth representation. And while we are still trying to answer this question, we would like to conclude by offering one possible answer based on what a participant at the YCIG meeting at IGF 2010 said: "From being here and listening, I get the feeling that a lot of young activists or youth activists participating in governance processes don't really consider themselves young

17

representatives. They consider themselves normal representatives just like anybody else." (IGF, 2016f)

Does the World Belong to the Young?

References

Antonova, S. (2011). "Capacity-building" in global Internet governance: The long-term outcomes of "multistakeholderism." *Regulation & Governance*, *5*, 425–445. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5991.2011.01117.x

Ballamingie, P. (2009). Democratizing public consultation processes: Some critical insights. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, *5*(1). Retrieved from http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd/vol5/iss1/art11

Barnes, M., Newman, J., Knops, A., & Sullivan, H. (2003). Constituting "the public" in public participation. *Public Administration*, *81*, 379–399. doi:10.1111/1467-9299.00352

Bucht, C., & Edström, M. (2012). *Youth have their say on internet governance: Nordic Youth Forum at EuroDIG Stockholm*. University of Gothenburg: The International Clearinghouse on Children, Youth and Media NORDICOM.

Carr, M. (2015) Power plays in global internet governance. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, *43*, 2640–2659. doi:10.1177/0305829814562655

Crawford, C. (August 1, 2016). The Wisdom of Young Speechwriters. *Pundit Wire*. Retrieved from http://punditwire.com/2016/08/01/the-wisdom-of-young-speechwriters/

Dahlgren, P. (2007). *Young Citizens and new media: Learning for democratic participation*. New York: Routledge

Delli Carpini, M. X. (2000). Gen.com: Youth, civic engagement, and the new information environment. *Political Communication*, *17*, 341–349. doi:10.1080/10584600050178942

Does the World Belong to the Young?

Epstein, D. (2011). Manufacturing Internet policy language: The inner workings of the discourse construction at the Internet Governance Forum. *TPRC 2011*. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1989674

Epstein, D. (2012). *The duality of information policy debates: The case of the internet governance forum.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://ecommons.cornell.edu/bitstream/handle/1813/29128/de56thesisPDF.pdf?sequence=1

Fishkin J., & Senges, M. (2016). *The public voice in internet governance.* Retrieved from http://freespeechdebate.com/es/debate/the-public-voice-in-internet-governance/

Hamelink, C. J. (2008). On being critical. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, *1*(1), 3–7. doi:10.1111/j.1753-9137.2007.00001.x

Hintz, A., & Milan, S. (2009). At the margins of Internet governance: Grassroots techgroups and communication policy. *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, *5*(1/2), 23–38.

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2016a). *About the IGF*. Retrieved from http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/aboutigf

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2016b). *MAG terms of reference*. Retrieved from http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/magabout

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2016c). *Youth involvement in IG – workshop 173*. Retrieved from http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/174-igf-2014/transcripts/2054-2014-09-04-ws173-youth-involvement-main-hall

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2016d). *2015 11 12 Youth Coalition on Internet Governance Workshop*. Retrieved from

Does the World Belong to the Young?

http://www.intgovforum.org/multilingual/content/2015-11-12-youth-coalition-on-internet-governance-workshop-room-5-finished

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2016e). *All proposals received*. Retrieved from http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/igf16-workshops/igf-2016-published-proposals

Internet Governance Forum (IGF) (2016f). *Policy, governance and participation: Harnessing all aspects of the net for youth activism.* Retrieved from https://www.intgovforum.org/cms/component/content/article/102-transcripts2010/637-70

Levenson, N. S. (2012). Ecologies of representation: knowledge, networks, & innovation in internet governance. Paper presented at APSA Annual Meeting. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2108671

Livingstone, S. (2002). *Young People and new media: Childhood and the changing media environment*. London: Sage.

Livingstone, S. (2009). *Children and the Internet: Great expectations, challenging realities.* Cambridge: Polity

MacNeil, C. A., & McClean, J. (2006). Moving from "youth leadership development" to "youth in governance": Learning leadership by doing leadership. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *109*, 99–106. doi:10.1002/yd

Malcolm, J. (September 27, 2011). Arresting the decline of multi-stakeholderism in Internet governance. Paper presented at GigaNet: Global Internet Governance Academic Network, Annual Symposium. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2809733

Mueller, M. L. (2010). *Networks and states: The global politics of internet governance*. MA: MIT Press.

Does the World Belong to the Young?

Mueller, M. & Wagner, B. (2014) Finding a formula for Brazil: Representation and legitimacy in internet governance. The Center for Global Communication Studies: The Internet Policy Observatory. Retrieved from http://www.internetgovernance.org/wordpress/wp content/uploads/MiltonBenWPdraft_Final_clean2.pdf

Newman, J. (2007). Rethinking the public in troubled times. *Public Policy and Administration*, *22*(1), 27–47.

Newman, J., Barnes, M., Sullivan, H., & Knops, A. (2004). Public participation and collaborative governance. *Journal of Social Policy*, *33*, 203–223.

Norris, P. (1996). Does television erode social capital? A reply to Putnam. *Political Science and Politics*, *29*, 474–480.

Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The concept of representation*. University of California Press.

Phillips, A. (1995). *Politics of presence*. New York: Clarendon.

Serido, J., Borden, L. M., & Perkins, D. F. (2011). Moving beyond youth voice. *Youth & Society*, *43*(1), 44–63.

Shapira, A., Kenig, O., Friedberg, C., & Itzkovitch-Malka, R. (2013). *The representation of women in Israeli politics: A comparative perspective*. The Israel Democratic Institute.

Stald, G. (2016). Children as digital rights agents. Paper presented at an IAMCR pre-conference. Children's and Young People's Rights in the Digital Age. London, UK.

Weinberg, J. (2011). Governments, privatization, and privatization: ICANN and GAC. *Michigan Telecommunications and Technology Law Review*, *18*(1), 188–218

YCIG (2009). *Charter. Retrieved from* https://ycigweb.wordpress.com/charter/

Does the World Belong to the Young?

Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002). Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *12*(1), 121–148

Zeldin, S., & Macneil, C. (2006). Lessons from the field: engaging youth and adults as partners in organizational governance. *National Civic Review*, *95*, 7–14. doi:10.1002/ncr.125