

## CHAPTER 10

# The role of the youth in socio-economic development

*Adelaide Selemela*  & *Michael N. Khwela* 

*University of Limpopo*

### **Introduction and Background**

In the National Youth Policy, youth are identified as anyone between the ages of 14 and 35 years (National Youth Policy, 1996). This classification encompasses diverse youth groups that have experienced different historical, socio-political, and cultural influences. In addition to the ability to understand their own needs, young people possess the creativity and energy to rethink old problems (Coccia, 2019). An economy's growth rate is determined by the intensity of youth involvement in socio-economic development. As the youth unemployment rate is high, they will inevitably become dependent on the state, which means there will be no significant economic growth (Oaktree, 2016; Human Development Report, 2018). Modern society relies on the youth for justifiable socio-economic development; hence their involvement in a country's development plans is vital. The youth represents maximum multicultural competence in terms of culture (Coccia, 2017b). As a result of changes made over the years, it is now easier to cross borders and travel across countries. Many study abroad and come back with new ideologies and expertise to improve the country (Richards & Aldana, 2013; Oaktree, 2016). The technological advancements that have rendered the world a global village have simultaneously positioned the youth as the embodiment of multicultural competence. Consequently, thanks to technological progress, communication becomes

instantaneous, transcending geographical boundaries (Iwasaki, 2014; Chambers, 2020).

The paper shows that placing a premium on socio-economic development enables young people to participate in economic activities and be more meaningfully engaged. Investing in the development of skills among young people greatly benefits the economy. When young people are empowered and given sufficient educational opportunities, they play an important role as active citizens, and this role is associated with positive economic outcomes (De Cubellis, 2021). Public engagement with young people helps in understanding the needs of young people and how best to capture their specific requirements in public policy development. Promoting youth participation is vital to achieving economic growth and development (Arnold, 2018; Johnson, 2021). In this context, this paper seeks to advance perspectives that could promote greater youth involvement in socio-economic development. In this paper, we will discuss the significance of enabling the youth in areas such as education, economics, industrial training, policy development, including morals. It is important that the youth be equipped to make informed decisions regarding their communities, countries, and the world at large.

In the National Youth Policy, youth are identified as anyone between the ages of 14 and 35 years old (National Youth Policy, 1996). This classification encompasses diverse youth groups that have experienced different historical, socio-political, and cultural influences. In addition to the ability to understand their own needs, young people possess the creativity and energy to reconsider old problems (Coccia, 2019). One of the ways to determine an economy's growth rate is by measuring the intensity of youth involvement in socio-economic development. As the youth unemployment rate is high, they will inevitably become dependent on the state, which means there will be no significant economic growth (Oaktree, 2016; Human Development Report, 2018). Most society relies on the youth for justifiable socio-economic development; hence, their involvement in a country's

development plans is vital. The youth represent maximum multicultural competence in terms of culture (Coccia, 2017b). As a result of changes made over the years, it is now easier to cross borders and travel across countries. Many study abroad and come back with new ideologies and expertise to improve the country (Richards and Aldana, 2013; Oaktree, 2016). The technological advancements that have rendered the world a global village have simultaneously positioned the youth as the embodiment of multicultural competence (Iwasaki, 2014; Chambers, 2020).

This chapter shows that placing a premium on socio-economic development enables young people to participate in economic activities and be more meaningfully engaged. Investing in the development of skills among young people greatly benefits the economy. When young people are empowered and given sufficient educational opportunities, they play an important role as active citizens, and this role is associated with positive economic outcomes (De Cubellis, 2021). Public engagement with young people helps in understanding the needs of young people and how best to capture their specific requirements in public policy development. Promoting youth participation is vital to achieving economic growth and development (Arnold, 2018; Johnson, 2021). In this context, this paper seeks to advance perspectives that could promote greater youth involvement in socio-economic development. This paper, discusses the significance of enabling the youth in areas such as education, economics, industrial training, policy development and morals. It is important that the youth be equipped to make informed decisions regarding their communities, countries, and the world at large. The next section reviews three theories which are; youth development theory, theory of positive youth development and theory of context and community change. These theories serve as the basis for this study.

## **Theoretical Literature**

### **Youth Development Theory**

Youth development theory emphasises the importance of creating supportive communities. Developing solutions that meet urgent needs sustainably is more likely when those most affected by a challenge are involved in the process (Caine and Boydell, 2010; Ross, 2011; LaPeer, 2020). Youth growth ventures and programmes profit from young people's participation at every stage of the process (Cammarota, 2011; Arnold, 2018). In addition to understanding their own needs, young people are creative and energetic, and they are able to view previous challenges in a new light. Involving youth in the design and delivery of programmes can improve modernisation, surge participant maintenance, result in longer-long-lasting programme outcomes, and influence neighbouring practices (Coccia, 2018a). The positive youth development philosophy, which views young people as resources rather than challenges, is the starting point for positive youth engagement. Efforts aimed at supporting youth, devoid of their active involvement, pose a dual risk of potential failure and missed opportunities (LaPeer, 2020). Youth are the prime drivers of their own growth, with systems and adults maintaining and supporting them. Young people's presence is often seen as a token or decorative gesture. Support is indispensable for fostering effective youth engagement, providing opportunities and services that enable youth from diverse backgrounds to contribute meaningfully to decision-making processes and assume leadership roles (Coccia, 2016; De Satge, 2021). Majority of the of the community faces a significant challenge in engaging marginalised youth since they are often disconnected from and distrustful of their environments (Davidson, Wien, and Anderson, 2010; Ramey, Busseri, Khanna, and Rose-Krasnor, 2010; LaPeer, 2020).

Youth commitment is crucial both for optimal youth development and as a facilitator for system changes to encourage high-risk, ostracised youth and families (Yohalem and Martin, 2007; Blanchet-Cohen and Salazar, 2009;

Wexler, DiFluvio, and Burke, 2009; Davidson et al., 2010). Furthermore, youth ought to be more courteously recognised as a key backer to youth growth and system change (Durlak et al., 2007; Hodges, Ferreira and Israel, 2012). Fostering health, development, and well-being outcomes for ostracised youth is a shared responsibility across all societal structures and sectors (Delgado, 2002; Ersing, 2009; Zahradnik, et al., 2010). Support systems must be transformed to enhance these effects for ostracised youth. Research indicates the significance and challenges of working and engaging with marginalised youth in a youth-friendly manner to build positive, meaningful relationships (Yohalem and Martin, 2007; Ersing, 2009; Smyth and Eaton-Erickson, 2009; De Cubellis, 2021). The literature detects considerable disparities regarding the use of youth-guided approaches to engage youth with high-risk behaviours and conditions such as homelessness, abusive and health-risk behaviours, mental health challenges, poverty, and social exclusion (Davidson et al., 2010; Cammarota, 2011; Gharabaghi and Anderson-Nathe, 2012). This theory promotes youth leadership in the context of supporting and inspiring high-risk, ostracised youth in their quest for an optimistic, involved, and profound life. The next theory's discussion on positive youth development will help attain this aim.

### **Theory of Positive Youth Development**

The 1990s saw the emergence of positive youth development (PYD), an alternative to the deficit model of adolescent development that had dominated adolescent development for the majority of the 20th century. The strengths-based PYD approach views youth as resources to be developed, as opposed to this deficit model's perception of youth as problems to be managed (Zeldin, 2000; De Satge, 2021). Sustaining the convergence of research and practice is crucial to addressing complicated concerns related to the promotion of PYD and optimizing positive development for all young people.

Positive youth development entails the incorporation of various theoretical inclinations. The reason for this is that optimistic youth advancement includes numerous scholarly

disciplines and spheres of practice (Coccia and Wang, 2016; Nelson, 2020).. A series of developmental psychology-based questions underpin positive youth development theory (Coccia, 2017a). This model specifically aims to elucidate the capacity of youth to undergo transformation in a way that fosters both individual and societal well-being. It seeks to explore how contingent and ecological factors contribute to this transformation, as well as how the developing individual shapes and is influenced by these elements. Additionally, it investigates the principles and mechanisms that facilitate dynamic and mutually beneficial collaboration between the individual and their environment (Zeldin, 2000; De Satge, 2021). In addition to positive youth development being a field of practice since several decades ago, the creation of a developmental theory is also an ongoing and dynamic process (Larson, 2000; Zeldin, 2000; Benson and Saito, 2001; Hamilton and Hamilton, 2004; Johnson, 2021). The theoretical foundations of positive youth development have been laid in the past few decades. During the mid-1990s, positive youth development research flourished with the burgeoning literature on service-learning, civic engagement, connectedness, empowerment, generosity, purpose, and leadership. Theory of positive youth development supports guides for theoretical and change research which will be discussed in the next theory.

#### *Theory of Context and Community Change*

The literature on developmentally supportive contexts is extensive and growing. Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory of development has a significant influence on the theory, research, and practice of optimistic youth development. In a canon of youth development, the ecology of human development would be at the top of the list (Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 1998; Chen, 2016). Viewing individuals as actively engaged within their environment, the human development ecology explores how their growth is shaped by both their immediate surroundings and the broader context (Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 1998). The conceptualisation

of development contexts was one of Bronfenbrenner's many contributions. In his view, nested systems influence development by interdependently influencing one another; none stands or functions alone. Exertions to augment youth benefits should adjust more than one system and concentration to be effective. The effectiveness of altering schools, or even families, will be lower than adjusting numerous approaches or backgrounds (Wynn, 1997; Nelson, 2020). Support for youth is voluntary; youth make choices about what they will do and how they will do it. In contrast to the passive role of the student, primary supporters provide opportunities for youth to take initiative and contribute vigorously. Among the primary sources of support are arts and after-school programmes, organised sports, community service opportunities, and youth entrepreneurship. This would include the establishment and maintenance of parks, libraries, museums, and community centres (Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 1998; Chambers, 2021).

In the tierce articulation, the focus is on the approaches, procedures, and strategies that can directly or indirectly alter perspectives and communities (Coccia, 2018a). Among the three theoretic societies presented, this is the least developed. An in-depth appraisal of the science of "how change occurs" contended that the developments and processes of a surging approach to developing nutrients and assets on a gigantic scale are the most compelling question emerging from the study of dynamic and bidirectional sources of growth (Oaktree et al., 2016). Several hundred communities, organisations, and systems are already implementing positive youth development activities (Alicea, Pardo, Conover, Gopalan and McKay, 2012). Several concepts hypothesised to be vital to this investigation can be observed by connecting this principle and examination programme to the preceding segment on framework and society pressures. Building a shared vision, mobilizing joint and individual efficiency, enhancing relationships with young people, forming efficient cross-sector partnerships, and improving developmentally proper pursuits constitute just a few essential endeavours (Coccia, 2019). Granger

(2002) identified two predominant paradigms: intrusion approaches aimed at improving change and intervention strategies aimed at improving change capacity. He suggests five crucial approaches: redistribution approaches, investment tactics, human capital creation, social capital creation, and efficiency tactics. Moreover, Benson et al. (2003) identified five interconnected realms of intrusion. This model is based on organisational systems theory and suggests that changes in one sphere have an impact on the others. In terms of theory, this assertion is in line with the tenets of developmental systems theory (Alicea, Pardo, Conover, Gopalan and McKay, 2012). It is hoped that this five-fold model will serve to create a developmentally attentive community by mobilising and activating the capacity-building of families, neighbourhoods, schools, youth organisations, and other institutions (Rhodes and Roffman, 2003; Burciaga and Erbstein, 2018). The basis for this study is established by the three theories covered in this chapter.

The discussed theories promote social change aimed at providing better support for marginalised youth (Yohalem and Martin, 2007; Blanchet-Cohen and Salazar 2009; Wexler et al., 2009; Davidson et al., 2010). In economics, political economics, and other social sciences, the study of economic development is an important research field (Nafziger, 2005; LaPeer, 2020). In classical and neoclassical economics, youth development is analysed as a matter of the efficient allocation of scarce resources (Curran, Bowness, and Comack, 2010; Nelson, 2020). It is attributed to socio-economic, political, and institutional factors that increase monetary development, enhance living standards, diminish poverty among the inhabitants, and reduce income disparity and violent delinquency in the population (Todaro and Smith, 2003; Coccia, 2017a). The next section focuses on empirical literature and review the principles of youth engagement, approaches to youth engagement and indicators of socio-economic development.

## **Empirical Literature**

A youth-oriented attitude to societal transformation is recommended across collaboration with community-university associates. Youth development is crucial to strengthen youth living in high-risk, banished environments more realistically by accentuating youth engagement and development (Blanchet-Cohen and Salazar, 2009; Curran et al., 2010; LaPeer, 2020). Thus, engaging young people in reflective participation is essential for fostering both positive youth development and Societal Justice youth development (Cammarota, 2011; Ross, 2011; Gharabaghi and Anderson-Nathe, 2012). This approach promotes social change aimed at providing better support for marginalised youth. This section discusses the principles of youth engagement, approaches to youth engagement and indicators of socio-economic development.

### **Principles of Youth Engagement**

The goal of optimistic youth development is to guide societies in the way they coordinate services, prospects, and support in order that young people can progress to reach their comprehensive capacity (Pittman et al., 2001; Burciaga and Erstein, 2018). There is more to positive youth development than just another programme. The youth development principles are emphasised by communities that adopt a youth development approach. To adopt youth development approach positive outcomes and building on strengths should be the focus. Rather than focusing on weaknesses, communities should intentionally help young people develop competencies, values, and connections. It is important to include youth in programmes and the communities as value-adding and decision-making partners. A core youth development principle is to view young people as assets rather than as dilemmas or maintenance beneficiaries. Youth involvement can take a variety of forms, from youth participation to youth involvement in designing and implementing programmes. The engagement of young people in the planning, development, and execution of youth-oriented initiatives challenges adults

to reassess their approach to involving the younger generation (Coccia, 2018b; Johnson, 2021).

There is a strong link between positive orientation and universality. If all young people require support in their development, participating in a programme should not carry any stigma. In theory, youth development programmes should target specific groups for different programmes (Wexler, DiFluvio, and Burke, 2009; Chambers, 2020). Youth are embryonic, and their growth can either be improved or hampered by the prospects they have in their families, schools, and societies. This does not imply that the entire youth population has similar prospects. Some youth might require an opportunity to practice leadership skills, whereas others might require a safe place to stay. According to the principles of youth development, affording a shelter for the evening is essential but not adequate; growth opportunities need to be provided as well (Zeldin, Krauss, Collura, Lucchesi, and Sulaiman, 2014; Gonzalez, 2020). Instead of focusing solely on “high-risk” or “gifted” youth, communities should support and engage all youth. While communities acknowledge the responsibility to acknowledge and address challenges faced by specific groups of youth, such as violence or early parenting, they often lack the knowledge or resources to effectively do so.

Optimistic youth development stimulates organisational change and collaboration for societal change, in addition to programmes. Every sector has a responsibility to ensure that society provides an enriching and secure environment for children to grow up in. When youth-serving and non-youth-serving sectors in a society cooperate, youth are more likely to obtain essential services, assistance, and opportunities. To foster communities that are mindful of development, faith communities, government agencies, businesses, and individual members of society all have roles to play (Ross, 2022). Over the first 20 years of a child’s life, communities provide ongoing, developmentally appropriate support. Youth development requires ongoing activities and supportive relationships. Despite short-term positive results, community-based youth consequences may not

be quantifiable for 15 to 20 years. As a result, youth growth approaches should consider how they will be sustained (De Satge, 2021).

It is crucial to undertake actions aimed at enhancing the health, safety, performance, and overall well-being, including physiological functions, of young people. Public health systems, school districts, and recreational facilities provide primary, secondary, and, to some extent, tertiary intervention services. While they play an important role in fostering well-being, they are not sufficient on their own (Arnold, 2018). Interpersonal relationships and resources are fostered through tangible activities with youth. There are three main types of support, namely, emotional, motivational, and strategic. These support channels work together in equal portions to nurture constructive growth. Overall, support creates an optimistic environment for development. Emotional support can facilitate a perception of safety, nurturing, and friendship. The purpose of motivational support is to provide encouraging expectations, guidance, and developmentally suitable confines. Approaches to information and resources are made easier with strategic support (Chambers, 2020; Johnson, 2021). Young people are playing an active role in these actions rather than receiving them as beneficiaries. In the SOS trilogy, the “O” signifies the degree to which youth are given evocative and actual prospects to execute and amplify what they understand and comprehend. Consistent opportunities for young people to practice significant decision-making responsibilities can foster the greatest number of personal competencies (Zeldin, McDaniel, Topitzes, and Lorens, 2001; Chen, 2016).

Youth have a range of options available to them, all of which qualify for support. One form of support is facilitating connections with others, while mentoring serves as another example. Access to services and opportunities should be ensured for young people. When opportunities for learning, exploration, play, and self-expression arise, young people eagerly seize them. This approach ensures that support is both universal and tailored to individual needs. (Pittman et al., 2002; Johnson, 2021). A number of services are provided,

including health care, housing, social services, compulsory education, and drug treatment. In theory, everyone with a need for a service has access to it. In addition to a universal safety net, there is a safety net for targeted services. This strategy begins by identifying the most prevalent youth issues within a particular society and then selecting an accredited programme, or programmes, to address and reduce those challenges (Hawkins, 1996; Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, and Hawkins, 1998; Catalano and Developmental Research and Programmes, 2000; LaPeer, 2020). The Search Institute, by contrast, helps communities identify and build both their own assets and those of their own youth. Due to this, it is less prescriptive and less focused on identifying and resolving problems. This framework is potentially viewed as complementary, tackling numerous facets of comprehensive, community-wide youth development resourcefulness, irrespective of financial and other constraints (Whitlock and Hamilton, 2003; Nelson, 2020).

### **Approaches to Youth Engagement**

Young people should advise decision-makers on matters relevant to development through youth councils. Youth councils would have been created by a number of elected administrators and both legislative and non-legislative organisations throughout the country. Youth governance should provide support and encouragement to young people in leading organisations so that they can develop healthy adolescent initiatives. These structures should also assist youth to achieve positive outcomes and reach their full potential through a partnership between youth and adults (De Satge, 2021).

It may be a good idea to add a youth representative to the governing board of organisations and ensure that the position is filled regularly. Thus, youth should have a voice to generate prospects to articulate themselves, voice their concepts, and stipulate their contribution (Arnold, 2020). This contribution is an important component of youth engagement. The voices of youth must be understood. Youth in focus inspires urban

youth, through photography, to practice their realm in innovative approaches and to make optimistic alternatives for their beings by obtaining their expression and understanding how to articulate it (LaPeer, 2020). Young people can develop essential life skills and learn leadership skills through a wide variety of youth leadership programmes. Young people formerly in foster care attend youth conventions and nurture care-related events within the country as part of the Foster Club's All-Stars programme each year, where they receive intensive leadership and public speaking training (Burciaga and Erbstein, 2018). Young people can develop essential life skills and learn leadership skills through a wide variety of youth leadership programmes. Youth can communicate about concerns impacting their wellbeing, such as texting, late head start times in school, tobacco use, healthy eating, and support for themselves and their needs (Nelson, 2020). Service projects contribute to youth's sense of community, their engagement in school, and their training for the workplace. The National Youth Leadership Council (NYLC) fosters the development of young leaders through service-learning initiatives like Project Ignition, which is aimed at improving teenage car driver welfare. Alongside offering leadership opportunities, guidance, and resources, the NYLC supports youth in addressing issues they are passionate about (De Cubellis, 2021). It would be beneficial to engage young people in projects that promote adolescent and young adult health by bringing their peers together.

### **Indicators of Socio-Economic Development**

According to the WHO (World Health Organization), South Africa's average life expectancy, based on 2016 data, stands at 63.6 years. A wide range of health programmes are provided by the government (Fields, 201; Nelson, 2020). Education plays a crucial role in socio-economic development. The GDP plays a pivotal role in driving socio-economic development. Currently, both the private and public sectors within the industrial domain contribute a larger proportion to the GDP. As a result, government funds and public spending

increased. Employment in the secondary and tertiary sectors is clearly shifting from the primary sector. There was a rise in the number of people moving to urban areas in pursuit of employment. By subsidising electricity at a lower rate, the government encourages the private sector to start industries in developing and rural areas. The aim would be that these initiatives and shifts would assist in eliminating regional inequality. In order to combat diseases and malnutrition, clean water and sanitary facilities are necessary. The availability of these resources will improve people's life cycles.

In the employment sector, young people promote multicultural competence. As a result, no group in the population will feel marginalised, which is optimistic for economic development since marginalisation usually leads to revolutions and civil wars when it affects an entire community (Orton-Johnson, 2013; Nelson, 2020). Embracing cultural diversity, led by the youth, enables a nation to uphold economic equilibrium and foster an equitable distribution of wealth. Sustainable socio-economic development is the result of equitable economic growth that alleviates poverty equally. This study used primary data which was collected using a desktop study, will be covered in more detail in the following section.

## **Methodology**

This paper adopts a literature-based methodology to review the role of youth in socio-economic development. It has employed this methodology to analyse the prospects and challenges thereof. This type of methodology employs a qualitative approach, which focuses and reflects primarily on the subjective and objective stances of different scholars. This methodology allowed the researchers to immerse themselves in the existing literature and identify the gaps and weaknesses of the literature. These gaps were addressed by explaining that youth involvement is vital to enhancing economic development. Due to the nature of this study, data was collected using a desktop. The use of a desktop is one way

to collect data through a review of the literature. Hence, data was collected through access to journals, books, and reports to synthesise and review the subject under investigation. This enabled the researchers to review, analyse, and discuss different viewpoints of scholars in an attempt to achieve the purpose of the paper.

## **Discussions and Recommendations**

The socio-economic development of destitute groupings is a broad area requiring an understanding of various frameworks. To empower disadvantaged groups, development in the social, biological, political, science and technology, language, and literature sectors is imperative (Coccia, 2018d). In the socio-economic framework, development is characterised as improvements in the lifestyles of individuals in terms of education, income, skills development, and employment. Culture and environment play a crucial part in the process of economic and social transformation (Blanchet-Cohen, 2009; Gonzalez, 2020). Consequently, it is regarded as the procedure for societal and economic growth in a society.

Socio-economic development is determined by two primary elements: economic growth and poverty levels. Economic growth must be accompanied by poverty reduction for socio-economic development to be sustainable. Creating employment opportunities is the primary method of reducing poverty (Iwasaki, 2014; SFCG, 2017). Employment prospects typically arise from economic development, facilitated by investments in less industrialised areas. It is possible to invest locally or internationally. Despite this, several factors influence the willingness of businesses to invest in certain regions (Caine and Boydell, 2010; Nelson, 2020). There are several factors to ncludes the convenience of labour and the accessibility of the area in terms of infrastructure and security. Young people's participation in policy dialogue and decision-making processes is crucial to their socio-economic empowerment To foster youth involvement and commitment in socio-economic development, emphasis should be placed

on innovation, creativity, and willingness to take risks. Organisations should intensify their initiatives to unleash the creativity and energy of young people. This is as far as foresight or “outsight” goes (Coccia, 2019). Now, it appears that the “comfort level” is primarily to involve young people in activities that are more or less planned beforehand by the project. The perception of risk may play a role in this (Coccia and Wang, 2016).

Research revealed that some young people are already contributing to a lot of promising work and bringing smiles and hope to the world. Young people in the Philippines are receiving emergency assistance because of Typhoon Yolanda. To fully understand what works and what does not, more targeted data secondary must be collected. In addition to critiquing and sharing policies and programmes that have been successful and less successful, there is also a need to share global successes and failures (Coccia and Wang, 2016). Most youth are willing, prepared, and ready to participate in larger deliberations concerning their lives and their prospects, according to the findings. A sturdy obligation to listen to, act upon, and respect the voices of the youth of different classes, ages, socio-economic circumstances, and capabilities will accelerate the achievement of the social development goals. A significant portion of this can be credited to the proficiency of youth in cultivating networks and fostering movements across generations and within them. Hence, policymakers must include the youth in executive spheres, involving those with authorities, the private sector, and civil society (Nelson, 2020). In the research, the youth commonly mentioned violence in various arrangements, involving exploitation and the abuse of authority, as issues of apprehension. Intercessions in the study included accountability components in some cases, but not all.

To be operative and vigorous citizens, youth must comprehend in what manner political and economic choices are put together, and they must recognise the significant role they can perform in refining accountability across all levels (Johnson, 2020). Knowledgeable and enthusiastic participation in accountability methods can reduce youth’s uncertainty

about politics, private sector operations, and civic institutions. Young people, particularly youth-led clusters and associations operational at the ground level, can safeguard accountability and transparency. These clusters are more probable to retort to the desires of the youth cohorts they signify, as well as provide greater opportunities for youth creativity and innovation (LaPeer, 2020).

## Conclusion

It is essential that the youth participate in the development plans of a country because they are the driving force behind sustainable socio-economic development. Increasing young people's participation and engagement are regarded as a means of developing a sense of equality, justice, and citizenship (Lerner and Overton, 2008; Zeldin, Krauses, Collura, Lucchesi, and Sulaiman, 2014; Oaktree, 2016). SJYD prejudices the youth's fundamental viewpoints, including their propensity to engage in societal alteration activities (Camarota, 2011; Arnold, 2018; Johnson, 2021). As discussed in this manuscript, Ross (2011) accentuates the necessity of youth-initiated societal change instead of adults striving for change on behalf of youth. Young people, committed to studying ways to empower themselves and others through collaboration, shared learning, and teamwork, play a vital role in promoting positive outcomes. This aligns with the principles of Positive Youth Development (PYD) (Chambers, 2020). In contrast, developing exploration into activity expertise, translation, and pragmatic usage are key SJYD-related concepts. This article illustrates the reciprocally bolstering responsibilities of PYD and SJYD rather than treating them separately. To motivate and encourage ostracised youth that are at extreme risk of a diversity of lifetime encounters, youth leadership with the support of community partners and stakeholders is essential (Worker, Janiero, and Lewis, 2020; LaPeer, 2020). It is important not to underestimate the power of youth in mobilising systems and social change.

## References

- Arnold, M. E. (2018). From context to outcomes: A thriving model for 4-H youth development. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, 6(1), 141-160. <https://doi.org/10.54718/NBNL5438>
- Alicea, S., Pardo, G., Conover, K., Gopalan, G., and McKay, M. (2012). Step-up: Promoting youth mental health and development in inner-city high schools. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 40, 175-186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10615-011-0344-3>
- Blanchet-Cohen, N., and Salazar, J. (2009). Empowering practices for working with marginalised youth. *Relational Child and Youth Care Practice*, 22, 5-15.
- Caine, V., and Boydell, K. (2010). Composing lives: Listening and responding to marginalised youth. *Education Canada*, 50, 42-45.
- Cammarota, J. (2011). From hopelessness to hope: Social justice pedagogy in urban education and youth development. *Urban Education*, 46, 828-844. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085911399931>
- Chambers, C. R. (2020). Rural pathways to higher education: The role of mathematics achievement and self-efficacy for Black students. In C. R. Chambers and L. Crumb (Eds), *African American rural education* (Vol. 7, pp. 103-118). Emerald Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2051-231720200000007008>
- Chen, B-B. (2016). Conscientiousness and everyday creativity among Chinese undergraduate students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 56-59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.061>
- Coccia, M. (2016). Problem-driven innovations in drug discovery: co-evolution of the patterns of radical innovation with the evolution of problems. *Health Policy and Technology*, 5(2), 143-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlpt.2016.02.003>

- Coccia, M., and Wang, L. (2016). Evolution and convergence of the patterns of international scientific collaboration. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, February 23, 2016, 113(8), 2057–2061. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1510820113>
- Coccia, M. (2017a). A Theory of general causes of violent crime: Homicides, income inequality and deficiencies of the heat hypothesis and the model of CLASH. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, vol. 37, November–December, pp. 190–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.10.005>
- Coccia, M. (2017b). Asymmetric paths of public debts and general government deficits across countries within and outside the European monetary unification and economic policy of debt dissolution. *The Journal of Economic Asymmetries*, vol. 15, June, pp. 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeca.2016.10.003>
- Coccia, M. (2018a). A theory of the general causes of long waves: war, general purpose technologies, and economic change. *Technol Forecast Soc Chang*, 128 (March), 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.11.013>
- Coccia, M. (2018b). Optimization in RandD intensity and tax on corporate profits for supporting labour productivity of nations. *J Technol Transf*, 43(3), 792–814. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-017-9572-1>
- Coccia, M. (2018c). A theory of classification and evolution of technologies within a Generalised Darwinism. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2018.1523385>
- Coccia, M. (2018d). A Theory of the General Causes of Long Waves: War, General Purpose Technologies, and Economic Change. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, vol. 128, March, pp. 287–295 (S0040-1625 (16)30652-7). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.11.013>

- Coccia, M. (2019). The theory of technological parasitism for the measurement of the evolution of technology and technological forecasting. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 141, 289–304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2018.12.012>
- Commission on Positive Youth Development. (2005). *The positive perspective on youth development*.
- Corbin, J., and Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452230153>
- Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curran, A., Bowness, E., and Comack, E. (2010). *Meeting the needs of youth: Perspectives from youth-serving agencies*. Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives–Manitoba.
- Davidson, J., Wien, S., and Anderson, K. (2010). Creating a provincial family council to engage youth and families in child and youth mental health systems. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19, 169–175.
- DeCubellis, C., and Barrick, K. (2021). Sense of belonging as perceived by youths who continue participation in 4-H. *Journal of Extension*, 58(3), Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.58.03.19>
- Delgado, M. (2002). *New frontiers for youth development in the twenty-first century: Revitalising and broadening youth development*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Durlak, J. A., Taylor, R. D., Kawashima, K., Pachan, M. K., DuPre, E. P., Celio, C. I., and Weissberg, R. P. (2007). Effects of positive youth development programs on school, family, and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39, 269–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-007-9112-5>

## Chapter 10

- Ersing, R. L. (2009). Building the capacity of youths through community cultural arts: A positive youth development perspective. *Best Practice in Mental Health*, 5, 26-43.
- Fields, N. I., and Nathaniel, K. C. (2015). Our role in and responsibility toward social justice. *Journal of Extension*, 53(5), Article 15. <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.53.05.15>
- Geldhof, G. J., Bowers, E. P., and Lerner, R. M. (2013). Special section introduction: Thriving in context: Findings from the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9855-7>
- Gharabaghi, K., and Anderson-Nathe, B. (2012). *In search of new ideas*. *Child and Youth Services*, 33(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0145935X.2012.665317>
- Ginwright, S., and Cammarota, J. (2002). New terrain in youth development: The promise of a social justice approach. *Social Justice*, 29, 82-95. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.25>
- Ginwright, S., and James, T. (2002). From assets to agents of change: Social justice, organising, and youth development. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 96, 27-46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/yd.25>
- Gonzalez, M., Kokozos, M., Byrd, C., and McKee, K. (2020). Critical positive youth development: A framework for centering critical consciousness. *Journal of Youth Development*, 15(6), 24-43. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jyd.2020.859>
- Grace-Odeleye, B., and Santiago, J. (2019). A review of some diverse models of summer bridge programmes for first-generation and at-risk college students. *Administrative Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research*, 9(1), 35-47. <https://doi.org/10.5929/9.1.2>
- Hodges, S., Ferreira, K., and Israel, N. (2012). "If we're going to change things, it has to be systemic:" Systems change in children's mental health. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 49, 526-537. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-012-9491-0>

- Iwasaki, Y. (2014). Reflection on learning from engaging and working with high-risk, marginalised youth. *Relational Child and Youth Care Practice*, 27, 24-35.
- Iwasaki, Y., Springett, J., Dashora, P., McLaughlin, A. M., McHugh, T. L., and Youth 4 YEG Team. (2014). Youth-guided youth engagement: Participatory action research (PAR) with high-risk, marginalised youth. *Child and Youth Services*, 35, 316-342.
- Johnson, H. (2021). *Examining the differences in perceived stress, academic success, and potential protective factors between first-generation college students and continuing-generation college students* (Doctoral dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University).
- LaPeer, D. (2020). "We were all kind of by ourselves." Understanding the challenges faced by first-generation college students in Fentress County. *McNair Scholars Research Journal*, 3(12), 153-194.
- Lerner, R. M., and Overton, W. F. (2008). Exemplifying the integrations of the relational developmental system: Synthesising theory, research, and application to promote positive development and social justice. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 23, 245-255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558408314385>
- Lind, C. (2008). Knowledge development with adolescents in a PAR process. *Educational Action Research*, 16, 221-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790802011874>
- Nelson, L. M. (2020). *Minnesota 4-H youth development: Capacity for diversity and inclusion* (Master's thesis, University of Minnesota). ResearchGate.
- National Youth Commission Act (1996). The National Youth Development Policy (1996).
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

## Chapter 10

- Ramey, H. L., Busseri, M. A., Khanna, N., and Rose-Krasnor, L. (2010). Youth engagement and suicide risk: Testing a mediated model in a Canadian community sample. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 243-258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9476-y>
- Richards-Schuster, K., and Aldana, A. (2013). Learning to speak out about racism: Youths' insights on participation in an intergroup dialogues program. *Social Work With Groups*, 36, 332-348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01609513.2013.763327>
- Ross, L. (2011). Sustaining youth participation in a long-term tobacco control initiative: Consideration of a social justice perspective. *Youth and Society*, 43, 681-704. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X10366672>
- Smyth, P., and Eaton-Erickson, A. (2009). *Making the connection: Strategies for working with high-risk youth*. In S. McKay, D. Fuchs, and I. Brown (Eds.), *Passion for action in child and family services: Voices from the prairies* (pp. 119-142). Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre.
- Suleiman, A., Soleimanpour, S., and London, J. (2006). Youth action for health through youth-led research. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14, 125-145. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J125v14n01\\_08](https://doi.org/10.1300/J125v14n01_08)
- Wexler, L. M., DiFluvio, G., and Burke, T. K. (2009). Resilience and marginalised youth: Making a case for personal and collective meaning-making as part of resilience research in public health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 69, 565-570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.06.022>
- Wilson, N., Minkler, M., Dasho, S., Carrillo, R., Wallerstein, N., and Garcia, D. (2006). Training students as facilitators in the youth empowerment strategies (yes!) project. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14, 201-217. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J125v14n01\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1300/J125v14n01_12)

- Worker, S., Janiero, M. F., and Lewis, K. (2020). Youth in 4-H Latino Initiative programmes achieve similar outcomes to youth in 4-H community clubs. *California Agriculture*, 74(1), 40-45. <https://doi.org/10.3733/ca.2019a0027>
- Yohalem, N., and Martin, S. (2007). Building the evidence base for youth engagement: Reflections on youth and democracy. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 807-810. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20180>
- Zahradnik, M. M., Stewart, S. H., O'Connor, R. M., Stevens, D., Ungar, M., and Wekerle, C. (2010). Resilience moderates the relationship between exposure to violence and posttraumatic re-experiencing in Mi'kmaq youth. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 8, 408-420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-009-9228-y>
- Zeldin, S., Krauss, S. E., Collura, J., Lucchesi, M., and Sulaiman, A. H. (2014). Conceptualising and measuring youth-adult partnership in community programs: A cross-national study. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 54, 337-347. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-014-9676-9>