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In 2016, 90 percent of young Americans showed an interest in politics and 80 percent intended to vote. Yet, only 43 percent of people between the ages of 18 and 29 ended up actually casting a ballot. Making Young Voters investigates what lies at the core of this gap.

The authors’ in-depth, interdisciplinary approach reveals that political apathy is not the reason for low levels of youth turnout. Rather, young people too often fail to follow through on their political interests and intentions. Those with “noncognitive” skills related to self-regulation are more likely to overcome internal and external barriers to participation. This book combines theory from psychology, economics, child development, and more to explore possible solutions rooted in civic education and electoral reform.

This potentially paradigm-shifting contribution to the literature of American politics serves to influence not only our understanding of voter turnout, but also the fundamental connections between the education system, electoral institutions, and individual civic behavior in a democracy. How young people vote affects not only each individual future, but that of the United States, and of us all.
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