



ARTICLE



## Reimagining Public Policy and Legal Education for Youth Civic Engagement in Indonesia: Bridging Structural Capacity Gaps

Rizky Amalia Putri<sup>1\*</sup>, Marlina<sup>2</sup>, Dzaki Zain<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Banyumas, Indonesia

How to cite: Putri, R.A., Marlina, Zain, D. (2025) Reimagining Public Policy and Legal Education for Youth Civic Engagement in Indonesia: Bridging Structural Capacity Gaps. *Administratio: Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Publik dan Pembangunan*, 16(2)

### Article History

Received: 23 September 2025

Accepted: 11 Desember 2025

### Keywords:

public policy  
law  
civil space

### Kata Kunci:

kebijakan publik  
hukum  
ruang sipil

### ABSTRACT

*Civil space in Indonesia is commonly understood through the lens of coercive restrictions, yet a less examined dimension is how education and the design of public participation shape young people's access to policy processes. This study employs a sequential embedded design, combining document analysis of the regulatory framework for participation with an online survey of 567 Indonesian youth aged 16–30, selected through convenience sampling. The findings reveal three participatory capacity gaps: (1) the knowing–understanding gap—96.3% of respondents are familiar with the concept of policy participation, but only 43.7% understand its processes; (2) the understanding–doing gap—direct involvement is very low (19.2%); and (3) the access–influence gap—informational access does not translate into substantive influence. These patterns indicate that participatory exclusion is structural and reproduced through the disjunction between learning processes and regulatory design. This article contributes by offering an integrative framework for public policy–legal education that emphasizes procedural literacy and deliberative experience as strategies to expand a more inclusive civil space for youth.*

### ABSTRAK

Ruang sipil di Indonesia umumnya dipahami melalui lensa pembatasan koersif, namun dimensi yang kurang diperhatikan adalah bagaimana pendidikan dan desain partisipasi publik membentuk akses pemuda terhadap proses kebijakan. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain *sequential embedded*, menggabungkan analisis dokumen terhadap kerangka regulasi partisipasi dengan survei daring terhadap 567 pemuda Indonesia berusia 16–30 tahun yang dipilih melalui *convenience sampling*. Temuan menunjukkan tiga kesenjangan kapasitas partisipatif: (1) *knowing–understanding gap*—96,3% responden mengenal konsep partisipasi kebijakan, tetapi hanya 43,7% memahami prosesnya; (2) *understanding–doing gap*—keterlibatan langsung sangat rendah (19,2%); dan (3) *access–influence gap*—akses informasional tidak terkonversi menjadi pengaruh substantif. Pola ini mengindikasikan bahwa eksklusi partisipatif bersifat struktural dan direproduksi melalui disjungsi antara proses

\* Corresponding Author

Email : rizky.amalia.putri@unsoed.ac.id

---

pembelajaran dan desain regulasi. Artikel ini berkontribusi dengan menawarkan kerangka integratif pendidikan kebijakan–hukum yang menekankan literasi prosedural dan pengalaman deliberatif sebagai strategi untuk memperluas ruang sipil yang lebih inklusif bagi pemuda.

---

## A. INTRODUCTION

The shrinking of civil space is a significant challenge in contemporary governance, including in Indonesia. Academic and policy debates tend to highlight the coercive aspects of the state or restrictions on freedom of expression. However, the frequently overlooked dimension is the design of participatory governance itself. Public participation mechanisms are increasingly characterized by formalistic, expertise-based, and procedural requirements that limit substantive engagement, particularly for young people who constitute one of the largest populations in Indonesia. These barriers are shaped not only by regulation but also reinforced by the way public policy and legal education are delivered in the higher education system. Therefore, the analysis of civil space cannot be separated from how the state designs participation processes and how education prepares citizens' capacities to utilize such space.

One of the roots of this issue lies in the mismatch between the education system that shapes citizens' capacities and the institutional design of participation that determines how such capacities can be exercised. These two domains form a mutually reproducing relationship: education produces citizens with limited participatory competencies, while exclusive participation mechanisms narrow the orientation of education to bureaucratic and procedural matters. This pattern of reproduction indicates that the expansion of participation does not depend only on regulatory reform (Bani-Hani, 2022), but also on improving how education prepares citizens to be critically involved in policy and legislative processes.

This mismatch becomes more apparent when examined through the epistemic relationship between public policy education and legal education. Both are situated in a complementary epistemic relationship because they play a role in articulating public needs, formulating development priorities, and orienting the direction of social change. Although substantively interconnected, public policy education and legal education remain institutionally and epistemologically fragmented. Epistemic fragmentation, namely the separation of the fields of law and public policy, results in students' partial knowledge and limited understanding of their interaction, leading to partial competencies and restricting the youth's participatory capacity. Public policy programs emphasize analytical and technocratic competencies, while legal education focuses on normative and dogmatic reasoning. The literature shows that this separation often contributes to the formation of partial competencies, both procedural legality and technical analysis, without the integration of the two. This pattern aligns with the survey findings on limitations in procedural understanding and the lack of deliberative experience among youth, indicating consistency between epistemic fragmentation and fragmented participatory capacity. However, youth participation in policymaking is an essential part of human rights and social development (Villa-Torres & Svanemyr, 2015).

The limitations become more complex when linked to the current participation framework. Several legal instruments do recognize youth as strategic actors, yet the participation mechanisms are often procedural and require certain technical legitimacy or social capital. Public consultation channels are available, but their operations are more administrative than deliberative; thus, they do not always provide opportunities for youth to influence policy substance. In other words, the available opportunities are still formal in nature and have not become substantive access, namely opportunities to provide input that truly influences policy decisions, so that youth participation remains mostly symbolic. Such a design pattern creates a

subtle form of exclusion: access is available at the formal level, but it does not appear in the form of substantive influence. This exclusionary pattern in the regulatory design cannot be separated from how policy and legal actors are shaped by separate, technocratic-oriented education.

At this point, policy and legal education have a strategic role. If education emphasizes only normative compliance or technocratic capability, it reproduces the form of exclusion embedded in regulatory design. Conversely, integratively designed education can equip youth to critically and substantively direct legislative and policy processes. In other words, the expansion of civil space requires not only regulatory reform but also pedagogical transformation that builds deliberative capacities across disciplines. However, the relationship among regulatory barriers, educational design, and civil space has not been widely discussed in the literature. Studies on youth participation, meaningful public participation, or civic literacy generally stand alone and have not yet integrated these structural layers into a single analytical framework.

This article argues that the mismatch between the fragmentation of legal and policy education and the regulatory design of participation constitutes a structural context that helps explain the pattern of youth participatory capacity. Although this study does not directly assess curriculum quality, the survey findings show patterns consistent with the literature's critique of legal and public policy education: a relatively high level of familiarity, but low procedural understanding and limited participatory experience. The consistency of these patterns indicates that the issue of participatory capacity is not only an individual matter but also related to regulatory and pedagogical structures that frame how youth understand and access the policy space. These problems do not stand alone but are interrelated and form a complex structure, which, if not immediately addressed, will widen the gap between the goals of national education and the social realities faced by society (Rayhana & Tjalla, 2021).

In this situation, the mismatch between the high demand for public participation and the pattern of youth participatory capacity, consistent with the literature on the orientation of legal and policy education, indicates a structural gap that has not been widely discussed in previous studies. Given the limitations of public participation spaces and the fragmentation of public policy and legal education, the need to understand how youth's participatory capacity is formed becomes increasingly urgent. The gaps between declarative knowledge, procedural understanding, and deliberative experience in the survey findings indicate that youth do not yet possess the substantive prerequisites to access the policy space meaningfully. Therefore, this article positions education not merely as a provider of professional competencies but as a civic infrastructure with the potential to strengthen youth agency, enhance participatory capacity, and expand access to political and legislative processes. This article contributes by linking the analysis of the regulatory design of public participation and the practices of legal and policy education, two domains that have often been discussed separately. This approach helps explain how their mismatch can influence youth participatory capacity.

## **B. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Within the framework of deliberative democracy, as put forward by Jürgen Habermas, the legitimacy of policy is obtained not only through legal-formal procedures but also through a rational, open, and equal process of public communication (Huttunen, 2025). Therefore, education in public policy and law must be designed inclusively and contextually. Inclusive means opening the broadest possible access to all social groups, including those who are vulnerable or marginalized (Bartlett & Schugurensky, 2024). Contextual learning is structured based on real-world problems faced by society, while also providing space for local experiences and identities to be incorporated into the construction of knowledge. Thus, the current literature underlines that citizen literacy is not merely a matter of technical

understanding, but also part of the project of democratizing knowledge. Higher education institutions play a strategic role in shaping a generation that is not only able to operate the legal and policy system but also has the capacity to critique, improve, and transform the system ethically and democratically.

The literature on public policy and legal education shows that both fields play a crucial role in shaping citizens' capacity to understand, assess, and participate in political and legal processes. However, several studies highlight that education in these areas often remains highly technical and legalistic. Rather than serving as a space for the democratization of knowledge, educational practices tend to emphasize procedural mastery, normative compliance, and administrative skills (Leiviskä, 2023). Such an orientation limits the development of young people's reflective and deliberative abilities, positioning them more as bureaucratic objects than as actors capable of articulating interests and critically evaluating policies (Latif et al., 2024).

In line with these critiques, a number of studies emphasize the importance of adopting more collaborative educational approaches. Engaging young people as partners in the learning process—rather than merely passive participants—can facilitate a more contextual understanding of policy and legal issues. The literature shows that equal involvement between youth and facilitators helps create analytical processes that are more responsive to lived experiences and local needs (Horwath, Kalyva, & Spyru, 2012; Kataria & Fagan, 2019; Krenichyn Nicole Schaefer-McDaniel Heléne Clark Sarah Zeller-Berkman, Schaefer-McDaniel, Clark, & Zeller-Berkman, 2007). Such approaches position young people as part of a dialogic and co-productive process of generating knowledge, ensuring that policy and legal content does not remain purely technical but becomes connected to the social dynamics they encounter in their everyday lives.

Criticism of this technocratic orientation aligns with studies on public participation, which show that overly focused approaches to administrative efficiency can narrow the space for deliberation. Hurlbert and Gupta (2024) argue, through the concept of the Split Ladder of Participation, that procedural participation often produces processes that appear formally inclusive but remain substantively exclusive. This is consistent with Young's (2022) perspective on representational justice, in which structural barriers experienced by groups such as women, youth, and Indigenous communities prevent them from participating equally in political processes. This perspective shows that participatory limitations are not merely an issue of individual capacity, but are related to institutional designs that do not fully open deliberative space. In the context of youth, this gap is reinforced by limited access to adequate information and literacy, which hinders their ability to be actively involved in decision-making that influences their future (Marah, Pradhan, & Shuhood, 2024). Conversely, forms of participation that are unsatisfactory, unequal, or merely superficial make young people feel “utilized” (Faulkner, 2009) or “merely formalistic or tokenistic” (Horwath et al., 2012).

International findings on youth participation show that meaningful participation is not only determined by procedural openness, but also by the extent to which young people have space to determine their own choices. Youth participation is crucial because when young people are involved, they not only contribute their expertise and exercise their citizenship rights to strengthen democracy, but also develop themselves through the substantive knowledge and practical skills they acquire (Checkoway, 2011).

Several studies note that young people value the ability to choose whether to participate, to determine issues that are relevant to them, and to feel a sense of ownership over both the process and the outcomes of their involvement (Arches & Fleming, 2006; Charles & Haines, 2019; Horwath et al., 2012). Positive experiences such as feelings of enjoyment, value, and exceeding expectations are reported as factors that strengthen long-term engagement (Anderson, Stackhouse, Shaw, & Iredale, 2011; Coad et al., 2008; Kimberlee, 2008; Percy-

Smith, 2006). These findings underscore that youth agency is a crucial element in enhancing the quality of participation, making it not only informative but also empowering. The literature further emphasizes that the importance of youth participation rests on three main arguments: democratic and active citizenship, developmental benefits for young people, and improvements in the quality of public services (Cairns, 2006; Checkoway, 2011; Head, 2011).

A systematic synthesis of the literature shows that the main challenges in the development of policy and legal education are not only structural, but also epistemological and cultural.

Table 1. Summary of Main Themes from the Literature Review

Main Theme	Authors and Year	Key Findings	Relevance to Policy and Legal Education Reform
Epistemological fragmentation between law and policy	(Bedner & Vel, 2021); (Kammerer & Estrella-Luna, 2020); (Prihandono & Yuniarti, 2020)	Public policy and legal education still operate epistemologically and methodologically separately.	Interdisciplinary curriculum integration is needed to develop comprehensive policy and legal competencies.
Legal and public policy literacy among youth	(Latif et al., 2024); (OECD, 2021); UNDP (2022); (Rahman, Budimansyah, Suryadi, & Sundawa, 2024)	Public policy and legal literacy among youth remain low, limiting participation.	Strengthening civic literacy and participatory education needs to be integrated into policy and legal curricula.
Participatory reform in policy and legal education	(Head & Alford, 2015); Creswell & Báez (2020); (Checkoway & Aldana, 2013)	Participatory and deliberative learning strengthens critical capacity and youth leadership.	Education reform needs to emphasize civic engagement and deliberative approaches.

Source: processed by the author, 2025

Civic education literature also emphasizes the importance of developing civic literacy to enable citizens to engage meaningfully in policy processes. Hoskins et al. (2012) and (Checkoway & Aldana, 2013) emphasize that civic literacy includes an understanding of policy processes, awareness of constitutional rights, and the ability to participate in deliberative spaces. This framework is enriched by findings that civic literacy functions as a connector between legal understanding and the ability to assess the legitimacy and impact of policies (Nuryadi & Widiatmaka, 2023). Several other studies show that education that strengthens civic literacy can increase youth engagement (Sala-Torrent & Planas-Lladó, 2024; Sari et al., 2024). However, the literature also criticizes that legal education, which is too normative, and policy education, which is too technocratic, hinder the internalization of deliberative values (Head & Alford, 2015; Damanik, 2025)

Deliberative democracy studies add that policy legitimacy is supported not only by legal formal procedures, but also by rational, open, and equal communication processes (Huttunen, 2025). Therefore, legal and policy education is required to adopt inclusive, context-specific pedagogical approaches. Bartlett and Schugurensky (2024) emphasize that equal access to knowledge and to dialogic learning spaces is a prerequisite for the formation of citizens able to participate substantively. The theoretical framework is relevant when linked to the context of the Indonesian legal system. The development of a democratic society requires meaningful public involvement, particularly in the process of formulating regulations. However, the

doctrine of legal fiction, which assumes that every citizen knows the law once it is enacted, becomes problematic when the public lacks the opportunity to participate in or understand the legislative process.

These findings align with existing literature indicating that low policy literacy, limited access to information, and political apathy—rooted in weak beliefs that participation can produce meaningful change—remain major barriers to youth engagement (Witianti & Solihah, 2019; Youth Policy Cafe, 2023). The literature also highlights ongoing questions regarding how youth participation in decision-making should be designed, whether all segments of the youth population have equitable opportunities to participate, and the extent to which such involvement genuinely leads to change (Braithwaite, 2020). Young people are frequently marginalized due to age-related bias, limited opportunities, and a lack of experience or practice (Saud, 2020). Nevertheless, numerous studies emphasize that youth constitute an important and valuable societal asset (Dyson & Jeffrey, 2018).

Recognition of the strategic value of youth aligns with Indonesian legal and policy scholarship, which emphasizes that regulations designed without meaningful public participation—including youth participation—risk facing problems of effectiveness and legitimacy. Various studies show that every regulation emerges from two fundamental needs: the strategic need to respond to public issues and the legal need to address gaps or overlaps in existing rules. Without a regulatory design that is open and responsive to social contexts, public policies risk generating legal uncertainty and may even trigger harmful regulatory competition (race to the bottom) (Kementerian PPN/Bappenas, 2023a).

### C. METHOD

This study used a sequential embedded design, in which normative document analysis served as the primary approach, while the quantitative survey functioned as a complementary embedded component to examine the alignment between conceptual findings and empirical realities. Document analysis was first conducted on regulations of public participation, the legal framework on youth, higher education policies, and relevant academic literature. The analysis process followed the framework by Bowen (2009), through the stages of document selection, comprehensive reading, thematic categorization (curriculum fragmentation, regulatory design, participatory capacity), and conceptual pattern identification. This stage produced an initial mapping of the structural mismatch between legal and policy education and the regulatory design of participation.

To assess whether these patterns are reflected at the empirical level, this study added an online survey as the embedded component. The target population was Indonesian youth aged 16–30 years in accordance with the national definition of youth. A total of 567 respondents from various provinces participated in an open online recruitment campaign using convenience sampling. This strategy was selected because the study does not focus on statistical generalization, but rather on exploring patterns of participatory capacity and youth deliberative experience. The questionnaire instrument contained descriptive items regarding procedural understanding of participation, basic knowledge of constitutional rights, experience in policy processes, and perceptions of participation access and influence. The instrument was tested briefly in a pilot check to ensure clarity of the questions.

Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively to map the distribution of literacy and participatory experience, and then compared with normative findings to assess consistency between the structural framework and empirical conditions. Integration was conducted sequentially, using document analysis to identify structural barriers and survey data to confirm whether these barriers are experienced by youth in practice. This approach enabled the study to combine the strengths of normative analysis with empirical evidence to explain how

educational fragmentation and regulatory design influence the participatory capacity of the younger generation.

## **D. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Participatory Capacity Mismatch: Survey Findings and Their Implications for Legal and Public Policy Education**

The survey results involving 567 young respondents show a mismatch in participatory capacity. The limited understanding of policy formulation processes, political participation, and political rights becomes the main barrier to their involvement in decision-making. This condition not only indicates weaknesses in declarative and procedural knowledge but also suggests that the participation ecosystem has not fully provided opportunities for youth to practice and substantively negotiate their interests. This is consistent with the findings of Dokubo, Radulescu, and Squintani (2024), which state that the lack of substantive participation spaces, the dominance of technocratic approaches, and fragmentation are significant barriers to the emergence of citizens with legal awareness and policy competencies.

The challenge of participatory capacity is not only an issue of insufficient knowledge at the individual level, but also reflects a structural misalignment between the design of participation and the educational processes that shape youth civic competencies. Although the majority of respondents (96.3 percent) recognized the concept of policy participation, only 43.7 percent understood how a policy is formulated, and only 45 percent knew their participation rights in regulatory development. The level of direct involvement is even lower: only 19.2 percent of respondents have ever been involved in participation processes, either formally or non formally. Interestingly, university students showed a lower level of understanding of policy processes (33.7 percent) than respondents from the general public category (56.3 percent), even though both groups have almost equal levels of familiarity.

These findings show a clear gap between awareness and capacity: the young generation knows that participation is important, but they do not yet possess procedural understanding or direct experience to engage substantively. From an analytical perspective, the mismatch in participatory capacity can be explained through three forms of gaps:

- a. Knowledge Gap.** An understanding of the policy process does not accompany a high level of familiarity. This indicates that the respondents' knowledge is declarative, meaning they know the terminology, but it is not yet operational, namely, understanding the stages, actors, and mechanisms required to participate effectively.
- b. Experience Gap.** The low rate of direct involvement (19.2 percent) shows that although respondents feel they have access (63 percent), participatory experience remains minimal. In other words, perceived access does not automatically generate opportunities or confidence to be involved.
- c. Substantive Access Gap.** Although 63 percent of respondents assess that they have access to policy processes, actual involvement remains significantly lower. These findings indicate that available access tends to be informational or administrative rather than providing opportunities for substantive influence.

3 These three gaps not only illustrate individual limitations but also indicate the presence of structural barriers within the participation ecosystem itself. The survey findings regarding the three forms of participatory capacity mismatch indicate that the development of civic literacy, as described in the literature, has not yet occurred optimally.

First, the Knowing and Understanding Gap shows that civic knowledge remains weak: although the majority of respondents recognize the term policy participation, fewer than half understand policy processes and participation rights. Yet the literature emphasizes that

procedural understanding is a fundamental component of civic literacy that enables citizens to assess policy legitimacy and identify their spaces for intervention (Hoskins et al, 2012; Nuryadi & Widiatmaka, 2023). Second, the Understanding and Doing Gap illustrates weak **civic skills**, namely the ability to engage in deliberation processes, public consultations, and other deliberative activities. The low level of participatory experience (19.2%) indicates that education has not yet provided practical training spaces that enable students to develop deliberative abilities as suggested by Checkoway and Aldana (2013). Thus, participatory capacity does not develop through concrete experience but remains at the cognitive level. Third, the Access and Influence Gap reflects a problem in the civic dispositions dimension. Although most respondents feel they have access to policy processes, this access has not yet translated into meaningful participation. The literature refers to this condition as weak civic orientation, including political efficacy and the willingness to be involved in decision-making processes (Bartlett & Schugurensky, 2024). In the context of education, this can be interpreted as a failure of pedagogy to develop courage, critical reflection, and democratic orientation, which constitute the core of civic literacy. Thus, the mismatch in participatory capacity found in the survey is not merely a reflection of insufficient information or technical skills, but is an indicator that the three foundations of civic literacy, namely knowledge, skills, and dispositions, do not develop in a balanced manner in legal and public policy education.

In this position, although this survey does not directly assess the curriculum of legal and public policy education, the emerging findings provide important indications of the young generation's readiness in terms of participatory capacity, shaped through various formal and non-formal educational processes. This is in line with the findings of Raharjo, Armawi, and Soerjo (2017) which emphasizes that reforming public policy and legal education should prioritize integrating civic literacy into the curriculum and learning experiences as a prerequisite for strengthening the civic agency of the young generation.

The low procedural understanding and limited participatory experience imply two things. First, this capacity pattern indicates that the learning received by youth, both in the context of law and policy, has not yet systematically provided space to understand policy procedures or legislative practices in meaningful ways. These findings are consistent with the literature's critique, highlighting the dominance of normative dogmatic approaches in legal education and technocratic orientations in public policy education, which tend to minimize practice-based and deliberative learning experiences (Prihandono & Yuniarti, 2020; Head & Alford, 2015). Thus, the pattern found does not indicate a direct educational deficiency but instead aligns with the survey results and the pedagogical structures criticized by previous studies.

Second, participatory capacity has not yet been formed through experience. The limited direct involvement implies restricted deliberative spaces accessible to youth. Yet, participatory experience is an essential component of citizen literacy and democratic learning (Hoskins, 2012; Checkoway & Aldana, 2013). Thus, the survey findings provide empirical contributions that reinforce the premise that the participatory capacity of the young generation is shaped not only by the availability of information but also by patterns of legal and policy education that have not fully prepared them to engage in the public sphere. Based on the findings and the limitations of the analysis, several implications that can be reasonably drawn are:

1. There is a need to strengthen procedural literacy. The finding that only 43.7% understand the policy formulation process indicates the necessity of learning that more clearly emphasizes the policy cycle, legislative drafting, and regulatory impact. In this context, procedural literacy is one of the pillars of civic literacy, which refers to the ability of citizens to understand, critically evaluate, and actively engage in the processes of policy and law-making that influence public life (Prasetyo, Rahmawati, & Rahayu, 2025).
2. There is a need for experience-based learning. The low level of direct involvement (19.2%) highlights the importance of legislative simulations, policy clinics, government

partnership projects, and campus deliberative forums. Participatory approaches that position young people's lived experiences as the starting point of learning have been proven effective in fostering a sense of ownership of democratic processes, especially for marginalized youth who have long been excluded from formal political structures (Brady, Chaskin, & McGregor, 2020). Thus, experience-based learning not only strengthens technical skills but also builds the confidence and civic orientation needed for substantive participation.

3. There is a need for linking legal and policy literacy. The significant differences between university students and the general public indicate the possibility of a gap in the curriculum that can be addressed through an integrative approach. The strengthening of legal and political literacy and the development of civic awareness are key to opening meaningful spaces of participation for youth in the policymaking process (Sari et al., 2024). This finding confirms that isolated instruction in law or public policy is insufficient; instead, an integrated learning model is required to equip youth with the analytical, procedural, and critical capacities needed for substantive participation.
4. There is a need for more inclusive participation spaces. The data indicate that perceived access has not led to substantive influence, suggesting the need to design more dialogic participatory spaces.

### **Fragmentation of Education and Structural Barriers**

The fragmentation of public policy and legal education is not merely an issue of curriculum coordination but a reflection of structural barriers that shape how knowledge is produced and disseminated to the young generation. The critique of technocratic elitist education, which emphasizes the mastery of specific technical skills and is accessible only to groups with certain competencies, becomes more evident when understood in the context of how pedagogical models, institutional dynamics, and power structures in higher education restrict the participatory capacity of students, namely their ability to understand and engage substantively in policy and legislative processes.

First, the literature on pedagogy in legal and public policy education shows that one-way lecturing methods, regulatory reading, and administrative technical exercises still dominate many study programs. This pattern positions students as recipients of knowledge rather than deliberative actors. Such an approach tends to make the learning process stop at the cognitive level, namely recognizing norms, regulations, or policy theories, without providing space for critical reflection on the relationship between law, power, and citizen participation. Previous studies note that such a learning orientation often produces a strong understanding of procedural aspects but a weak understanding of policy negotiation, interest dynamics, and the construction of civil space. The learning process also emphasizes technical mastery and legal formalism more than critical, ethical, and communicative thinking abilities (Head & Alford, 2015). In this context, (Nugroho, 2023) describes its impact as a ghost public, namely, participation that occurs procedurally but exerts minimal substantive influence.

Second, fragmentation arises from institutional dynamics that separate the fields of law and public policy. Legal education develops with a normative dogmatic orientation that focuses on rules, legal reasoning, and text interpretation (Prihandono & Yuniarti, 2020). Conversely, public policy education is oriented toward empirical analysis, evidence-based policy, and socio-political dynamics (Bundi & Trein, 2022). Because these two approaches operate in parallel without epistemic dialogue, law students often view regulations as closed texts, unaware of their policy contexts. In contrast, public policy students design interventions without understanding constitutional limitations and legality. This mismatch creates what the literature refers to as "pseudo competence" (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003): namely, conceptual

abilities that are not able to address practical complexities. This fragmentation produces professionals who are competent in sectoral terms but lack cross-domain deliberative capacities and ethical sensitivity to the public interest (Hajer & Wagenaar, 2003).

Third, fragmentation is also closely related to power structures and the logic of the state that is reproduced in academic spaces. In many academic environments, the state–society relationship is still understood within a hierarchical framework: the state is treated as the center of authority and the source of knowledge; policy is reduced to a technocratic domain that can only be managed by experts. In contrast, society, including the young generation, is positioned as an object that is merely “included” within minimal procedural boundaries. This perspective contradicts the constitution's normative mandate and the regulatory framework's demands for justice, openness, and meaningful public participation, yet learning practices fail to internalize these values. Students eventually do not see themselves as legitimate actors in political and legal processes; they position themselves solely as analysts, technocrats, or implementers, not as policy subjects who have the right to influence policy content nor as legal subjects who are authorized to review or interpret legal products. Thus, education unconsciously reproduces the logic of power that marginalizes the public's role, making it difficult for the young generation's participatory capacity to develop substantively.

In addition, the lack of interdisciplinary forums, such as joint lectures, cross-faculty projects, and collaborative research, narrows students' opportunities to develop deliberative capacity and engage in cross-disciplinary dialogue. Yet, education literature shows that collaborative learning can enhance cross-field understanding and strengthen adaptive abilities in responding to complex public issues (Bransford et al., 2000; Ramachandran, Schwellnus, Gladwin, Derby-Talbot, & Ellis, 2024). When learning is too technical and fragmented, students lose the opportunity to develop the critical, ethical, and participatory abilities needed to expand civil space. However, deliberative education, which cultivates dialogue, argumentation, and critical reflection, has been proven to increase civic engagement and leadership among the young generation (Checkoway & Aldana, 2013).

The more explicit integration of curriculum is not merely an administrative solution but a strategic step toward building an educational framework that is responsive to the challenges of modern governance while also relevant to the needs of democracy. The idea of progressive law by Satjipto Rahardjo (2014) and the normative conceptual policy analysis approach by Dente (2014) show that law cannot be understood separately from policy, and similarly, policy cannot be designed without an understanding of legal principles and justice. Thus, efforts to address this epistemological fragmentation are a prerequisite for strengthening the younger generation's capacity to become part of a dynamic, substantive, and inclusive deliberative space.

In addition to internal barriers within the education sector, the fragmentation of youth capacity is also reinforced by Indonesia's regulatory framework for public participation. In a democratic rule-of-law system, the authority to establish regulations lies with state institutions such as the government and the House of Representatives. However, in principle, the process must not be closed or substantively exclusive. Public participation should not end at mere administrative formalities. However, it should be understood as a deliberative process that opens space for affected groups, including youth, women, Indigenous communities, and persons with disabilities, to provide meaningful input. According to the 2022 Youth Development Index Report published by the Ministry of National Development Planning, Indonesia's youth participation in social organizations and public decision-making processes remains relatively low. This indicates that although understanding the importance of participation is relatively high, direct involvement in policy processes remains limited (Kementerian PPN/Bappenas, 2023b).

Normatively, Law Number 40 of 2009 (Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 40 Tahun 2009) on Youth has affirmed the strategic role of youth as a moral force, a social control, and an agent

of change. Youth participation is understood as young people's involvement in helping the community and achieving common goals (Rexhepi, Filiposka, & Trajkovik, 2018). However, its implementation has not fully opened substantive participation space for the young generation in legislative processes and public policymaking. Youth involvement is often symbolic and has not yet generated a real influence on the direction and content of policies. Moreover, the model of public participation, as regulated in various regulations, remains procedural. Article 96 of Law Number 13 of 2022 (Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 13 Tahun 2022 Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan) provides the legal basis for public involvement in the formulation of legislation. However, its implementation tends to take the form of consultative forums lacking substantive accountability mechanisms. This includes the absence of an obligation for lawmakers to respond to or explain the reasons for rejecting inputs submitted by the public (Julranda, Simanjuntak, & Effendi, 2022).

Similarly, Government Regulation (PP) Number 45 of 2017 on Community Participation in Regional Government requires participants in participation processes to possess certain characteristics (Peraturan Pemerintah (PP) No. 45 Tahun 2017). Article 6 of PP 45/2017 stipulates that individuals involved in participation processes must have mastery of the issue discussed, an academic or professional background, relevant experience, or be directly affected by the substance of the policy. In practice, this requirement narrows access for youth groups and the general public who may have public concern but cannot consistently show the technical track record as required. This configuration of requirements shows regulatory exclusivity, as formal access is opened while technical competency requirements and the absence of a response mechanism for public input limit opportunities for substantive participation.

Nevertheless, some literature argues that disciplinary fragmentation in legal and public policy education may be maintained to preserve the methodological depth of each field. This fragmentation allows students to gain strong technical competencies before engaging in cross-disciplinary integration, so there is a trade-off between disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary capability that needs to be considered when understanding cross-field education.

### **(New) Future Structural Implications: Professionalization and Youth Access?**

The findings regarding knowledge, experience, and influence gaps in policy participation indicate that youth do not yet have the substantive prerequisites to utilize civil space meaningfully. In this context, the direction of professionalization through competency certification in public policy and law becomes a structural layer that requires further attention. Certification mechanisms are essentially designed to improve the quality of governance. Professionalization efforts in the fields of public policy and law in recent years have experienced significant growth through the presence of professional certification schemes organized by the National Professional Certification Agency (BNSP), such as in the functional positions of Policy Analyst and Legislative Analyst (Lembaga Sertifikasi Profesi Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, 2024). The presence of this scheme signifies the state's formal recognition of technical expertise in the fields of policy and law, serving as an instrument to improve competency standards for both civil servants and non-governmental professionals (Abdur Rahim, Nisaul Fatona, Rozani, Santoso, & Sukamsi, 2023). This certification refers to the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (KKNI), which regulates the mastery of technical, managerial, and social competencies aligned with the needs of the public sector and national professional practice standards. In general, this initiative aligns with the state's policy direction to strengthen institutional capacity and improve public governance quality.

Although improving competency standards through professionalization aims to strengthen institutional capacity and the quality of public governance, this process has the potential to

widen the gap between actors with professional legitimacy and youth whose participatory capacity is not yet sufficiently supported by the education system. The findings of this study, although not fully reflected through the survey instrument, indicate that the limitations of youth capacity underline the importance of positioning professionalization as a future research and reform agenda. Without specific attention, increasingly technocratic competency standards may shift deliberative space, which should be inclusive, into an arena that demands certain technical and administrative capital in order to participate. In other words, the tendency toward professionalization may reinforce exclusivity, which has been empirically visible in the survey, namely when access to information does not automatically translate into the ability to influence policy, and a basic understanding of regulation does not develop into substantive capacity in the policymaking process.

In this framework, professionalization should not be understood in opposition to public participation. Instead, it must be framed as a structural factor shaping the ecosystem of knowledge and legitimacy in policy and law. The certification process, competency curricula, and the accompanying technocratic logic help determine who is considered “worthy” to be involved in policymaking and who is positioned only as a recipient of policy. Thus, including the discussion of professionalization allows this analysis to capture how knowledge production, the legitimacy of technical authority, and access to deliberative space intersect to form both boundaries and opportunities for youth participation. This elaboration also clarifies that efforts to enhance participatory capacity are not sufficient through procedural education alone, but also require improvements to the institutional structures that define who has a voice in the policymaking process.

Professionalization through BNSP certification schemes, such as the certification for Policy Analysts and Legislative Analysts, is essentially intended to improve competency standards and governance quality. However, in the context of this study’s findings, professionalization reveals an important paradox.

First, professionalization reinforces the logic of exclusivity already constructed in legal and public policy education. Certification schemes based on output-based competencies require technical abilities such as drafting policy documents, conducting regulatory impact analysis, or facilitating public consultations. However, the survey results show that most respondents do not even understand policy processes or their participation rights. When the basic ability to participate has not been developed through education, certification becomes an additional filter that creates a new hierarchy: those who possess technical and financial capital can access professional legitimacy, while other young people remain at the margins of participatory space. In addition, the costs of training, assessment, and competency testing create economic barriers for students and young people from lower-middle socioeconomic backgrounds. In other words, this paradox highlights that professionalization efforts intended to improve quality instead have the potential to deepen inequalities in access and produce expertise-based citizenship, in which the right to influence policy depends on the accumulation of technical, social, and financial capital.

Second, professionalization has not been integrated with the higher education system, thereby creating an institutional gap. Conceptual and normative approaches still dominate law and public policy study programs, so they do not provide the practical experience required to meet certification competency units. As a result, graduates find themselves in a situation where they understand the concepts but lack a professionally recognized portfolio. This tension is consistent with the pattern of desynchronization found in the survey, namely between familiarity and procedural understanding, as well as between perceived access and empirical experiences. This means that the problem of participatory capacity is not only individual but also a consequence of an education structure that is not aligned with the state's professional standards.

International comparisons, such as the Certified Public Policy Analyst (CPPA) program in Georgia, show that professionalization can be carried out more integratively because it is administered through higher education institutions and involves several months of intensive training. This model bridges the gap between conceptual education and practical competencies. In contrast, in Indonesia, the absence of institutional integration causes professionalization to run parallel to education rather than becoming part of it.

Thus, professionalization is not only a technical issue related to improving competency standards but also a part of the structure that influences the distribution of knowledge, access, and political influence. When education has not yet developed adequate participatory capacity, certification mechanisms can deepen epistemic and participatory inequalities. Therefore, the reform agenda for public policy and legal education needs to consider how professionalization can be directed to expand, rather than restrict, youth access to deliberative spaces and regulatory processes.

## **E. CONCLUSION**

This study shows that the desynchronization between the design of public participation regulations and a fragmented legal policy education system shapes the youth's participatory capacity. The survey findings reveal three consistent patterns: young people are familiar with the concept of participation but do not understand its procedures, have informational access but lack deliberative experience, and are aware of the importance of participation but are not yet able to articulate substantive influence in regulatory processes. These empirical findings are consistent with the literature on civic literacy, which emphasizes the importance of balancing understanding, skills, and experience for meaningful participation.

This article does not claim a direct causal relationship between educational fragmentation and low participatory capacity. However, the empirical patterns identified are consistent with the literature that criticizes the normative-dogmatic orientation in legal education and the technocratic approach in public policy education. These patterns demonstrate how the misalignment between institutions that open space for participation and institutions that shape citizens' capacity can produce structural exclusion. Thus, the theoretical contribution of this article lies in unifying two layers of analysis, regulatory and pedagogical, which have been frequently examined separately.

In practice, this study highlights that strengthening the participatory capacity of youth can begin with feasible measures within the context of Indonesian higher education: improving procedural literacy, providing experience-based learning spaces such as legislative simulations or policy clinics, and implementing limited integration between legal education and public policy education. In addition, this article emphasizes that the design of public participation regulations should move beyond administrative standards toward a more deliberative and inclusive model, ensuring that civic space is not only formally available but also substantively accessible to youth.

Several limitations need to be noted. The survey, based on convenience sampling, limits statistical generalization and relies on respondents' perceptions. The document analysis used open sources, so it does not capture the dynamics of implementation at the practical level. This study has also not explored variations across study programs or regions, so the heterogeneity of youth experiences has not been fully illustrated. These limitations do not weaken the findings but provide important context for interpreting the study's results proportionally.

Looking ahead, further research can develop comparative designs across universities, conduct in-depth qualitative analyses of youth participation experiences, or undertake institutional studies of the practice of public participation in regulation. By showing that participation gaps are structural and linked to misalignments among education, regulation, and

citizens' capacity, this article opens space for the development of more critical, contextually grounded interdisciplinary approaches to strengthen civic engagement among Indonesian youth.

## Acknowledgement

The author extends the highest appreciation to the Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Universitas Indonesia (FIA UI), the Faculty of Law, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman (FH UNSOED), the Faculty of Sharia and Law, Universitas Islam Negeri Profesor Kiai Haji Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto (UIN SAIZU), and Institut Harkat Negeri for their support and opportunities provided through the Tri-Sector Leadership Bootcamp (TSLB), which has significantly enriched the author's insights and capacity in leadership development and public governance. Sincere gratitude is also expressed to the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) of Universitas Jenderal Soedirman (UNSOED) for its facilitation and administrative support during the research process, which forms part of the study on Developing a Public Policy and Law Education Model to Strengthen Youth Leadership and Public Participation.

## REFERENCES

- Abdur Rahim, Nisaul Fatona, Rozani, N. G., Santoso, B., & Sukamsi. (2023). Tinjauan Kualifikasi Jabatan Fungsional Analisis Kebijakan Pemerintah Daerah Berdasarkan Permen Pan No. 45 Tahun 2013. *NeoRespublica : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 4(2), 387–395.
- Anderson, C., Stackhouse, R., Shaw, A., & Iredale, R. (2011). The National DNA Database on trial. *Public Understanding of Science*, 20(2), 146–162.
- Arches, J., & Fleming, J. (2006). Young people and social action: Youth participation in the United Kingdom and United States. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 2006(111), 81–90.
- Bani-Hani, N. (2022). Youth Political Engagement: Legal Barriers and Opportunities for Participation. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics*, 1(1), 23–30.
- Bartlett, T., & Schugurensky, D. (2024). Inclusive civic education and school democracy through participatory budgeting. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 19(3), 362–380.
- Bedner, A., & Vel, J. (2021). Legal Education in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Socio-Legal Studies*, 1(1).
- Brady, B., Chaskin, R. J., & McGregor, C. (2020). Promoting civic and political engagement among marginalized urban youth in three cities: Strategies and challenges. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 116. Elsevier Ltd.
- Braithwaite, J. M. (2020). *One Size Does Not Fit All Youth Participation in Non-Governmental Organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand*. the University of Auckland.
- Bundi, P., & Trein, P. (2022). Evaluation use and learning in public policy. *Policy Sciences*, 55(2), 283–309. Springer US.
- Cairns, L. (2006). Participation with purpose. *Children, young people and social inclusion Participation for what?* (pp. 216–234). Policy Press.
- Charles, A., & Haines, K. (2019). Engaging Young People as Partners for Change: The ur Community Project. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 27(1), 140–175.
- Checkoway, B. (2011). What is youth participation? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(2), 340–345.
- Checkoway, B., & Aldana, A. (2013). Four forms of youth civic engagement for diverse democracy. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35(11), 1894–1899.
- Coad, J., Flay, J., Aspinall, M., Bilverstone, B., Coxhead, E., & Hones, B. (2008). Evaluating the impact of involving young people in developing children's services in an acute hospital trust. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 17(23), 3115–3122.
- Dente, B. (2014). *Understanding Policy Decisions*. SpringerBriefs in Applied Sciences and Technology. Cham: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-02520-9>

- Dokubo, O. I., Radulescu, M. A., & Squintani, L. (2024). What law does not understand about public participation. *Heliyon*, 10(11), e32001. Elsevier Ltd.
- Dyson, J., & Jeffrey, C. (2018). Everyday prefiguration: Youth social action in north India. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 43(4), 573–585.
- Faulkner, K. M. (2009). Presentation and Representation: Youth participation in ongoing public decision-making projects. *Childhood*, 16(1), 89–104.
- Head, B. W. (2011). Why not ask them? Mapping and promoting youth participation. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(4), 541–547.
- Head, B. W., & Alford, J. (2015). Wicked Problems: Implications for Public Policy and Management. *Administration and Society*, 47(6), 711–739. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Horwath, J., Kalyva, E., & Spyru, S. (2012). “I want my experiences to make a difference” promoting participation in policy-making and service development by young people who have experienced violence. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(1), 155–162.
- Hoskins, B., Janmaat, J. G., & Villalba, E. (2012). Learning citizenship through social participation outside and inside school: An international, multilevel study of young people’s learning of citizenship. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 419–446.
- Huttunen, H. (2025). Education for deliberative democracy through the long-term view. *Theory and Research in Education*, 23(1), 77–97.
- Julranda, R., Simanjuntak, P. M., & Effendi, S. F. (2022). Quo Vadis: Penerapan Asas Partisipasi Publik dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan di Indonesia. *Padjadjaran Law Review*, 10(2).
- Kartika Sari, F., Meisy Astria, B., & Alisa, S. (2024). *Peran dan Tantangan Generasi Muda dalam Perspektif Undang-Undang Nomor 40 Tahun 2009 tentang Kepemudaan*. Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum E-ISSN (Vol. 2). Retrieved from <https://ejournal.mejailmiah.com/index.php/adagium>
- Kataria, I., & Fagan, L. (2019). Securing a constituency-based approach for youth engagement in NCDs. *The Lancet*, 393(10183), 1788–1789.
- Kementerian PPN/Bappenas. (2023a). *Laporan Backround Study Kerangka Regulasi RPJMN 2025-2029*. Jakarta. Retrieved September 24, 2025, from <https://ditkumlasi.bappenas.go.id/>
- Kementerian PPN/Bappenas. (2023b). *Laporan Indeks Pembangunan Pemuda Indonesia 2022*. Jakarta.
- Kimberlee, R. (2008). Streets ahead on safety: young people’s participation in decision-making to address the European road injury ‘epidemic.’ *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 16(3), 322–328.
- Krenichyn Nicole Schaefer-McDaniel Heléne Clark Sarah Zeller-Berkman, K., Schaefer-McDaniel, N., Clark, H., & Zeller-Berkman, S. (2007). *Where Are Young People in Youth Program Evaluation Research*. *Children, Youth and Environments* (Vol. 17). Retrieved from <http://www.colorado.edu/journals/cye>.
- Latif, B., Yasin, I., Rahaman, A., Ali, M. J., Forid, S., & Islam, N. (2024). Interdisciplinary Approaches to Social Justice : Bridging Sociology , Law , and Education Interdisciplinary Approaches to Social Justice : Bridging Sociology , Law , and Education, (October).
- Leiviskä, A. (2023). Democratic education and the epistemic quality of democratic deliberation. *Theory and Research in Education*, 21(2), 113–134.
- Marah, T. S., Pradhan, H. D., & Shuhoud, F. A. (2024). Youth Participation in Global Governance: Opportunities and Challenges. *Journal of Governance and Public Administration*, 2(1), 238–249.
- Nugroho, R. (2023). *Public Policy (Dinamika Kebijakan Publik, Analisis Kebijakan Publik, Manajemen Politik Kebijakan Publik, Etika Kebijakan Publik)* (7th ed.). Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.
- Nuryadi, M. H., & Widiatmaka, P. (2023). Strengthening civic literacy among students through digital literacy in society 5.0. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 17(2), 215–220.
- OECD. (2021). *Education at a Glance 2021*. OECD.
- Peraturan Pemerintah (PP) No. 45 Tahun 2017 Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Daerah*. (2017). . Jakarta.
- Percy-Smith, B. (2006). “You think you know? ... You have no idea”: youth participation in health policy development. *Health Education Research*, 22(6), 879–894.

- Prasetyo, W. H., Rahmawati, N., & Rahayu, R. D. (2025). *Civic Literacy in Digital Age for Learning Democracy: A systematic Review*. Atlantis Press SARL.
- Prihandono, I. , & Yuniarti, D. S. (2020). Interdisciplinary Teaching in Law: Study on Indonesian Law Schools. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 25(6), 268–277.
- Rahardjo, S. (2014). *Ilmu Hukum* (8th ed.). Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Raharjo, R., Armawi, A., & Soerjo, D. (2017). Penguatan Civic Literacy Dalam Pembentukan Warga Negara Yang Baik (Good Citizen) Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Ketahanan Pribadi Warga Negara Muda (Studi Tentang Peran Pemuda HMP PPKn Demokratis pada Dusun Binaan Mutiara Ilmu di Jebres, Surakarta, Jawa Tengah). *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional*, 23(2), 51. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Rahman, I. N., Budimansyah, D., Suryadi, K., & Sundawa, D. (2024). A Conceptual Framework of the Factor Influencing Democratic Citizenship in Civic Education. *KnE Social Sciences*, 2024, 102–111.
- Ramachandran, A., Schwellnus, M., Gladwin, D., Derby-Talbot, R., & Ellis, N. (2024). Cultivating educational adaptability through collaborative transdisciplinary learning spaces. *Discover Education*, 3(1). Springer International Publishing.
- Rayhana, & Tjalla, A. (2021). the Challenges of the 2020 – 2035 Indonesian Education Roadmap Towards Achieving World-Class Higher: a Review. *Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 12(2), 65–68.
- Rexhepi, A., Filiposka, S., & Trajkovik, V. (2018). Youth e-participation as a pillar of sustainable societies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 174, 114–122.
- Sala-Torrent, M., & Planas-Lladó, A. (2024). Enhancing youth Voices: Exploring community participation through youth workers. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 160. Elsevier Ltd.
- Saud, M. (2020). Civic engagement, youth socialisation and participation in public spheres in Indonesia. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 119, 105669.
- Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 13 Tahun 2022 Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. (2022). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/212810/uu-no-13-tahun-2022>. Indonesia: LN.2022/No.143, TLN No.6801 jdih.setneg.go.id: 13 hlm.
- Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 40 Tahun 2009 Kepemudaan. (2009). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/38784/uu-no-40-tahun-2009>. Indonesia: LN. 2009/ No. 148, TLN NO. 5067, LL SETNEG: 25 HLM. Retrieved May 20, 2025, from <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/38784/uu-no-40-tahun-2009>
- Villa-Torres, L., & Svanemyr, J. (2015). Ensuring Youth's Right to Participation and Promotion of Youth Leadership in the Development of Sexual and Reproductive Health Policies and Programs. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 56(1), S51–S57.
- Witianti, S., & Solihah, R. (2019). Faktor kegagalan dan upaya mengatasinya dalam proses perumusan kebijakan publik partisipatif di Indonesia. *Universitas Terbuka*, 635–649.
- Young, M. T. (2022). From epistemology to policy: reorienting philosophy courses for science students. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 12(2), 1–14. European Journal for Philosophy of Science.
- Youth Policy Cafe. (2023). Enhancing Youth Participation in Public Policy Making Process . <https://linkedin.com/pulse/enhancing-youth-participation-public-policy-making>.