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Introducing Civic and Political Participation Studies

- “Political socialization” research began as interdisciplinary study of young people’s political attitudes
- Studies of “civic education” added knowledge and cognition
- “Civic or political engagement” now includes the cognitive, attitudinal and behavioral
- Can examine in ecologically focused models
  - Macro-, exo-, micro system - Bronfenbrenner
  - Developmental niche – Super/Harkness
  - Can be informed by empirical data
Accelerating Interest in Civic Engagement in the Early 1990s

• Global discourses in human rights and migration

• Need for rigorous international comparisons of adolescents/young adults on civic topics
  – IEA General Assembly requested a proposal for a civic education study 1993
  – IEA Civic Education Study in two phases 1994-2001
  – IEA International Civic & Citizenship Study 2005-2010
  – PIDOP 2009-present
Details of IEA Civic Education Study

- Mid-1990s CIVED Phase 1
  - An international consensus process achieved agreement on concepts for a test and survey.

- 1999 CIVED Phase 2
  - Nationally representative samples of 14-year-olds were tested in 28 countries (primarily in Europe)
  - 94,000 students; nearly 2500 schools.
  - 90 minute test/survey included “were you born in this country?” also home literacy, classroom climate, attitude scales

- 2001 to the Present: Secondary Analysis
  - For example, HLM analysis of human rights knowledge and attitudes
Countries Testing at Age 14 in CIVED Study

- Australia, England, United States
- Belgium (French), Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Switzerland
- Hong Kong (SAR)
- Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden
- Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania
- Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, Slovenia
- Chile, Colombia
Each individual adolescent enacts “emergent participatory citizenship” on a daily basis within a unique developmental niche.
Developmental Concepts in Civic/Political Studies

- Individual differences and processes
  - Personal integration of attitudes or identity
  - Status as a migrant
  - Gender and developmental progressions
- Possible prerequisites for participation
- Distal and proximal contexts influencing development
  - By country: Cultural/historical contexts reflected in everyday life settings
  - By socialization experience: teachers, classmates
Framing Questions:

How can developmental psychology models and CIVED findings inform PIDOP’s work?

1. What variability exists between and within European countries?
2. How are political attitudes organized within individuals, and do clusters of adolescents with similar attitudes exist?
3. What roles do gender and immigrant status play?
4. What roles do proximal groups play?
5. Is civic knowledge a developmental prerequisite for orientation to civic action?
Addressing Framing Question 1:
The Extent of Variability Between and Within Countries

Using Data from 13 CIVED Countries
[Chosen to include the PIDOP Participants]

From papers with Jo-Ann Amadeo
# Countries’ Means on Three Participation/Attitude Measures

International Means = 10.0, SDs = 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Support Norms of Conventional Citizenship</th>
<th>Support Norms of Social-Movement Citizenship</th>
<th>Internal Political Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5-.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-.4</td>
<td>Italy Portugal US</td>
<td>Italy Norway US</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6-.9.9</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Germany Sweden CzechR</td>
<td>Italy Germany BelgiumF Austr Estonia Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2-.5</td>
<td>Austrl BelgiumF Estonia Czech Engl Norw Sweden</td>
<td>Austrl England Estonia Latvia</td>
<td>Norway CzechR England Finland Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8-.9.1</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>BelgiumF Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Countries’ Means on Three Other Attitude Measures

International Means = 10.0, SDs = 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Trust in Government Institutions</th>
<th>Support for Women’s Rights</th>
<th>Support for Rights of Ethnic Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.5-.8</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Austrl England Finland Germany Norway US</td>
<td>U.S. England Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-.4</td>
<td>Austrl Finland Sweden US</td>
<td>BelgiumF Portugal Sweden</td>
<td>Finland BelgiumF Norway Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>England Germany Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Austrl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6-.9</td>
<td>BelgiumF CzechR Estonia Portugal</td>
<td>CzechR</td>
<td>CzechR Estonia Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2-.5</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Germany Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8-.9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary/Transition

- No PIDOP country’s adolescents hold a high rank on all of these attitudinal scales
- PIDOP countries generally low on efficacy and support for participation
  - Macrosystem and exosystem factors
  - Characteristics of the developmental niche

- Next we move from country averages to look at person-centered analysis (or clusters) of individuals
Addressing Framing Question 2: 
Person Centered Analysis of Attitudinal Patterns 

Using Data from 10 CIVED Countries
Person-Centered Analysis of CIVED Data

- Need to describe these groups of young people in a compelling way to increase public understanding

- Analysis to accomplish this
  - Cluster analyses using 12 attitudinal variables from IEA CIVED survey data
  - 2 step Cluster Analysis with 12 attitudes scales
  - Described cluster with “mottos”
  - 30,000 14-year-olds from 10 countries
    - Western European: Australia, England, Finland, Sweden, U.S.
    - Eastern European: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia
Research Questions

- RQ1: Are there groups of adolescents with distinctive patterns of attitudes?
- RQ2: How do distributions of cluster membership differ by country?
- RQ3: How do individual characteristics, beliefs and school context relate to cluster membership?
Next Figure: Cluster Patterns for 5 Countries Sharing the Western Europe Tradition

Based on the following scales (Mean 10, SD 2):

- Support for Ethic/Minority Rights
- Support for Immigrant Rights
- Support for Women’s Rights
- Cynicism
- Internal Political Efficacy
- Protectionist Attitudes (Nationalism)
- Positive Attitudes to Nation (Patriotism)
- Trust in Government Institutions
- Trust in the Media
- Society-Related Government Responsibilities
- Norms of Conventional Citizen Participation
- Norms of Social Movement Participation
Next Figure: Cluster Patterns for 5 Eastern European Countries

Based on the following scales (Mean 10, SD 2):

- Support for Ethnic/Minority Rights
- Support for Immigrant Rights
- Support for Women’s Rights
- Cynicism
- Internal Political Efficacy
- Protectionist Attitudes (Nationalism)
- Positive Attitudes to Nation (Patriotism)
- Trust in Government Institutions
- Trust in the Media
- Society-Related Government Responsibilities
- Norms of Conventional Citizen Participation
- Norms of Social Movement Participation
Parallel Cluster Group 1

• Social Justice Cluster
  – Support for minority and immigrant rights
  – Low support for norms of conventional or protest action
  – Motto: “I believe in rights for all but do not feel obligated to do much about it.”
Parallel Cluster Group 2

• Conventionally Political Cluster
  – High trust in government institutions;
  – High political self efficacy;
  – Believe in norms of conventional and social oriented citizen action;
  – Protectionist and patriotic in Eastern Europe
  – Also support social justice in Western Europe
  – Motto: “I believe in my country and will support the status quo with expected political and civic activities.”
Parallel Cluster Groups 3 and 4

• Indifferent Cluster
  – All attitudes very close to the mean
  – Will do the minimum expected

• Disaffected Cluster
  – More negative than Indifferent but not extreme

• Motto for both clusters:
  – “I have better ways to spend my time than thinking about politics, but I won’t do anything rash.”
Parallel Cluster Group 5

• Alienated Cluster (Anti-Social Justice)
  – Uniformly negative attitudes about rights for minorities and immigrants
  – Trust 1 ½ SDs below the international mean
  – Motto: I’m angry about the immigrants and minority groups in my country, and I don’t trust the government. I have the right to do what I want.”
Distributions of Cluster Groups in Western Europe

- **Australia**: 15, 10, 15, 10, 5, 5
- **England**: 20, 20, 20, 20, 5, 5
- **Finland**: 25, 25, 25, 25, 10, 10
- **Sweden**: 30, 30, 30, 30, 15, 15
- **United States**: 35, 35, 35, 35, 20, 20

Colors:
- **Social Justice**
- **Conventional**
- **Indifferent**
- **Disaffected**
- **Alienated**
Distribution of Cluster Groups in Eastern Europe
A Focus on the Alienated Cluster

- About 7% across countries are Alienated and hold negative inter-group attitudes
- 25% of these Alienated youth think it is “not important to obey the law”
  - 1% for Conventional; 6% for Disaffected
- Potentially for illegal protest (block traffic):
  - Alienated cluster members expect to protest
  - Social Justice cluster members do not expect to protest
Individual and Proximal Characteristics of Alienated Students

- Alienated Cluster members likely to:
  - Be **male**
  - **Lack** a sense of **collective efficacy** in the school community
  - **Lack** the experience of a **respectful climate for discussion** in their classrooms
  - Spend evenings “hanging out” with peers
  - No differences by SES in Western Europe
Summary/Transition

- Many young people believe “citizens should behave democratically” but are unwilling to engage in action
  - Perhaps they are “standby citizens”
- The deeply alienated group is of concern
  - Intergroup attitudes are part of emergent citizenship and shaped in developmental niches
- Next we move to consider gender and proximal school factors in relation to attitudes across nations
Addressing Framing Questions 3 and 4: Gender Differences in Support for Women’s Rights and Political Efficacy

Using CIVED Data from 28 countries
Long History of Research on Gender Differences

- Older research on adults’ political participation and socialization shows males more politically efficacious and involved

- Recent research shows males still have higher efficacy, but as types of participation have expanded, females participate more

- Basic analysis of the IEA CIVED study (1999)
  - Few differences in political knowledge or trust
  - Females more positive about immigrant and ethnic rights
  - Females more likely to expect to undertake every type of political activity except candidacy and political party action
  - Females support women’s rights but are less efficacious
Research Questions and Mode of Analysis

- RQ1: Which gender has more positive attitudes or actions *on average*?

- RQ2: What context factors relate to larger or smaller gender *gaps*?
  - Especially proximal school-related experiences

- Uses HLM to model *averages and gaps between male and females*
  - With predictors at the individual, school and country levels
Support for Women's Rights
Average Predictors and Selected Interactions

- **Student Level – Individual WR Support**
  - Positively related to Civic Knowledge & Home Literacy background
  - Females have higher WR Support

- **School Level – Average WR Support**
  - Positively related to average Open Class Discussion Climate
    - Smaller gender gap in schools with high openness
      [due to higher support from male students]
  - Negatively related to average perception of gender discrimination in employment

- **Country Level – Average WR Support**
  - Positively related to gender development GDI
Internal Political Efficacy
Average Predictors and Selected Interactions

- **Student Level – Individual Efficacy**
  - Positively related to Civic Knowledge & Home Literacy
  - Males have higher Efficacy

- **School Level – Average Efficacy**
  - Positively related to average Open Class Discussion climate
  - Positively related to average perception of Discrimination Against Women in Employment
    - Larger gender gap in schools perceiving more discrimination [due to higher efficacy of males]

- **Country Level – Average Efficacy**
  - Negatively related to Gender Development Index
School Effects on Gender Gaps

- Open classroom discussion climate is associated with *smaller gender gap* for Women’s Rights Support
  - Driven mainly by higher support among males
- Higher average perception of gender discrimination is associated with *larger gender gap* in Internal Political Efficacy
  - Driven mainly by higher efficacy among males
Summary/Transition

- Shows proximal school context is important
  - Views of discrimination in opportunities
  - Respectful classroom climate to share ideas

- Shows context outside school is important
  - Position of women and opportunities

- Suggests considering other factors in developmental niche

- Next we move to consider immigrant status and proximal school and out-of-school factors in relation to attitudes
Addressing Framing Questions 3 and 4: The Extent and Meaning of Differences by Migrant Status

Using Australian, U.S. and Swedish CIVED Data

From a paper co-authored with Carolyn Barber and Britt Wilkenfeld
The “Patchwork” of Previous Research

- PISA studies of reading achievement
- International Comparative Study of Ethnocultural Youth (Phinney’s work)
- Qualitative studies cross-nationally and in single nations/cities
Research Questions

- RQ1: Are there *gaps* in civic knowledge and attitudes between immigrants/non-immigrants in Australia, Sweden, and the U.S.?
- RQ2: To what extent can proximal factors, *explain these gaps*?
  - Family, formal and non-formal education
Immigrants in the Three Countries:

- **United States**: characteristics and policies
  - 11% immigrants; largest group Latino
  - Integrated identity (Phinney)
- **Australia**: characteristics and policies
  - 10% immigrants: large groups English-speaking or Asian
  - Integrated identity (Phinney)
- **Sweden**: characteristics and policies
  - 8% immigrants; large group of Muslims/refugees
  - Ethnic-oriented identity (Phinney)
Results of the Analysis

• RQ1: What is the nature of gaps between students who were or were not “born in the country”:
  – Found most gaps in U.S.; fewest in Australia
• RQ 2: To explain gaps used HLM entering student-level predictors in blocks to examine what happened to gaps in Civic Knowledge and WR Attitudes:
  – Immigrant/non-immigrant (base)
  – Discuss politics with family and gender
  – Formal and non-formal education: “open climate” of class and school and activities (school council)
  – Informal interaction with friends
  – Speak language of the test at home
Proximal Factors and Their Influence

- Predictors of Civic Knowledge for All Students
  - Open Classroom Climate for Discussion
  - Confidence in the Value of School Participation
  - Student Council Participation

- Predictors of Women’s Rights for All Students
  - Being female
  - Open Classroom Climate for Discussion
  - Confidence in the Value of School Participation

- Gaps reduced to non-significance after entry of 5 blocks including in- and out-of-school factors:
  - In Civic Knowledge in Australia and Sweden
  - In Support for Women’s Rights in Australia and the U.S.
Support for Women’s Rights: Immigrant Gaps in Australia

Note: Dark bars indicate significant differences
Support for Women’s Rights: Immigrant Gaps in the United States

Note: Dark bars indicate significant differences
Support for Women’s Rights: Immigrant Gaps in Sweden

Note: Dark bars indicate significant differences
Summary/Transition

• Reinforces the importance of formal and informal education for all students:
  – Open climate for discussion in the classroom
  – School environment where student feels participation makes a difference

• Some attitudes embedded in the developmental niches of migrant students

• Next we move to consider whether young people need civic skills as prerequisite to civic/political action.
Addressing Framing Question 5: Civic Knowledge and Skills as Possible “Developmental Prerequisites” for Civic/Political Action or Engagement

Analysis of 6 PIDOP countries (BelgiumFr, Czech Republic, England, Italy, Portugal, Sweden) using CIVED data conducted with Ting Zhang
Exploratory Research Questions

- Using advanced modeling, can we estimate the extent to which civic knowledge or skills are prerequisite for an intention to adult civic engagement?
- What profiles of student orientations exist and with what frequency?
- Are there differences by gender and migrant status in the frequencies of these profiles?
The Analysis

• Used civic knowledge items and skills in interpreting political communication from a previous analysis of CIVED (38 items).

• Added 12 items including support for norms of adult participation and intent to participate as an adult (e.g. vote, get information before voting, act in community)

• Used Cognitive Diagnostic Modeling which generates profiles
  – Of Knowledge, Skills, and Participatory Intent
## Six Countries’ CDM Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Patterns of Civic Knowledge, Skills and Expected/Value Placed on Citizen Action

- Italy
- Germany
- Czech Rep
- Sweden
- Portugal
- England

Legend:
- Red: Neither knowledge, skills nor action orientation 000
- Purple: Knowledge and/or skills without action orientation 010 011
- Green: Action orientation without knowledge or skills 001
- Blue: Action orientation with either or both knowledge and skills 011 101 111
Results of Exploration of Profiles in Four PIDOP Countries

- Most students fell into profiles possessing all three (Knowledge/Skills/Action) or none of the three
- Nearly 20% had Action without the “cognitive prerequisites” of Knowledge and/or Skills
- Small proportions in other profiles
- More than one route to action and engagement
Differences in Profile Patterns by Gender, SES, and Migrant Status in England and Sweden

• Few differences by gender

• In both countries
  – Higher SES (home literacy), Not Being a Migrant associated with the “Action. Knowledge and Skills Profile”
  – Lower SES (home literacy) and Being a Migrant associated with the “Action without Knowledge or Skills Profile”
Profile Patterns Associated with “Being Born in England”

- Neither knowledge, skills nor action orientation 000
- Knowledge and/or skills without action orientation 010 010 110
- Action orientation without knowledge or skills 001
- Action orientation with either or both knowledge and skills 011 101 111
Profile Patterns Associated with “Being Born in Sweden”

- Neither knowledge, skills nor action orientation 000
- Knowledge and/or skills without action orientation 100 010 110
- Action orientation without knowledge or skills 001
- Action orientation with either or both knowledge and skills 011 101 111
Summary

- Knowledge/skills are valuable but not necessary to acquire orientations toward participation
- Interventions should not be limited to enhancing knowledge
- Further research needed on progressions, prerequisites and proximal factors in this area
Overall Summary Returning to the Framing Questions:

- Countries differ in attitudes
- Adolescents possess organized patterns of attitudes
  - Indifferent and Disengaged groups large
  - A small but worrisome group is Alienated
- Some gender- and migrant-related gaps can be reduced
  - Proximal influences such as Open Classroom and School Climates of Efficacy especially important
- The Developmental Niche model of value
Each individual adolescent enacts “emergent participatory citizenship” on a daily basis within a unique developmental niche.

- **Daily Life Routines with Families and Peers; Formal and Informal Schooling**
- **Historically Rooted Beliefs and Social Identities in Relation to Nation/Culture**
- **Adults’ Beliefs/Expectations about the Young Person**
- **Late Adolescent and Young Adult Formal Citizenship Potential**
- **Young Child Rights to Protection and to Develop Identities**

**Adolescent Emergent Participatory Citizenship**
Future Directions

• Make research findings compelling for the public and for policy audiences
• Address an appropriately broad view of emergent citizenship in adolescence
• Support research on common research questions with different methodologies
  – Mixed methods research, especially on challenges to efficacy outside the school
  – Developmental research, including longitudinal
  – Evaluation research cross-nationally focusing on the climate of schools and classrooms
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