



Student Protest Participation and Citizenship Development: An Overview

Md. Jahurul Islam^{1*} Dr. Md. Moynul Haque²

¹School of Social Science, Humanities & Languages (SSHL),
Bangladesh Open University, Gazipur-1705, Bangladesh.

²Department of Political Science, Jagannath University, Dhaka-1100

Abstract

There is a growing tendency among students to take part in protest activism in both developing and developed countries. The student protest movement has remained the subject of attention for scholars of the sociology of higher education, political science, and other subfields, including social movement and resistance studies. The existing scholarship shows a keen interest in studying contentious student protest, highlighting the detrimental consequences of student activism, including violent forms of protest. Yet, little is known about the developmental outcomes of student protest participation. This paper addresses this underexplored relationship by examining the linkage between protest participation and citizenship development. It aims to understand how protest activism may contribute to student learning about and the practice of citizenship, helping them to explore the student political world. The article focuses on student citizenship and investigates how student involvement in protest activism can constitute a practice that involves the development, enactment, and negotiation of citizenship. The article examines protest participation as a potential practical ground for developing citizenship qualities. Building on this argument, this article employs a descriptive literature review method to examine the linkage between protest participation and citizenship development. The article, therefore, does not consider protest activism and student citizenship as two different fields of study but as interconnected areas in which student citizenship is cultivated and lived. The findings suggest that instead of viewing citizenship only as legal status, student citizenship is also expressed through claim-making politics in non-institutional channels. Based on the review, we argue that students' protest participation is associated with civic learning and citizenship practices, which in turn may contribute to their development as active citizens.

Keywords: *Students, Protest, Participation, Citizenship, Politics, Bangladesh*

Introduction

Students in higher education are prone to engage in both conventional and non-conventional political action. In particular, during the 20th century, students voiced their opinions on social and political issues (Rhoads, 1998). Students' participation in broad and small-scale movement activism has helped shape the notion of a politically engaged citizen in civic life. By looking through this lens, students' political activism can contribute significantly to shaping how their citizenship is understood and practiced.

Citizenship encompasses both political and social engagement and action. Debate has arisen regarding students' awareness and interest in citizenship. The pro-participation view favors the idea

*Corresponding author: Md. Jahurul Islam. E-mail: jahurul@bou.ac.bd
Journal homepage: <https://jssh.bou.ac.bd>

that students are readily active, as they are often deeply concerned with issues surrounding them, which moves them to participate in work for social and political causes—from neoliberal economic policy concerns to civil and political rights issues (White, 2016) as well as more global causes such as environmental and social justice concerns (Quaye, 2007; Rhoads, 1998).

In contrast to these views, however, criticisms abound centering on students' apathy in political participation as well as their passivity in socio-political concerns (Mathews, 1993; Putnam, 2000; Sax, 2004; Torney-Purta et al., 2001). Putnam (2000) finds a generational decline in civic engagement. He notes that American youth generations are remarkably more apathetic about being engaged in social and political life than the older civic generation. Torney-Purta et al. (2001) report that students are less inclined to join a political party, become career politicians, and respond negatively to writing letters to newspapers about socio-political issues.

Although civic participation has undergone profound changes in recent decades, a gradual transformation and expansion of the forms of citizen participation appears to be underway. Hustinx et al. (2012) suggest that newer forms of civic involvement may reflect continued interest in societal affairs despite criticism of conventional systems of political representation. This perspective suggests that apparent disengagement from conventional politics does not necessarily indicate a broader withdrawal from civic or political life; instead, participation may increasingly take non-institutional and issue-based forms. Protest activism is an avenue through which students can learn and develop civically oriented attributes such as civility and a collective form of action. Although the number of studies exploring and documenting student activism has grown, research is scarce on the civic outcomes associated with protest participation. Students' participation in protest campaigns exposes them to various methods and tactics. The learning of and involvement in protest activity is associated with civil protest behavior. The recognition of the civic virtues and skills that students may acquire through their protest participation is critical for understanding the significance of student activism within the discussion of social movement studies. This article therefore considers protest participation not only as a form of political contention but also as a potential arena for civic learning and citizenship practice.

The South Asian experience offers instructive examples of how students can exercise citizenship through collective action, rights-claiming, and democratic participation. Student protest movements in Bangladesh and Nepal, in particular, illustrate that activism is not merely a form of resistance but also can operate as a meaningful process through which young people develop civic responsibility and practice engaged citizenship beyond the classroom (Dalton, 2008a; Hustinx et al., 2012). In Bangladesh, the 2018 Road Safety Movement—led predominantly by secondary school students—demonstrated how youth can effectively mobilize around public policy demands, challenging state authority through organized, nonviolent protest (Tanjeem & Fatima, 2023). Similarly, student-led movements in Nepal have historically played a significant role in democratic transitions, most notably during the 1990 People's Movement and the 2006 Jana Andolan, where students functioned as active political agents rather than passive observers of democratic change (Hachhethu, 2002). These cases collectively indicate that student activism in South Asia may serve as a bridge between civic theory and practice, as young people actively engage in collective political action rather than merely learning about citizenship in formal educational settings. At the same time, the tension between civic engagement and political apathy identified in the broader literature raises an important research question: Under what conditions can student protest participation contribute to the development and practice of active citizenship? The present review centers on this question.

Literature Review

There is an ongoing discussion about citizenship centering on the question of how universities contribute to students' social and political consciousness—a concern in society that students lack it (Arthur & Bohlin, 2005). Citizenship offers an alternative path that enables individual students to discover 'social citizenship,' meaning the political and moral sensibility of active citizens (Marshall, 1950). Student citizenship development is enhanced when students form a habit of involvement in specific activities, for example, discussing social and political issues, taking part in religious services, and socializing across cultural and ethnic lines (Sax, 2004). Kennedy (2007) argues that the family, school, and community socialization process helps to prepare students for citizenship. He further adds that “Students cannot help but be influenced by their local contexts as their views about the responsibilities of active citizenship emerge and develop” (Kennedy, 2007, p. 305). In another study, Kennedy et al. (2006) point to the effects of history, social context, and culture in developing student conceptions of active citizenship.

Higher education institutions are seen as spatio-temporal terrains in which students develop and nurture a sense of civicness (Cheng & Holton, 2019). The space of higher education provides opportunities for students to make decisions about their freedom and responsibility and about the kinds of moral and ethical matters that guide their lives. Morse (1989) noted that although student citizenship education was de-emphasized during the industrialization era of the nineteenth century, it reemerged as a priority goal of higher education in the twentieth century, when universities increasingly recognized the importance of their civic role.

Ideally, the primary responsibility of the university is to educate its students, to motivate them to search for new knowledge, to develop their intellectual minds, and to teach them to know the truth (Arthur & Bohlin, 2005). Hamrick (1998) argues that the purpose of higher education is to prepare students for mature participation in the civic life of a democracy. In their study on citizenship development in the United States, Colby et al. (2003) pointed out that almost every higher education institution has a role in developing citizenship attributes among students.

Crossley and Ibrahim (2012) maintain that universities serve as a central place where political participation is developed—through a wider scope of meeting and communicating with people of similar views, which in turn helps to form political networks. Higher education attachment provides students with a relatively safe context to develop their habits as student citizens (Abrahams & Brooks, 2019). Indeed, university campus culture serves as a significant setting for cultivating citizenship experiences, familiarizing students with civically oriented concepts such as state and citizenry; developing civic virtues such as social concern, involvement, commitment, and responsibility; as well as helping to create both socially and politically engaged citizens. Citizenship in Europe has been significantly shaped and consolidated through the role universities played in the development of the principles of rational thought, as well as certain values that have appeared to be important factors in the development of citizenship (Fernández, 2005).

University campuses can therefore provide forward-looking spaces in which young people, particularly students, can learn from and negotiate diversity (Tsui, 2000) as well as “provide resources for political or activist mobilization that enable political work to be done” (Crossley & Ibrahim, 2012, as cited in Cheng & Holton, 2019, p. 613).

There are various arrangements through which student citizenship can be formed and developed. Colby et al. (2003) discussed institutional arrangements that academic institutions can use to introduce courses and design their curricula, which would inform service learning and problem-

based learning while also promoting a broader understanding of local, national, and global issues and concerns. Cheng's (2019) study has underscored the prominent role of university institutes in Asian countries in the development of youth citizenship. The author has explained how liberal arts education encourages academic youths to cultivate embodied skills, dispositions, and forms of cultural capital that would enable them to become student citizens. Sax (2004) mentions two important aspects of civic responsibility through which student citizenship is developed: commitment to participate in voluntary and community services and interest in political activism. These studies collectively suggest that citizenship development within higher education extends beyond formal instruction and is also shaped through students' social, institutional, and political participation.

There are attitudinal and behavioral aspects of citizenship that students might acquire throughout their study career. The attitudinal measures of student citizenship involve a commitment to social activism and a sense of empowerment. These attitudinal aspects demonstrate a greater potential for participation in civic life. For example, commitment to social activism encourages students to participate in activities aimed at helping others who are in difficulty. It also refers to students' engagement in achieving various goals through community action programs. There is also a contrasting attitude available among students regarding their citizenship engagement (O'Connor, 2006). A study report by Keeter et al. (2002) illustrates the contrast between the young generation's commitment to community service and their disregard for political participation. The findings suggest that the youngest generation is more favorable toward government action and more socially tolerant than older generations, yet it is also less attentive to public affairs, less involved in politics, and less trustful of others (Keeter et al., 2002, as cited in O'Connor, 2006, p. 53). This contrast is relevant in that it implies that civic involvement and traditional political involvement do not always need to be equated: students might show involvement in civic activities without showing involvement in traditional political activities.

The behavioral measure of citizenship is community involvement through volunteering. The practice of volunteering is critical to the long-term development of citizenship. In continental European countries, citizens' engagement in voluntary associations is considered a good source for producing a civic tradition of trust and social solidarity—the assets enrich a person's civility and civicness (Neumayr & Meyer, 2010). In other words, voluntary work promotes students' sense of civic responsibility (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000). Thus, students benefit from a practical as well as an academic understanding of civic responsibilities. This literature collectively suggests that the civic development of students is the outcome of more than one type of involvement (volunteering, community involvement, political involvement, and social interaction) but not necessarily formal citizenship education. This more general comprehension serves as the basis for an analysis of protest participation as a possible environment to learn, practice, and negotiate citizenship.

Aims and Objectives

The paper aims to shed light on the scholarly debate over the developmental outcomes of student protest participation. In particular, this paper attempts to understand (i) the underlying concepts of student citizenship and citizenship development, and (ii) how protest participation may contribute to students becoming civically engaged citizens and help them understand the student political world. Conceptually, the paper draws on Lister's (2007) notion of "citizenship as practice" and Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) concept of participatory citizenship.

Research Method

The paper draws predominantly on secondary sources and reviews literature on citizenship studies, higher education, protest, and political participation. The literature search was carried out mainly through Google Scholar, focusing primarily on studies published between 2000 and 2023, while selected earlier works were included for their theoretical significance. The keywords used were *student citizenship*, *student protest*, *student activism*, *political participation*, and *civic learning*. A total of 49 sources were included in the paper, comprising theoretical, empirical, methodological, and contextual literature relevant to student participation, civic learning, and citizenship development. Sources were included if they related to student citizenship, higher education and civic development, student protest/activism, political participation, or civic learning. Selected contextual sources were also included to support the discussion of student movements and student unions in South Asia, particularly Bangladesh. Studies that did not substantially relate to these areas were excluded.

As this was a descriptive literature review, a PRISMA-style screening procedure was not applied. The analysis followed a deductive thematic approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Selected literature was coded and grouped into three themes: (i) citizenship as participation and practice, (ii) protest as a site of civic learning, and (iii) collective and institutional involvement in citizenship learning. Relevant arguments and findings within these themes were compared to identify similarities, differences, and conceptual connections. The study therefore provides a descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the relationship between student protest participation and citizenship development.

Theoretical Framework: The Concept of Citizenship

The concept of citizenship has occupied a key area of debate within the social sciences in recent decades. In T.H. Marshall's (1950) definition of citizenship, three sets of rights are identified. These are civil or legal rights, political rights, and social rights. Civil and legal rights are institutionalized through law. Examples of these types are freedom of speech, thought, and belief (subject to guarantee by the constitution); the right to own property; individual liberty; and the right to justice. Political rights are institutionalized in the parliamentary political system and include the right to contest elections and vote, as well as the right to run for political office. Social rights refer to a certain level of economic security and the right to live the life of a civilized human being in accordance with the prevailing standards of society. Social anthropological perspectives also define citizenship in terms of belonging to a society or nation-state. This view suggests that a person who is stateless or lacks recognized social membership may be excluded from the rights of citizenship. The concept of cultural citizenship has also been part of the debate in recent decades, seeking to establish cultural rights and obligations as dimensions of citizenship claims (Richardson, 1998).

Over the past decades, scholars have enriched the field of citizenship (Lister, 2007). The underlying assumptions and meanings of citizenship are further advanced by Kennedy (2007), who identifies three broad areas in which citizenship has been discussed and pursued: the popularized adoption of citizenship, conceptual and theoretical uses of citizenship, and the empirical approach to constructing citizenship. The popular approach to citizenship has come into the mainstream discussion as governments in different countries have prioritized the issue of citizenship in their policy prescriptions. Moreover, the issue of citizenship has remained the subject of political calculations; governments can encourage specific interpretations of active citizenship which reflect their political and policy frameworks. As such, citizenship can be seen as something that is done as well as held, that is performed in practice, that is lived into, and that is therefore a socially produced

and socially performed reality (Lister, 2007). This wider knowledge is important for the present study, as student participation in politics can be studied as a context within which citizenship can be experienced and constructed.

Students' Political Participation and Citizenship

Scholars of civic engagement and citizenship education have long advocated for the active engagement of young people in social and political work (Adler & Goggin, 2005; Youniss et al., 2002). Particular attention has been paid to students, as civic participation enables them to engage in the real “student political world” (Crossley & Ibrahim, 2012) and act collectively to foster social and political change. Rhoads (2016) found that students' participation in campus protest activities is associated with learning outcomes such as practical knowledge of collective engagement and action. Participation in protest demonstrations has also been associated with increased self-reflection, collective identity, social agency, awareness, and leadership skills (Farago et al., 2018). Student engagement also incorporates principles such as voice and reflection (Raill & Hollander, 2006).

Dahl (1998) considers public participation in political affairs a defining element of citizenship. Although this often refers to electoral politics and duty-based citizenship, political participation also includes non-institutional forms of engagement. Dalton (2008a) maintains that active citizenship involves participation in civil society groups and direct political action. Similarly, Inglehart and Welzel (2005) suggest that educated young people in Western societies are less attached to duty-based citizenship and increasingly prefer direct forms of participation to contest decisions affecting their lives. This distinction is important because student protest represents a direct and often non-institutional form of engaged citizenship (Dalton, 2008a).

Participation may also contribute to citizenship by developing civic skills, political efficacy, civic virtues, and awareness (Dekker, 2009). Warren (2001) argues that participation has developmental effects by strengthening political skills, tolerance, and readiness to participate; it also provides spaces for public communication, deliberation, representation, and collective action. Thus, participation can function both as a learning process and as a means through which individuals practice citizenship.

Students also participate in different levels of public life on campus. Students can practice negotiation, responsibility, tolerance, and cooperation through campus representation, collective decision-making, and community service. Participation in self-governing collectivities, community service, and volunteer programs can motivate students to become concerned, responsible, and engaged citizens (Hamrick, 1998). Cheng and Holton (2019) similarly understand citizenship not only as a constitutional-legal status but also as something practiced through social and political life. Student involvement can thus offer valuable contexts for the practice, negotiation and acquisition of citizenship.

Student Protest Activism as Citizenship Claim

Student citizenship can be activated through several means, including questioning the problems of the whole system, rather than those of the university education system alone. It is a rights-based citizenship model as an alternative to a market-centered, competitive, and exclusionary model or, in precise words, the neoliberal model of citizenship characterized by individualization and consumption (Grugel & Nem Singh, 2015). The beginning of the twenty-first century has witnessed significant student protest events in which students have advanced demands for educational reform and democratic rights through social mobilization. Students are using university education as a

space for radical reflection about democratic society and citizenship and new forms of subjectivity (Pusey, 2016). As such, students may develop forms of political engagement and enact citizenship around ideas of justice, voice, equity, and solidarity.

Grugel and Nem Singh (2015) illuminate the connection between the Chilean student protest and citizenship claims. Through their protests, Chilean students challenged market-oriented understandings of citizenship and advanced a more active conception centered on political agency, rights, and resistance. Their experiences under neoliberal democracy also exposed tensions between formal ideas of citizenship and everyday experiences of social and economic insecurity (Grugel & Nem Singh, 2015). Students in Chile have positioned themselves at the center of a network of protests. The debate about reclaiming the model of citizenship from the market has become the focal point of the student movement. The Latin American political landscape is associated with a new cycle of contention and citizenship claims. As such, students are increasingly positioned as activist citizens. Protesters explore a new avenue that goes beyond traditional institutionalized democratic political structures, allowing their voices to be heard.

Pusey's (2016) account of the UK student resistance in 2010 indicates a revival of student engagement in dissension and politics. Students critically questioned the neoliberal policy that introduced the marketization of higher education, leading to a surge in student activism and widespread resistance. UK students, who were once seen as merely apathetic and self-interested, demonstrated their protest potential by actively participating in strikes, occupying spaces, and transforming the nature of activism. This situation represents a significant resurgence of re-politicized student activism. Cini and Guzmán-Concha's (2017) study on the student movement in Chile and England in the age of austerity concludes that the reappearance of students as political actors is linked to the outbreak of a range of distributional conflicts caused by the implementation of the neoliberal project in the higher education sector. Referring to the student-led resistance movement against the broader structures of neoliberal capitalism in North America, Giroux's (2013) analysis suggests how student protest activism has ignited and awakened society to the prospect of what the fight for democracy might mean. The emerging protest culture can therefore contribute to the creation of public values and forms of engaged citizenship within democratic society.

Student Unions as Platforms for Citizenship Development: The Case of Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, student politics and student organizations have historically played an important role in political mobilization and major democratic movements (Nasrin & Rahman, 2019). Student unions such as Dhaka University Central Students' Union (DUCSU), Rajshahi University Central Students' Union (RUCSU), and Jahangirnagar University Central Students' Union (JUCSU) provide institutional settings for student representation and participation. These unions have historically been not merely representative entities concerned with student welfare but also organized venues whereby students may develop and practice active citizenship. In theory, student unions are akin to what Putnam (2000) terms 'civic associations'—institutions that develop social capital, democratic norms, and habits of political participation among their members. When students vote in union elections, seek representation, and bargain collectively with university administrations, they are engaging in practices that resemble those of broader democratic processes. Thus, they may develop a form of civic identity that Westheimer and Kahne (2004) have called "participatory citizenship," a form of civic identity grounded in active participation in community and institutional life.

DUCSU has a special historical significance in Bangladesh. The revival of DUCSU in 2019, after a 28-year gap in elections, offered new avenues of formal student representation and participation within the university (Jasim & Islam, 2021). However, in the presence of formal opportunities for student representation, institutional platforms can also play a role in engaging students in participation and civic mobilization as suggested by the DUCSU elections. Student unions in Bangladesh are forums not only for electoral participation but also for rights-claiming and collective campaigning. Union members engage in what Lister (2007) refers to as “citizenship as practice”—an active, continuing practice of civic activity rather than a passive legal status—by organizing rallies, making requests to universities, and engaging in national policy debates. In this regard, one institution in which citizenship can be considered as representation, negotiation and collective claims is the student union.

They may also promote “conscientization,” as Freire (1970) calls it, an awakening of critical consciousness about one’s social and political circumstances that inspires action. Students engaged in union activities are exposed to collective deliberation, negotiation, and advocacy, all of which may deepen civic consciousness and prepare students for broader democratic engagement beyond university life (Crick, 1998).

However, it is worth noting that student organizations in Bangladesh have also been criticized for their close links with national political parties, which may compromise their independence and reduce their effectiveness as truly representative institutions (Nasrin & Rahman, 2019). This political co-optation risks changing student unions from spaces for citizenship development into tools for partisan mobilization, thus limiting their democratic potential. Such tension is relevant because civic outcomes from participation are not a foregone conclusion, but rather depend, in part, on the organizational and political environment of participation.

Nevertheless, when exercising relative autonomy, student unions such as DUCSU, RUCSU, and JUCSU can be powerful institutional bases for citizenship education and civic empowerment. They offer students an organized context in which to participate in democratic life, learn leadership skills, and address public concerns together, which are all essential components of active and responsible citizenship (Dalton, 2008; Hustinx et al., 2012).

Findings and Discussion

The above analysis of theoretical materials reveals three interrelated findings on student participation and citizenship development. First, the reviewed literature does not consider student citizenship an inevitable consequence of university enrollment. Instead, citizenship is increasingly understood as a form of participation and engagement. While traditional conceptions emphasize voting, political party membership, and electoral participation, the literature also recognizes non-institutional and participatory forms of citizenship. This finding aligns with Lister’s (2007) conceptualization of citizenship as practice and Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004) notion of participatory citizenship, both of which emphasize citizens’ actions rather than citizenship as a fixed legal status.

A second finding is that protest is not treated simply as a reaction to unmet demands but also as a form of civic learning. Rhoads (2016) makes this point directly—taking part in a protest can provide students with practical experiences of collective engagement that are difficult to reproduce through classroom-based citizenship learning alone. Farago et al. (2018) describe such learning in terms of greater self-reflection, collective identity, and leadership skills. Protest participation may therefore provide an intensive setting for experiencing collective action, political voice, solidarity,

and rights-claiming. However, these developmental outcomes are not automatic. Protest is often linked to particular political issues or events, and civic learning through protest may not necessarily result in sustained political engagement. Its contribution to citizenship development therefore depends partly on the nature of participation and the social, political, and institutional context in which it occurs.

The third finding concerns the role of student unions. Groups such as DUCSU, RUCSU, and JUCSU in Bangladesh can be interpreted through what Putnam (2000) calls "civic associations"—institutional settings in which trust, social connection, and democratic habits may develop over time. Voting in union elections, seeking representation, and negotiating with university leaders correspond with Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) idea of participatory citizenship and Lister's (2007) understanding of citizenship as an ongoing practice. Compared with the often event-centered character of protest, student unions may provide more sustained opportunities to practice representation, negotiation, collective decision-making, and leadership. Protest and student unions can therefore be viewed as different but complementary arenas of civic learning and political engagement.

The DUCSU case illustrates this institutional dimension. Its return in 2019 after almost three decades of inactivity created renewed opportunities for students to participate in formal representative politics within the university. The case suggests that opportunities for formal representation may continue to attract student participation even after long periods of institutional inactivity. Freire's (1970) notion of "conscientization" is also relevant, as participation in collective political processes may contribute to greater awareness of one's social and political position and encourage further engagement.

The developmental potential of student unions, however, is conditional. Close ties between student organizations and national political parties may compromise institutional independence and transform participatory spaces into mechanisms of partisan mobilization. This reinforces the broader argument that participation does not automatically produce democratic citizenship. Its civic effects depend on whether the participatory environment supports deliberation, representation, tolerance, political efficacy, and meaningful collective action.

Taken together, the findings suggest that student citizenship develops through different forms and settings of participation. Protest may provide concentrated experiences of collective action and rights-claiming, whereas student unions may offer more sustained opportunities for representative and institutional participation. Both can contribute to citizenship as practice, although their developmental outcomes remain shaped by wider political and organizational contexts.

Conclusion

The paper presents an overview of the scholarly arguments in relation to developing student citizenship. Based on the literature review, the authors conclude that students' non-institutional political participation may contribute significantly to the development of attributes associated with civically engaged citizenship. The analysis suggests that participation in protests can play an important role in shaping a student's political world, where they actively engage in claim-making politics. It further postulates that students are subject to an interactive social network and a learned community socialization process that may help them develop the knowledge, awareness, and skills required to become politically engaged actors. A student in higher education may also acquire civic learning through participation in activities directed toward the well-being of the society in which they live. In sum, the potential that higher education can offer in citizenship development and

practice is important. Students might acquire civic and political skills as they are involved in protest movements, such as the skills of collective action, political awareness, leadership, and rights-claiming.

However, the link between protest and citizenship formation is not straightforward or uniformly positive. As mentioned in the literature, other patterns of student political life include apathy, disengagement from official politics, partisan engagement, and, in some contexts, hostile or problematic forms of political activism. These contrasting tendencies indicate that protest participation does not necessarily generate democratic citizenship. Instead, its civic consequences are shaped by the political, institutional, and organizational environments in which it takes place and whether participation promotes deliberation, representation, tolerance, political efficacy, and collective responsibility. Thus, the apparent tension between student apathy and student activism may reflect differences in the ways and contexts in which students engage in the citizenship process.

These findings could be used as the basis for future empirical research involving students' experiences of citizenship and political participation, including interviews, surveys, or comparative studies across universities and countries. Such research could examine the arguments presented in this study and provide deeper insight into the contribution of student involvement in student movements towards the development of civic and political citizenship. Further research might also explore the contextual factors that foster democratic citizenship and those that can lead to disengagement, polarization, and party politicization.

References

- Abrahams, J., & Brooks, R. (2019). Higher education students as political actors: Evidence from England and Ireland. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 22(1), 108–123.
- Adler, R. P., & Goggin, J. (2005). What do we mean by “civic engagement”? *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(3), 236–253.
- Arthur, J., & Bohlin, K. (Eds.). (2005). *Citizenship and higher education: The role of universities in communities and society*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Cheng, Y. E. (2019). Liberal arts-educated citizens: Experimentation, subjectification and ambiguous contours of youth citizenship. *Area*, 51(4), 618–626.
- Cheng, Y. E., & Holton, M. (2019). Geographies of citizenship in higher education: An introduction. *Area*, 51(4), 613–617.
- Cini, L., & Guzmán-Concha, C. (2017). Student movements in the age of austerity: The cases of Chile and England. *Social Movement Studies*, 16(5), 623–628.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. Jossey-Bass.
- Crick, B. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*. Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Crossley, N., & Ibrahim, J. (2012). Critical mass, social networks and collective action: Exploring student political worlds. *Sociology*, 46(4), 596–612.
- Dahl, R. A. (1998). *On democracy*. Yale University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008a). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76–98.
- Dekker, P. (2009). Civicness: From civil society to civic services? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 20(3), 220–238.

- Farago, F., Swadener, B. B., Richter, J., Eversman, K. A., & Roca-Servat, D. (2018). Local to global justice: Roles of student activism in higher education, leadership development, and community engagement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 64(2), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.55016/ojs/ajer.v64i2.56382>
- Fernández, Ó. (2005). Towards European citizenship through higher education? *European Journal of Education*, 40(1), 60–68.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Giroux, H. A. (2013). The Quebec student protest movement in the age of neoliberal terror. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 19(5), 515–535.
- Grugel, J., & Nem Singh, J. (2015). Protest, citizenship and democratic renewal: The student movement in Chile. *Citizenship Studies*, 19(3–4), 353–366.
- Hachhethu, K. (2002). *Party building in Nepal: Organisation, leadership and people*. Mandala Book Point.
- Hamrick, F. A. (1998). Democratic citizenship and student activism. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(5), 449–460.
- Hustinx, L., Meijs, L. C. P. M., Handy, F., & Cnaan, R. A. (2012). Monitorial citizens or civic omnivores? Repertoires of civic participation among university students. *Youth & Society*, 44(1), 95–117.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jasim, M. M., & Islam, R. (2021, March 10). Ducs election uncertain, once again. *The Business Standard*.
- Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002). *The civic and political health of the nation: A generational portrait*. Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Kennedy, K., Hahn, C., & Lee, W. O. (2006). Becoming apolitical: A comparison of students' constructions of citizenship in Australia, Hong Kong and the United States. *50th Anniversary Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society*.
- Kennedy, K. J. (2007). Student constructions of "active citizenship": What does participation mean to students? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55(3), 304–324.
- Lister, R. (2007). Inclusive citizenship: Realizing the potential. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 49–61.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class: And other essays*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mathews, D. (1993). Why students hate politics. *Education Digest*, 59(1), 49–51.
- Morse, S. W. (1989). *Renewing civic capacity: Preparing college students for service and citizenship* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 8). ASHE-ERIC.
- Nasrin, S., & Rahman, M. M. (2019). Politicization of student politics in Bangladesh: Historical experiences and contemporary trends. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 6(2), 17–42. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jsss.v6i2.14385>
- Neumayr, M., & Meyer, M. (2010). In search of civicness: An empirical investigation of service delivery, public advocacy, and community building by civil society organizations. In T. Brandsen, P. Dekker, & A. Evers (Eds.), *Civicness in the governance and delivery of social services* (pp. 201–226). Nomos. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845222400-201>
- O'Connor, J. S. (2006). Civic engagement in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(5), 52–58.
- Pusey, A. (2016). Strike, occupy, transform! Students, subjectivity, and struggle. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 26(2), 214–232.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

- Quaye, S. J. (2007). The outcomes of contemporary student activism. *About Campus*, 12(2), 2–9.
- Raill, S., & Hollander, E. (2006). How campuses can create engaged citizens: The student view. *Journal of College and Character*, 7(1), 1–7.
- Rhoads, R. A. (1998). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rhoads, R. A. (2016). Student activism, diversity, and the struggle for a just society. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(3), 189–202.
- Richardson, D. (1998). Sexuality and citizenship. *Sociology*, 32(1), 83–100.
- Sax, L. J. (2004). Citizenship development and the American college student. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 122, 65–80.
- Tanjeem, N., & Fatima, R. E. (2023). The 2018 road safety protest in Bangladesh: How a student crowd challenged (or could not challenge) the repressive state. In I. Rivers & C. L. Lovin (Eds.), *Young people shaping democratic politics: Interrogating inclusion, mobilising education* (pp. 55–81). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Tsui, L. (2000). Effects of campus culture on students' critical thinking. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(4), 421–441.
- Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7(1), 25–34.
- Warren, M. E. (2001). *Democracy and association*. Princeton University Press.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237–269.
- White, K. (2016). Black lives on campuses matter: Reflecting on the rise of the new Black student movement. *Soundings*, 63, 86–97.
- Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002). Youth civic engagement in the twenty-first century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12(1), 121–148.